INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

**“Public” and “Private” Crimes Against Women
in Eastern Ontario Public Housing:
The Role of Perceived Collective Efficacy**

by

E. Andreas Tomaszewski, B.A., M.A.

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
June 26, 2002

© 2002
E. Andreas Tomaszewski

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-79444-X

The undersigned recommend to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
acceptance of the thesis

**“Public” and “Private” Crimes Against Women
in Eastern Ontario Public Housing:
The Role of Perceived Collective Efficacy**

submitted by E. Andreas Tomaszewski, B.A., M.A.
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Thesis Supervisor

External Examiner

Carleton University
June 17, 2002

ABSTRACT

A large body of empirical work shows that poor neighbourhoods display higher levels of social disorganization, leading to a breakdown of informal neighbourhood social control, resulting in higher crime rates. The bulk of this research was done in urban areas consisting of many different neighbourhoods, such as “upscale” and gentrified neighbourhoods (e.g., Census Tracts and Census Metropolitan Areas), ethnically diverse and socially stratified neighbourhoods, as well as deteriorating inner cities and other urban areas of concentrated disadvantage. This research concludes that, compared to their better-off counterparts, poor neighbourhoods display much lower levels of informal social control and social cohesion. However, little attention has been paid to these factors and their relation to crime in poor neighbourhoods. Further, the victimization of women has largely been ignored, including “public” crimes, such as street violence and harassment, and “private” crimes, such as intimate partner abuse. Following the work of Robert Sampson and colleagues on “collective efficacy” (informal social control, social cohesion and trust) and crime, this study uses data from the West Town Study (WTS), conducted in six public housing neighbourhoods in an economically disadvantaged western section of an urban area in eastern Ontario, Canada, and attempts to answer the following questions: (1) What factors are associated with collective efficacy? (2) What are the associations between collective efficacy and “public” and “private” crimes against women? (3) Do women belonging to severely distressed households perceive collective efficacy to be lower than women not living in such households? (4) Are women belonging to severely distressed households more likely to be victimized by “public” and “private” crimes than women not living in severely distressed households? The data reveal the following: significant positive

correlations exist between collective efficacy and organizational participation, involvement with neighbours, and being single. Conversely, negative correlations exist between collective efficacy and respondents' perceptions that disorder, crime, and drugs are problems in their neighbourhood, being in a dating relationship, and being separated or divorced. While the associations between collective efficacy and "public" and "private" crimes are both negative, the association is stronger and more significant regarding "public" crimes. Women living in severely distressed households do neither perceive collective efficacy to be lower, nor are they more like to be victimized by "public" or "private" crimes than other women. Methodological and theoretical considerations are raised and policy implications are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Finishing this work after many years could not be accomplished without the help of a number of great people. These include the faculty associated with the Institute for Canadian Studies at the University of Augsburg, Bavaria (Germany), who introduced me to the exciting world of academia: Professor Rainer-Olaf Schultze, Professor Roland Vogelsang, Dr. Martin Kuester, the late Professor Walter Pache, and Dr. Hanspeter Plocher. Professor Wallace Clement can also be counted as a member of this group; while a guest professor in Germany, he assisted me in organizing my courses at Carleton so I would be able to finish an M.A. in Canadian Studies.

At Carleton University, the support, encouragement, and intellectual stimulation of my dissertation committee members Professors Walter DeKeseredy, Shahid Alvi, and Dennis Forcese, stands out. Their guidance, support, constructive criticism, and insights in so many ways over the past years are difficult to surpass. Their mentoring went well beyond what students can hope to receive. I am especially grateful to Professors DeKeseredy and Alvi, who allowed me to be part of the first Canadian study on victimization in public housing. I also want to express my gratitude to the participants of the West Town Study and the other researchers I had the pleasure to work with on that project. Further, faculty, staff, and students in the Department of Sociology & Anthropology at Carleton University helped me have a wonderful graduate experience.

Nevertheless, the biggest thanks I owe are to my family: my parents, especially mom, my grandparents (Rohrer Oma and Opa, Olga Oma), my sister Sabine, and Thomas. Had it not been for their continuous emotional and financial support, I would not have been able to finish, nor start, my studies. I also want to thank Elke for her support. And

dad, I know now how much you gave me and meant to me.

Many thanks also go to the staff at the Carleton University Library Data Centre for helping me obtain and manipulate Census data needed for my research: Wendy Watkins, Jane Fry, and Kevin Selbee. Equally important was the assistance of Jeet Atwal and Heather McAdam in the library's Maps, Data, and Government Information Centre MADGIC. Mrs. McAdam introduced me to the GIS software MapInfo and was helpful in creating earlier versions of the maps used in my research. Creating the maps displayed in this document was possible through the kind and outstanding support of Christy Sheeran at Ohio University's Institute for Local Government Administration and Rural Development.

I also want to acknowledge the support of Carleton University, especially Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, Dr. Roger Blockley, for providing me with a scholarship during a time of financial hardship. I am also thankful to the many friends I have made in Ottawa, especially Sylvie Aspirot, Michel Gratton, and Dr. Mark Lowes. Thanks also go to the faculty, students, and staff in the Department of Sociology & Anthropology at Ohio University, above all Professors Martin Schwartz and Mike Maume, as well as my graduate assistants at Ohio and Eastern Michigan University. Professor Schwartz, in particular, provided outstanding support as a mentor and colleague.

Finally, I want to thank my colleagues at Eastern Michigan University for the support and encouragement to "get it done." Over the past few years, the emotional and intellectual company and support of Donna Maidment has truly enriched my life.

This dissertation is dedicated to my family in Germany. I could not have done it without you!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
 Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Statement of the Research Problem	1
1.2 Overview of Subsequent Chapters	10
 Chapter 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	
2.1 Introduction	12
2.2 Research on Crime in Urban Areas of Concentrated Disadvantage	13
2.3 Research on Crimes Against Women	18
2.4 Conclusions	24
 Chapter 3: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	
3.1 Introduction	30
3.2 Collective Efficacy and Crime	33
3.3 Hypotheses	36

Chapter 4: SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF WEST TOWN

4.1	Introduction	37
4.2	Historical Development	37
4.2.1	The Creation of Public Housing Neighbourhoods as Urban Areas of Concentrated Disadvantage	38
4.2.2	Economic History and Economic Trends	45
4.2.2.1	The City	45
4.2.2.2	West Town	56
4.3	Population	58
4.3.1	Immigration and Ethnicity	61
4.3.2	Unemployment and Poverty	70
4.3.3	Education	76
4.4	Summary	78

Chapter 5: METHODOLOGY

5.1	The West Town Study: Sample and Data Collection	80
5.1.1	Census Data	82
5.1.2	The Quality of Neighbourhood Life Survey (QNLS)	82
5.1.3	In-Depth Interviews	93
5.2	Definitions and Measurements	94
5.3	Data Analysis	106

Chapter 6: PERCEIVED COLLECTIVE EFFICACY AND

”PUBLIC” AND “PRIVATE” CRIMES AGAINST WOMEN

IN WEST TOWN PUBLIC HOUSING

6.1	Introduction	107
6.2	Determining Levels of Perceived Collective Efficacy	108
6.3	Correlates of Perceived Collective Efficacy	110
6.4	“Public” Crimes Against Women	114
6.5	“Private” Crimes Against Women	126
6.6	Summary	141

Chapter 7: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

7.1	Overview	143
7.2	Methodological and Theoretical Considerations	145
7.3	Policy Implications	149
7.3.1	Creating the “Social Mix”	150
7.3.2	Confronting Crime in Public Housing	
	<i>Including Crimes Against Women</i>	151
7.3.2	Community-Building and Creating Woman Abuse-Free Environments .	152

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Gains in Total Employment According to Major Groups in the Region, 1990-1995	50
Table 2: Losses in Total Employment According to Major Groups in the Region, 1990-1995	51
Table 3: Changes in Employment by Business Activity Groups in the Region, 1990-1995	54
Table 4: Selected Ethnic Groups in West Town Census Tracts <i>Containing</i> Public Housing, 1995	68
Table 5: Selected Ethnic Groups in West Town Census Tracts <i>Not Containing</i> Public Housing, 1995	69
Table 6: Selected Sociodemographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics of Female QNLS Respondents	89
Table 7: Incidence of “Public” Crimes Against Women: Street Violence	118
Table 8: Incidence of “Public” Crimes Against Women: Harassment	119
Table 9: Collective Efficacy and Street Violence	120
Table 10: Collective Efficacy and Harassment	121
Table 11: Correlates of “Public” Crimes Against Women	124
Table 12: Incidence of “Private” Crimes Against Women: Psychological Abuse by Intimate Partners	131
Table 13: Incidence of “Private” Crimes Against Women: Physical Violence by Intimate Partners	132

Table 14: Incidence of “Private” Crimes Against Women:

Sexual Violence by Intimate Partners,

Intimate Abuse, and Intimate Violence 133

Table 15: Collective Efficacy and Intimate Abuse 134

Table 16: Collective Efficacy and Intimate Violence 135

Table 17: Correlates of “Private” Crimes Against Women 139

LIST OF MAPS

Map 1: Percentage of Immigrants in	
West Town Census Tracts, 1995.....	63
Map 2: Percentage Change of Immigrants in	
West Town Census Tracts, 1985 - 1995.....	64
Map 3: Percentage of Recent Immigrants in	
West Town Census Tracts, 1995.....	65
Map 4: Percentage Change of Recent Immigrants in	
West Town Census Tracts, 1985 - 1995.....	66
Map 5: Percentage of Unemployed Adults (15 Years of	
Age and Older) in West Town Census Tracts, 1995	72
Map 6: Percentage Change of Unemployed Adults	
(15 Years of Age and Older) in West Town	
Census Tracts, 1985 - 1995	73
Map 7: Percentage of Low-Income Families	
in West Town Census Tracts, 1995	74
Map 8: Percentage Change of Low-Income Families	
in West Town Census Tracts, 1985 - 1995	75
Map 9: Percentage of Adult Population with	
Less than Grade 9 Education in	
West Town Enumeration Areas, 1995	77

APPENDICES

A: Quality of Neighbourhood Life Survey (QNLS) Questionnaire	157
B: West Town Study Interview Guide	170
C: Zero-Order Relationships Among Major Variables	175

REFERENCES	176
-------------------------	------------

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Statement of the Research Problem

The criminogenic nature of poverty and joblessness has received much social scientific attention.¹ Further, high-poverty neighbourhoods, such as public housing estates and sections of the city in which they are located, are generally portrayed or known as areas ‘infested’ with a litany of social problems, including predatory street crime and violence against intimate female partners (e.g., DeKeseredy, Alvi, Schwartz, and Perry 1999; Hagan and Peterson 1995; Raphael 2001b).² Nevertheless, to date, social scientists in Canada have paid little attention to issues surrounding concentrated urban poverty, such as its extent and the social problems accompanying it (LaPrairie 1994, 1995; Tomaszewski 1997).

While U.S. researchers have studied crime in high-poverty neighbourhoods for several decades,³ it remains virtually unexamined in both Canadian and U.S. public

¹ Studies documenting this in the Canadian context include Baron and Hartnagel (1997), Hagan and McCarthy (1997), Hartnagel and Lee (1990), Kennedy, Silverman, and Forde (1991), and LaPrairie (1994, 1995). For a critique of Canadian research on inner city crime, see DeKeseredy, Alvi, Tomaszewski, and Schwartz (2000).

² This ‘general knowledge’ stems by and large from media reports and the police targeting these areas. For example, while the data used in this analysis were conducted, local newspapers and radio stations reported on a variety of crimes and disreputable behaviours in the area, including arson, drug arrests, teenage violence, stabbings, child abuse, etc. (Dimmock 2000; Ottawa Citizen 1998; Rupert 1998a, 1998b, 1999; see also Lofaro 1997).

³ This ranges from classics like Liebow’s (1967) to more contemporary studies such as those by Anderson (1990, 1999), Bourgois (1995), Hagedorn (1988), MacLeod (1995), Pinderhughes (1997), Rainwater (1990), Sullivan (1989), and Wilson (1987, 1996). Short (1997) provides a useful overview and evaluation of research on poverty, ethnicity, and violent crime conducted over the past 50 years.

housing neighbourhoods (DeKeseredy, Alvi, Tomaszewski, and Schwartz 2000; Fagan, Dumanovsky, Thompson, and Davies 1998; Holzman 1996; Holzman and Piper 1998). Still, the general public thinks that crime and drugs are synonymous with public housing estates and their residents. However, Holzman and Piper (1998) assert that the popular belief that predatory street crime is much more prevalent in public housing compared to other neighbourhoods is only partially confirmed. Some studies show that street crime is no more of a problem in public housing neighbourhoods than in areas displaying similar characteristics, such as high unemployment and poverty rates (e.g., Holzman 1996; Roncek, Bell, and Francik 1981; Weatherburn, Lind, and Ku 1999).

If the study of crime in public housing has been ignored in Canada and the U.S., the same can be said about crimes and other forms of non-criminal violence against women in public housing. This lack of attention further includes public harassment, intimate partner abuse, and the role of informal community-based social control in preventing and controlling these behaviours. While much social scientific research has shown that community or neighbourhood informal social control can effectively prevent and control crime,⁴ to the best of my knowledge, very few studies have examined whether this is the case in public housing neighbourhoods. As for violence against women in public housing, DeKeseredy et al. (1999: 501) assert that this issue, too, has not received adequate attention and needs to be researched since “public housing communities ... are key arenas where gendered power relations are played out.” Public harassment – such as unwanted sexual remarks, sexual touching, as well as racial and homophobic insults – also warrants

⁴ See, for example, Braithwaite (1989), (1993) and (1995); Brewer, Lockhart, and Rogers (1998); DeLeon-Granados (1999); Ellickson (1991); Foster (1990) and (1995); Ryan (1995); Taylor (1997); Warner and Rountree (1997).

more social scientific attention since it “transforms daily, enjoyable activities – walking, jogging and sitting in the park – into risky behaviours to be avoided” for many women (DeKeseredy et al. 1999: 502).

In addition to poor women’s limited options when trying to leave dangerous public and private environments, much research has shown that they experience higher rates of victimization than do their more affluent counterparts (e.g., Stanko 1985; Miles-Doan 1998). For example, recent data show that between close to one-fifth (e.g., DeKeseredy, Alvi, Schwartz, and Perry 1999) to half (Renzetti and Maier 2001) of female public housing residents had experienced violence at the hands of their intimate partners in the twelve months prior to the studies. Research on how incidents like these can be reduced in ways that are “less intrusive” than intensifying surveillance (DeLeon-Granados 1999: 6) are useful and important social scientific undertakings, especially because many female victims do not seek help from social service agencies or formal agents of social control. For example, Renzetti and Maier (2001), in studying woman abuse in public housing, found the following:

The majority of women said they could not trust the local police to help them, or when they had called the police in the past, the police were unresponsive. ... A common complaint from the women was that the police “take forever” to respond to a call, despite the fact that Camden is a small city. (Renzetti and Maier 2001: 14)

Most of the studies on crime and informal community social control are informed by a social disorganization perspective. According to this approach, crime and victimization are attributed to a breakdown of informal neighbourhood social control resulting from social disorganization in structurally disadvantaged urban areas. Sampson

and Groves (1989: 777) contend that “social disorganization refers to the inability of a community structure to realize the common values of its residents and maintain effective social controls.” Further, this perspective argues that social disorganization is the result of poverty, ethnic heterogeneity, residential instability, and family disruption (Sampson and Groves 1989). According to social disorganization theory, then, “low-socio-economic status communities will suffer from a weaker organizational base than higher-status communities” (Sampson and Groves 1989: 780). Consequently, communities with a higher proportion of poor residents will be more socially disorganized than middle-class neighbourhoods, leading to higher crime rates (e.g., Warner and Rountree 1997).

This relationship between social disorganization and crime has received significant empirical support (e.g., Kennedy et al. 1991; Sampson and Groves 1989; Sampson and Laub 1994; Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997).⁵ However, the bulk of this research was conducted in large urban areas (Census tracts (CTs), Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs), etc.) consisting of many different neighbourhoods, deteriorating inner cities, “upscale” and gentrified neighbourhoods, as well as areas of concentrated disadvantage (Rountree et al. 1994). Given that many neighbourhoods in the U.S. with mostly middle-class residents tend to be ethnically homogenous (i.e., mostly white or non-African-American), show higher residential stability, and consist primarily of two-parent families, it is not surprising that they fare better on the social organization scale and have more efficient informal community social control at their disposal (e.g., Warner and Rountree 1997). After all, social disorganization, resulting in low levels of informal social control,

⁵ There are too many for all to be mentioned here. Other studies examining aspects of social disorganization and crime include Blau and Blau (1982), Sampson (1985) and (1991), Sampson and Wilson (1995), Skogan (1990), Wilson (1987) and (1996).

is defined by the complete opposite of characteristics displayed by neighbourhoods comprised of financially better-situated residents, such as low socioeconomic status, ethnic heterogeneity, residential mobility (or higher proportion of renters versus home owners), and family disruption (Sampson and Groves 1989). Taylor (2001) notes that the opposite of social disorganization is “collective efficacy.” This concept has enjoyed increasing popularity since introduced to community crime researchers by Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997).

A growing body of empirical work shows that residents of poor neighbourhoods can control crime without the involvement of police (Bellair 2000; Brewer, Lockhart, and Rodgers 1998; DeLeon-Granados 1999; Foster 1990 and 1995; Walklate 1998). Despite these recent undertakings, we still lack adequate social scientific knowledge on informal community-based social control, and the control and prevention of crime in poor neighbourhoods. This is the case in the U.S. and even more so in Canada. In particular, there is a need for empirical research on the relationship between “collective efficacy,” defined by Sampson et al. (1997: 918) “as social cohesion among neighbors combined with their willingness to intervene on behalf of the common good,” and crime in poor neighbourhoods. This study is an effort to fill an important gap in the literature in several ways:⁶

⁶ Using the same data this analysis is based on, DeKeseredy et al. (1999) and Alvi, Schwartz, DeKeseredy, and Maume. (2001) make important steps in addressing related issues. However, their analysis focuses on the analysis of incidence and prevalence data on women’s victimization and their fear of crime, respectively, whereas the analysis presented here focuses on the associations between collective efficacy and crimes against women. A more detailed critique of the literature on these topics can be found in the next chapter.

- (1) It adds gender issues to discussions of collective efficacy, which has been ignored in the extant literature to date;
- (2) It examines collective efficacy in Canada with a sample of public housing residents and thus applies the concept in a different geographical location and to a different population than previously done;
- (3) It tests whether collective efficacy equally applies to crimes in the public and private domain.

Further, this study attempts to answer the following questions regarding female residents of six public housing estates located in the west end of an urban centre in eastern Ontario, Canada:

- (1) Do female members of severely distressed households perceive collective efficacy to be lower than those not living in such households?
- (2) Are female members of severely distressed households more likely to be victimized by “public” crimes, such as street violence (robbery and assault) and harassment (homophobic, racial, sexual) and “private” crimes, such as psychological, physical, and sexual intimate abuse?
- (3) What is the association between collective efficacy and the victimization of female public housing residents by “public” crimes (street violence and harassment)?
- (4) What is the association between collective efficacy and the victimization of female public housing residents by “private” crimes (psychological, physical, and sexual intimate abuse)?

Public housing neighbourhood refers to one of the six public housing estates in which the research was conducted⁷ and the immediate areas surrounding them, with parks, roads, rivers, and lakes forming natural boundaries (see Map 1 for the exact locations of the public housing estates in the research area). Public housing estates are specific types of government-assisted housing for low-income people or “the poor,” leading to rents that are below market prices. They are under the authority of local or regional governments (“housing authorities) and consist mostly of apartment complexes and townhouses. The public housing neighbourhoods at the centre of this study are located in adjacent Census statistical areas and in walking distance to each other. Zorbaugh (1961: 47) refers to neighbourhoods like these as “natural areas,” which are defined as geographical areas “characterized both by a physical individuality and by the cultural [and social] characteristics of the people who live in it.” Similarly, Wirth and Furez (1938; quoted in Bursik and Grasmick 1993: 7), call them “natural neighbourhood areas” which are “little worlds ... each one differentiated from the others by its characteristic function in the total economy and cultural complex of city life.” This also comes very close to Taylor’s (1997) conception of neighbourhoods as “street blocks.”

In her discussion of research in poverty areas, Tienda (1991: 259) argues that it is important to define neighbourhoods in spatial (geographic neighbourhood) and social terms (demographic neighbourhoods). The research at hand is one of those rare instances, in which geographic, demographic, and social neighbourhoods coincide, as Tienda’s

⁷ See Chapter Five for details regarding the research, including methodology. See Chapter Four for an in-depth examination of the origins of public housing in the research area.

(1991: 259; emphasis in original) comment illustrates: “*Geographic neighborhoods* [are] limited by major streets, highways, parks, rivers, and schools, ... *demographic neighborhoods* [are] defined by discontinuities in the population characteristics of places, ... *social neighborhoods* [are] defined by the boundaries of social networks and the density of interaction patterns.” Elliott et al. (1996: 417) support the definition of public housing neighbourhoods as “natural areas” and geographic, demographic, and social neighbourhoods:

Families in affluent neighborhoods may not be as dependent on their physical neighborhood for social support, resources, and informal social controls as are those living in disadvantaged neighborhoods; their “functional” neighborhood is more likely to transcend the physical boundaries of the neighborhood, whereas in more disadvantaged neighborhoods, the physical and functional neighborhoods are more likely to coincide.

All six public housing estates can be considered simultaneous geographic, demographic, and social neighbourhoods as:

- They are physically separated from non-public housing units by major streets, highways, parks, schools, or a combination of these.
- Their residents share similar socioeconomic characteristics that distinguish them from those in non-public housing as they qualify to live there because of their low incomes.
- These areas are densely populated which, combined with a relative lack of activities and contacts with non-public housing residents (see, for example, Fernandez and Harris 1992), makes it very likely for public housing residents to

interact with each other. Some research shows that this leads to higher levels of social interaction than in many advantaged neighbourhoods. For example, Bellair (2000: 152) contends that “residents living in disadvantaged communities engage in higher than average rates of informal surveillance.” Similarly, Ross, Mirowsky, and Pribesh (2001) find that residents in these neighbourhoods display higher levels of trust.

Since national and other large-scale surveys, such as the Canadian Urban Victimization Survey (CUVS), tell us little about the peculiarities of local neighbourhoods (e.g., DeKeseredy and MacLean 1991), the study focused on six particular neighbourhoods in the west end of an urban centre in eastern Ontario, Canada. Hence, it was called the West Town Study (WTS), which consisted of a combination of quantitative and qualitative components. The methodology of the WTS was also informed by feminist and left realist principles, which include that a local survey be conducted to gather meaningful information on neighbourhood residents (Quality of Neighbourhood Life Survey (QNLS)), the instrument be pretested, the community supports and be involved in research development and execution, methodological triangulation be used, and that the research be conducted by a research team that is independent of local or government interests (see Jones, MacLean, and Young 1986; MacLean 1992; Maguire 1987). Further, the methodology was informed by the work of Harvard University scholar William Julius Wilson and University of Chicago sociologist Robert J. Sampson, who kindly provided previously used research instruments.

In addition to the survey component, the WTS also included in-depth interviews

with residents and analyses of Census data to document demographic and economic changes and to generate sociodemographic and socioeconomic profiles of the West Town public housing neighbourhoods. One of the reasons for taking this approach is in response to Wilson's (1987: 18) proposition that careful empirical research, consisting of a combination of historical, quantitative, and rich qualitative research strategies, has to be conducted to document the problems the "truly disadvantaged" face.

1.2 Overview of Subsequent Chapters

Chapter Two includes a review of the extant literature on crime in urban neighbourhoods in general and crime in public housing in particular. The chapter closes by pointing to how the identified shortcomings can be addressed and how they have informed the research, which provided the data for the analysis presented here.

Chapter Three describes the theoretical framework that informs this study. The collective efficacy model (Sampson et al. 1997) has roots in social disorganization theory and emphasizes the positive roles of informal community social control exercised by neighbourhood residents to prevent and control neighbourhood crime. The chapter ends with a summary of the hypotheses generated from the theoretical framework.

Chapter Four presents data from various Census years and other government information to provide sociodemographic and socioeconomic profiles of West Town and its public housing neighbourhoods. Also part of this chapter is a description of how large portions of West Town evolved into urban areas of concentrated disadvantage. Further, to understand West Town's current economic and demographic situation, historical and recent economic developments in West Town and the surrounding urban area are also

discussed. These issues are relevant as they point to the importance of economic disenfranchisement in creating an environment making many people more likely to become perpetrators and victims of intimate partner abuse. The methodology of the West Town Study (WTS) is described in Chapter Five.

Chapter Six presents the results of the statistical analyses. A central question is whether the association between collective efficacy and the victimization of female West Town public housing residents by “public” and “private” crimes are negative. In other words, does collective efficacy decrease the likelihood of women becoming victim of both types of crimes? Chapter Seven summarizes the research and results, suggests policies, and describes implications for future research.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

There is a large body of knowledge on crime in urban neighbourhoods, dating back to the 1920's.⁸ These studies are largely guided by social disorganization theory (Agnew 1999; Olson 1982; Warner and Rountree 1997). However, several studies are informed by other perspectives, such as Agnew's "general strain theory" (Agnew 1992, 1999; Agnew and White 1992), feminist theory (e.g., Bourgois and Dunlap 1993; Connell 1987; DeKeseredy et al. 2000; Miller 1997), and left realism (e.g., Crawford, Jones, Woodhouse, and Young 1990; Jones, MacLean, and Young 1986). Research informed by the social disorganization perspective, in particular, has contributed to a rich social scientific understanding of neighbourhoods and crime, by drawing attention to the importance of neighbourhood context for individual and group behaviour. While much of this work focuses on violent crime, little attention has been paid to criminal and non-criminal victimization in public housing and gender – issues of central concern to this study.

The purpose of this chapter is to review the extant literature on these issues and to identify gaps in this body of knowledge. My review is organized as follows. It begins with a review of the literature on crime in urban areas of concentrated disadvantage with special attention given to social disorganization research and studies on crime in public

⁸ See Park and Burgess (1928), Shaw and McKay (1942), and Sampson and Groves (1989). For a discussion of the community / neighbourhood and crime literature drawing on social disorganization theory, see Bursik (1984) and (1988), Bursik and Grasmick (1993), Byrne and Sampson (1986), and Walker (1997).

housing. Then, research on crimes against women is reviewed. Gaps in both research areas are identified at the end of the chapter.

2.2 Research on Crime in Urban Areas of Concentrated Disadvantage

Again, the dominant perspective on crime in urban neighbourhoods assumes that structural neighbourhood characteristics – such as poverty, ethnic heterogeneity, and residential mobility – impair neighbourhood informal social controls and hence lead to failures in local attempts to control and prevent crime. This has been confirmed time and again in numerous studies examining neighbourhood contexts and local crime rates (e.g., Bursik and Grasmick 1993; Byrne and Sampson 1986; Harrell and Peterson 1992; Kennedy, Silverman, and Forde 1991; LaPrairie 1994, 1995; Sampson and Groves 1989).

Much research has found that both residential stability and neighbourhood informal social control can affect local crime rates. This has led several researchers to study the factors that encourage the formation of informal social control, neighbourhood social cohesion and trust, friendship networks, local social ties, etc., and their associations with local crime rates.⁹ As briefly illustrated earlier, Sampson et al. (1997) termed this concept, which captures some of the above characteristics, namely informal social control and social cohesion and trust, “collective efficacy.” While most of these findings are the result of quantitative research, qualitative studies produced similar results. For example, Foster’s (1990, 1995) ethnographic research, conducted in British public housing, and DeLeon-

⁹ For example, Bellair (1997) and (2000), Bursik and Grasmick (1993), Hirschfield and Bowers (1997b), Nash and Bowen (1999), Pattillo (1998), Rountree and Warner (1999), Sampson (1997a), Sampson et al. (1997), Sampson and Raudenbush (1999) and (2001), Taylor (1997) and (2001).

Granados' (1999) "travels through crime and place" in the U.S. come to similar conclusions:

Neighborhoods rich in collective efficacy are sources for abundant informal social control, mutual trust, and cohesion. They are places where neighbors can depend on one another for help in times of crisis, and where the social capital of residents provides a powerful regulation of behavior. The good news is that *people* stop crime, specifically people who form cohesive, interdependent communities. (DeLeon-Granados 1999: 5-6; emphasis in original)

Since the findings of social disorganization studies point to *differences between poor and middle-class neighbourhoods*, they fail to examine whether poor and public housing neighbourhoods, although socially disorganized, can be socially cohesive and exert informal neighbourhood social controls over generally disapproved behaviours. Nevertheless, there is a growing body of knowledge showing that, despite the many challenges, even poor neighbourhoods can display a sense of community or *Gemeinschaft* which has been found so important in controlling neighbourhood crime (e.g. Brewer et al. 1998; DeLeon-Granados 1999; Foster 1990, 1995; Williams and Windebank 2000).

Issues regarding "collective efficacy" that have not been adequately addressed include its origins and how and why it might manifest itself differently in various social contexts. While it is beyond the scope of this project to discuss the former issue, the latter will be taken up, namely whether social organization and "collective efficacy" are, 'by default,' less developed in public housing and other poor neighbourhoods, by virtue of their relative lack of economic and other resources, than in more affluent neighbourhoods. Instead, the above body of research focuses on features of social *disorganization* and neglects positive aspects of poor neighbourhoods. An *a priori* assumption of social

disorganization theory and the collective efficacy model is that poor neighbourhoods cannot be socially organized. However, this is not necessarily the case. For example, Geis and Ross (1998: 242) found that “living in a poor neighborhood is not associated with a lack of ties with neighbors,” which has been confirmed by several others (e.g., Bellair 2000¹⁰; Warner and Rountree 1997). This is important because neighbourhood ties are a central aspect of informal community-based social controls. In this context, Sampson et al.’s (1997: 923) finding that collective efficacy mediates the effects of concentrated disadvantage and residential mobility is promising, as these are important features of public housing neighbourhoods. Thus, research on collective efficacy and its association with crime in urban areas of concentrated disadvantage would make an important contribution to criminological knowledge.

While Canadian research on crime in urban areas of concentrated disadvantage is sparse (e.g., LaPrairie 1994, 1995), several researchers have studied crime in the more general context of urban and downtown areas in Canada (Baron and Hartnagel 1997; Hartnagel and Lee 1990; McCarthy and Hagan 1991, 1992; Kennedy, Silverman and Forde 1991; Hagan and McCarthy 1992, 1997). In providing a detailed critique of Canadian sociological research on crime and concentrated urban disadvantage, DeKeseredy et al. (2000: 211) point to the “selective inattention given to housed poor people and disadvantaged urban refugees, immigrants, and racial/ethnic minority groups.” In contrast, Canadian urban crime research has focused on young and/or homeless people, without

¹⁰ Bellair (2000) attempts to answer the important question of whether low levels of informal surveillance lead to increased street crime or whether street crime decreases levels of informal surveillance. He finds that both processes are at work, with the direction depending on the type of street crime.

paying much attention to issues such as concentrated poverty, race/ethnicity, and gender.

Only a relatively small portion of the research on crime in urban areas of concentrated disadvantage focuses on public housing neighbourhoods (e.g., DeKeseredy et al. 2002; Foster 1990, 1995; Popkin et al. 1995, 1999, 2000; Venkatesh 1997a, 1997b, 2000; Websdale 2001). While the belief that “the crime problem” is more pronounced in public housing neighbourhoods appears to be widespread (e.g., Farley 1982; Popkin et al. 2000; Weatherburn, Lind, and Ku 1999), there is no clear empirical support for this. The little, mostly U.S., evidence that exists is contradictory (Fagan et al. 1998; Holzman 1996; Roncek et al. 1981) and the situation in Canada, where next to no social scientific research on crime in public housing exists, is similar. For example, Brill and Associates (1975) and Dunworth and Saiger (1994) found that crime rates are higher in public housing than in the rest of a city, while studies by Farley (1982) and Harrell and Gouvis (1994) discredit that notion. Holzman (1996) points to the lack of research showing that public housing neighbourhoods have indeed higher local crime rates than neighbourhoods with similar socioeconomic characteristics. Holzman and Piper (1998: 311) sum it all up by noting, “valid statistics on the level of crime in public housing do not exist.”

Regardless of the lack of accurate information on the existence or extent of the crime problem in this setting, some take it as a given and study the effect of public housing on crime rates in the surrounding neighbourhoods (e.g., McNulty and Holloway 2000; Roncek, Bell, and Francik 1981). Nevertheless, the majority of the research focuses on crime prevention through increased formal social control (e.g., Hann and Ashbury 1993; James 1993, 1997; Keyes 1992; Popkin et al. 1999, 2000; Rouse and Rubenstein 1978; Welsh and Roy 1996) and fear of crime (e.g., Alvi et al. 2001; Federation of Canadian

Municipalities 1993; Rainwater 1966; Rohe and Burby 1988; Rouse and Rubenstein 1978).

Much of this research is devoid of any gender analysis and thus the victimization of women is not examined.¹¹ Notable exceptions to this ‘gender-blindness’ are studies by Alvi et al. (2001), DeKeseredy et al. (1999, 2000), Holzman et al. (2001), Popkin et al. (1993, 2000), Renzetti (2001), Renzetti and Maier (2001), Venkatesh (2000), and Websdale (2001). These recent efforts indicate that gender is starting to be taken seriously. Further, the fact that the widely read and cited journal *Violence Against Women* recently published special issues on welfare, work, and domestic violence (Vol. 5, No. 4, 1999), welfare, poverty, and domestic violence (Vol. 7, No. 2, 2001), and violence against women in public housing (Vol. 7, No. 6, 2001) also shows that the topic is starting to get the attention it deserves.

Similar to the research on crime in urban neighbourhoods, there is a mixture of quantitative and qualitative studies on crime in public housing. While qualitative studies in poor urban areas have a long history (e.g., Rainwater 1966), recently, several studies recognized the value of the multi-methods approach and incorporated quantitative and ethnographic components, as well as interviews (Tomaszewski 2001). Among these are DeKeseredy et al. (2002), Popkin et al. (1995, 1999, 2000), Venkatesh (1997a, 1997b, 2000), and Websdale (2001). Aside from the above-mentioned characteristics displayed by research on crime in urban areas of concentrated disadvantage, most studies also apply narrow definitions of crime. In other words, similar to official crime surveys (e.g., Canadian Urban Victimization Survey (CUVS), National Crime Victimization Survey

¹¹ Likewise, only few researchers examine gender differences in perceptions of informal social control, collective efficacy, etc. (e.g., Rountree and Warner 1999).

(NCVS)), these studies only include behaviours defined as crimes in the *Criminal Code*.

While these are important behaviours to study, many people engage in, or are victimized by, injurious offences not officially designated as crimes (Crawford et al. 1990; DeKeseredy and MacLean 1991; Jones et al., 1986). As many scholars note, these include various male behaviours mostly directed at women, such as non-physical, sexual assaults on the street, leers, suggestive comments, being followed on the street, being yelled at, and unwanted sexual advances and remarks in public places and other forms of harassment (DeKeseredy 1992; DeKeseredy et al. 2000; DeKeseredy and MacLean 1990; DeKeseredy and Schwartz 1991; Jones et al. 1986; Pettway 1996; Russell 1984; Smith and Morra 1994).

2.3 Research on Crimes Against Women

There is a large body of research on the victimization of women, most of which focuses on violence against women in intimate relationships, perpetrated by their marital, cohabiting, dating, or estranged male partners (e.g., DeKeseredy and Kelly 1993; DeKeseredy and Schwartz 1998; Johnson 1996; Stanko 1985; Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz 1981; Tjaden and Thoennes 1998, 2000a, 2000b; Walker 1984). Although much of this work deals with women in general, with a focus on heterosexual relationships, several studies have focused on violence against specific subgroups of women, such as women in lesbian relationships (e.g., Renzetti 1992), single mothers, housed and homeless women (Browne and Bassuk 1997; Cook 1988; Goodman 1991a, 1991b; Malos and Hague 1997; Menard 2001; O'Brien 1995; Williams 1998), and disenfranchised women on the street or in an urban environment (e.g., Bourgois 1995;

Bourgois and Dunlap 1993; Maher 1995; Miller 1997). Other studies focus on the associations between women's violent experiences and macro-level issues like inequality, gender relations, and government policies (e.g., Fine and Weis 2000; Mama 1989; Susser 1998) and/or race/ethnicity (e.g., Bui and Morash 1999; Erez 2000; Kaljee, Stanton, Ricardo, and Whitehead 1995; Lucashenko 1996; Mama 1989; Mehrotra 1999; Sloan, Jason, and Addlesperger 1996; Websdale 2001; Weis 2001; Yoshihama 1999).

While research on crime in urban areas of concentrated disadvantage, including public housing, is growing in the U.S. and is starting to break some ground in Canada (Alvi et al. 2001; DeKeseredy et al. 1999, 2000), research on the abuse of poor women – although far from being abundant – appears to be more established in the U.S. One of the most important contributions to research on violence against poor women and women on welfare has been made by Jody Raphael and Richard Tolman (Raphael 1995, 1996, 2000, 2001a, 2001b; Raphael and Tolman 1997; Tolman 1999; Tolman and Raphael 2000, 2001; Tolman and Rosen 2001; see also Brandwein 1999).

Recently, Tolman and Raphael (2000) provided a critique of the research conducted on the abuse of women on welfare in the U.S. They identify four areas that dominate the field of research on the abuse of female welfare recipients. These are: the prevalence of domestic violence among women receiving welfare; the relationship between domestic violence and women's employment; the relationship between domestic violence and women's health and mental health; and the relationship between domestic violence and child support. Based on their extensive review of the literature, Tolman and Raphael (2000) conclude that women on welfare suffer from more abuse than women who do not receive such state support (e.g., Curcio 1999; Kurz 1998) and that their abuse interferes

with their employment, making it more difficult for them to leave poverty (e.g., Browne, Salomon, and Bassuk 1999; Lloyd and Taluc 1999; Salomon 2000; M.W. Smith 1999).¹²

What percentage of women experience intimate partner abuse? A considerable number of studies provide answers to this question. For example, in his survey on woman abuse in Toronto, Smith (1987) found that 14.4% of his respondents had been abused, which is significantly more than the approximately 3% generated by national surveys on women abuse.¹³ While the measures varied and thus results cannot be strictly compared, studies on woman abuse, including national surveys on women abuse, consistently show that poor women experience higher victimization rates than their more affluent counterparts (see also Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2000; Rennison and Welchans 2000; Taylor 1994; Tjaden and Thoennes 2000a).

In her review of U.S. national data, Kurz (1998) reports that 19.9% of women who reported annual family incomes of less than \$10,000 had become victims of domestic violence. A study of 436 homeless and poor housed women by Browne and Bassuk (1997)

¹² Regarding the relationship between domestic violence and child support, Tolman and Raphael (2000) find that much of the literature shows that women survivors of domestic violence fear for their own and their children's safety if or when they enforced child support from their abusive former partners (see, for example, Pearson, Thoennes, and Griswold 1998).

¹³ This is the case with widely cited national surveys on woman abuse in Canada and in the U.S. (e.g., see Johnson 1996; Tjaden and Thoennes 1998, 2000a, 2000b). The much lower rates are the result of limitations associated with the research methodology, which is discussed below. If the quality of the instrument is improved (e.g., by changing the wording of questions and including open-ended questions), national surveys can generate higher, and more realistic, rates of woman abuse. For example, DeKeseredy and Kelly's (1993) Canadian national study of woman abuse in university and college dating relationships and White and Koss' (1991) study of the same topic in the U.S. found much higher rates. DeKeseredy and Kelly (1993) report that 22.3% of female students experienced physical abuse at the hands of their dating partners in the year prior to the survey (see also DeKeseredy and Schwartz 1998).

found that one third of women had experienced severe physical violence by a current or most recent partner (see also Goodman 1991a, 1991b). Similarly, Miles-Doan and Kelly (1997) and Miles-Doan (1998) report that domestic violence is at least six times higher in concentrated poverty tracts.

These findings are echoed by the relatively small, albeit growing, body of research on woman abuse in areas where poor women are concentrated, namely public housing. Research on women in public housing includes examinations of the incidence and prevalence of woman abuse in these settings (e.g., DeKeseredy et al. 1999, 2000; Holzman et al. 2001; Renzetti and Maier 2001), female public housing residents' fear of crime (e.g., Alvi et al. 2001; Renzetti and Maier 2001), and how public housing policies negatively affect poor abused women (Menard 2001; Renzetti 2001; J. Smith 1999). While limited by a small sample size ($N=36$), Renzetti and Maier's (2001) survey of female residents of subsidized housing showed that an astounding half of the women interviewed experienced violence perpetrated by their intimate partners. This figure is much higher than that elicited by the Quality of Neighbourhood Life Survey (QNLS), which found that 19.2% of female respondents had experienced physical or sexual intimate violence in the 12 months prior to the study (DeKeseredy et al. 1999). These high rates clearly point to the importance of paying more attention to woman abuse in public housing. While it is not clear whether women in public housing experience more intimate partner abuse than poor women not living in this environment, it is possible that abused women are over-represented in public housing as some jurisdictions, including Ontario, give them priority status to move into subsidized housing. Nevertheless, even if this were the case, it would not make the issue a less important one.

The harassment of women is another topic that has received little attention when it comes to the victimization of poor women or female public housing residents. The majority of research on the harassment of women focuses on harassment in the workplace or educational settings (e.g., Koss et al. 1994; McMahon 1999; Paludi 1991), rather than in public places. Lenton, Smith, Fox, and Morra (1999) and DeKeseredy, Alvi, Schwartz, and Perry (1999) are among the select few who have studied harassment of women in public places. The former focused on the types, frequency, and severity of sexual harassment of Canadian women in public places, while the latter focused on sexual and other types of harassment (e.g., religious, racial and ethnic, or homophobic) of women in Canadian public housing. To the best of my knowledge, no other researchers have examined these issues in Canada or the U.S. This inattention is unfortunate since being female, poor, and living in public housing makes many residents targets of harassment on a daily basis. In addition to examining how “classism” manifests itself in the lives of public housing residents, it is also important to improve our understanding of harassment because of sex, race or ethnicity, religion, and sexual orientation.

While a significant amount of research has been conducted on correlates of woman abuse, including the abuse of poor women, such as personal characteristics of abusers and victims (e.g., alcohol consumption, patriarchal beliefs, socioeconomic status), there is very limited research on the relationship between informal community social controls, such as collective efficacy, and woman abuse. To the best of my knowledge, the only studies to date examining this issue have been conducted by Block and Skogan (2001) and Browning (2002). However, their findings are inconsistent. For example, Browning (2002) found that collective efficacy is negatively associated with intimate partner violence and

increases the likelihood a woman will disclose intimate abuse to potential sources of support. In contrast, Block and Skogan (2001) conclude that collective efficacy does not affect the kind of help an abused woman seeks and whether she is able to escape future intimate violence. These discrepancies might be related to their different research questions, measures, and samples. Further, Block and Skogan's (2001) sample solely consisted of abused women, while Browning (2002) used the same data as Sampson et al. (1997).

Raphael (2001b: 704) emphasizes that "the high degree of disorder ... in public housing ... reduces community cohesion and the proclivity of people to support and help one another. Indeed, this lack of cohesion makes domestic violence possible." Similarly, although Renzetti and Maier (2001) did not focus on the relationship between collective efficacy and the abuse of female public housing residents, they conclude that their respondents perceived social cohesion or collective efficacy in their respective neighbourhoods to be low:

Most of the women also felt that, for various reasons, they could not count on their neighbors for help when a problem or an emergency arose. For instance, ... their neighbors were often a source of other problems for them (they dealt drugs, played their music too loud, fought, didn't control their children). A second reason some women gave was that the neighbors had so many problems of their own, they do not want to get involved in other people's troubles. ... But the reason most frequently given ... was that they do not know their neighbors and, in fact, had chosen not to get to know them. (Renzetti and Maier 2001: 16)

2.4 Conclusions

One important criticism of the literature on neighbourhoods and crime has been voiced by Sampson (2000), who evaluates methodological approaches to research in this field as follows:

Neighbourhood level research, ..., is dominated by the study of poverty and other demographic characteristics drawn from census data and other government statistics that do not provide information on social mechanisms and social processes. (Not to mention the reliance on official definitions and measures of crime.) Equally important, the methodology needed to evaluate neighbourhood effects is in its infancy. (Sampson 2000: 713)

There are three key reasons for the lack of social scientific knowledge on crime in public housing neighbourhoods. First, some researchers argue that public housing estates usually make up only a small portion of the areas for which official crime statistics are kept (e.g., Fagan et al. 1998). Accordingly, data referring to administrative areas, such as electoral wards, police districts, or statistical areas such as Census tracts and enumeration areas, cannot provide adequate information on crime rates in particular neighbourhoods located in these areas. Thus, DeKeseredy et al. (2000), drawing on a point raised by Sampson and Groves (1989: 776), note that the sole reliance on Census data and official crime statistics raises the question of whether the findings of studies on social disorganization and crime “are in part artifactual.”

Recently, attempts have been made to address this issue through the application of GIS (Geographical Information Systems) software, such as MapInfo, ArcInfo or ArcView, which allows for the “mapping” of crime (Hirschfield, Brown, and Todd 1995; Hirschfield and Bowers 1997a; Mamalian and LaVigne 1999; Rich 2001; Weisburd and McEwen

1997). Using this approach, individual criminal offences are linked with the addresses where they occurred¹⁴ and are included in a database containing a digital map of the area, so that “hot spots” of crime can be identified. Over the past five years, the mapping of crime has become increasingly popular among law enforcement agencies and criminologists working with official data (e.g., Mamalian and LaVigne 1999; Weisburd and McEwen 1997).

More recently, crime mapping has been applied to research on crime and public housing. For example, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development developed a “Guidebook for Measuring Crime in Public Housing with Geographic Information Systems” (Hyatt and Holzman 1999) and, in collaboration with another researcher, the authors present results of the first study of violence against women in U.S. public housing (Holzman, Hyatt, and Dempster 2001) using GIS. While the use of GIS in crime research has opened up exciting opportunities, one important shortcoming is that, in the majority of cases, researchers continue to rely on official crime data, which is problematic for reasons discussed below.

Another reason for the dearth of research on crime in public housing is that even if official crime data for these relatively small geographical areas (e.g., street blocks, public housing estates) were available, their usefulness for determining crime in these locations is highly questionable. For example, official crime statistics, such as the Uniform Crime

¹⁴ This process is called “geocoding.” In addition to the spatial dimension, a temporal dimension can be added so that time of day or year can be controlled for.

Reporting System (UCR)¹⁵ only consist of incidents that come to the attention of the police and thus are of little help, if any, in determining the real extent, distribution, and nature of crime. The inaccuracies of official crime statistics result from “saturated policing” (Websdale 2001), on the one hand, and the failure to report crimes, on the other.

“Saturated policing” refers to the over-policing of public housing neighbourhoods and other urban areas of concentrated disadvantage and includes stops, questioning, and searches of these people for minor or no infractions. It is not uncommon for police to scrutinize these neighbourhoods and their residents more than their middle-class counterparts (e.g., Chambliss 1994; Websdale 2001). This type of policing can lead to charges for actions that remain undetected in other neighbourhoods, thus increasing or ‘inflating’ official crime rates. Conversely, several factors might affect residents’ willingness to report crimes to the police. Reasons why many crimes remain unreported include the following:¹⁶

- The acts are not defined as crimes in the Canadian Criminal Code or police do not make arrests (e.g., “gay bashing,” violence against prostitutes); police officers exercise discretion over whether an offence or victim “deserves” to have a report filed. For example, Lowman and Fraser (1995) found that many prostitutes feel that the police do not take their experiences as victims seriously.

¹⁵ Since they are discussed at length in introductory criminology and methodology textbooks (e.g., DeKeseredy and Schwartz 1996; Maxfield and Babbie 1995; see also MacLean 1992), I will only briefly summarize them here and note their particular relevance to this study.

¹⁶ Many of these came up during interviews in the course of the study, excerpts of which will be included later.

- Victims are not aware that they have been victimized.
- Victims disagree with the criminalization of a particular behaviour (e.g., consumption of certain drugs) or do not care about it as long as it does not affect them or their families. For example, Alvi et al. (2001) note that numerous (abstaining) West Town residents were aware of drug use and dealing but tolerated it.
- Victims are embarrassed, fear reprisal, or secondary victimization. Renzetti and Maier (2001: 14) note that “[s]everal women said they never call the police [after being beaten by their partners] because officers routinely tell those they are investigating who called them, and the women feared retaliation.”
- Victims feel that reporting would not make a difference (e.g., the chances to get their stolen property back are slim); for example, they were not insured or the insurance claim “isn’t worth it” because of the deductible, etc.
- Residents feel that the police treat them unfair, which strains police-“community” relationships and many express dissatisfaction with police performance in their neighbourhoods (Kinsey, Lea, and Young 1986).
- The presence of gangs and punitive policies, such as “one strike and you’re out” (Renzetti 2001), can even deter victims from contacting the police and other sources of potential support (e.g., Venkatesh 1997a; Renzetti 2001).

The third main reason explaining the lack of adequate crime data in public housing neighbourhoods is that although large-scale, mainstream victimization surveys tap into the dark figure of crime and elicit information about many crimes that remain hidden from

official statistics, they are equally unable to provide an accurate picture of crime in public housing. Methodological limitations associated with most victimization surveys include the following (e.g., DeKeseredy and MacLean 1991):

- Victimization surveys conducted by national statistical agencies, such as Statistics Canada's Canadian Urban Victimization Survey (CUVS), are large scale surveys and thus fail to reveal the peculiarities of local neighbourhoods;¹⁷ e.g., they do not contain information on local areas of concentrated disadvantage, social disorganization, etc., and do not measure variables hypothesized to mediate the relationship between community structure and crime, such as informal social control and social cohesion. Also, these surveys are of little help to law enforcement and social service agencies in identifying local areas where help is needed most (DeKeseredy et al. 2000).
- Respondents are typically only asked about their experiences of injurious behaviours officially defined as crimes, while acts excluded from the Criminal Code remain undetected (e.g., non-physical sexual and racial assaults). Thus, these methods are inadequate to measure various forms of victimization, especially woman abuse and public harassment.
- Further, Holzman and Piper (1998) point to the inefficiency of the telephone interview method in public housing neighbourhoods, as this excludes the experiences of those who do not have or can not afford telephones (e.g., a significant portion of the poor, transient, and homeless). Instead, they suggest, in-

¹⁷ Generally, the lowest levels for which data are available are Census Metropolitan Areas.

person interviews are much better suited to gather information in these environments.

The West Town Study (WTS) was designed to address many of the issues identified above. For example, the Quality of Neighbourhood Life Survey (QNLS) was a local survey, tailored to West Town public housing neighbourhoods and designed with input from the community. The survey was supplemented by interviews of public housing residents to allow for the documentation of the day-to-day experiences and voices of the disenfranchised (Jones, MacLean, and Young 1986; MacLean 1992; Wilson 1987). Further, broad definitions of crime were applied to include injurious behaviours not legally defined as crimes to glean information on various behaviours public housing residents are victimized by. To bring gender into discussions of crime in public housing and collective efficacy, this study attempts to fill some research gaps by examining “public” and “private” crimes against female public housing residents.

CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Introduction

The theoretical framework guiding this study, the collective efficacy model, has its origins in social disorganization theory (Thomas and Znaniecki 1958; Park and Burgess 1928; Shaw and McKay 1942) and explains the differential ability of neighbourhood residents to impact on local crime rates.¹⁸ Social disorganization theory attributes crime and victimization to a breakdown of informal community social controls resulting from social disorganization in structurally disadvantaged urban areas (Sampson and Groves 1989; Wilson 1987; Sampson and Wilson 1995; Wilson 1996). According to Sampson and Groves (1989: 777), “social disorganization refers to the inability of a community structure to realize the common values of its residents and maintain effective social controls.” It is characterized by high rates of family disruption, differences in socio-economic status, ethnic heterogeneity, high residential mobility, and considerable differences in age composition.

Other components of social disorganization that can be considered consequences of the above, include the lack of, or weakened ability of a community to supervise and control teenage peer groups (e.g., gangs), lack of informal friendship networks, and low participation rates in local, formal and informal (voluntary) organizations (committees, clubs, local institutions, and other organizations) (Sampson and Groves 1989: 778-779). In

¹⁸ For a more detailed discussion of social disorganization and other ecological theories, see Ellis and DeKeseredy (1996).

short, social disorganization leads to a breakdown of informal community social controls, making crime more likely to occur, as neighbourhood residents are unable to ensure that common values are adhered to.

My research is heavily informed by recent U.S. work on collective (or neighbourhood) efficacy (Morenoff, Sampson, and Raudenbush 2001; Sampson 1997a; Sampson, Morenoff, and Earls 1999; Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997; Sampson and Raudenbush 1999). Collective efficacy, Taylor (2001) notes, is the opposite of social disorganization and focuses on the informal social control capabilities of neighbourhood residents and their potential to reduce crime, while still acknowledging the importance of neighbourhood composition (such as concentrated disadvantage, residential stability, and immigrant concentration). In contrast, social disorganization theory can be seen as deterministic as socially disorganized neighbourhoods inevitably have higher crime rates because of their neighbourhood composition. This, as will be discussed below, is especially important in research on crime in urban areas of concentrated disadvantage.

Collective efficacy is currently a very popular model in urban crime research (see also Lee 2000; Lemieux 2001; Kawachi, Kennedy, and Wilkinson 1999) and, like social capital, has been linked to improving health, as well as satisfaction in the workplace and neighbourhoods (Parker 1994; Putnam 2000; Veenstra 2001; Wilkinson 1998). Collective efficacy can be traced back to Bandura's (1977) concept of self-efficacy and is related to social capital (see Côté 2001; Glaeser 2001; Sampson, Morenoff, and Earls 1999; Schuller 2001). Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997: 919) point to the:

analogy between individual and neighborhood efficacy: both are activated processes that seek to achieve an intended effect. At the neighbourhood level, however, the willingness of local residents

to intervene for the common good depends in large part on conditions of mutual trust and solidarity among neighbours. ... one is unlikely to intervene in a neighborhood context in which the rules are unclear or people mistrust or fear one another. (Sampson et al. 1997: 919)

Parker (1994: 43) explains the connection between individual and collective efficacy as follows:

Collective-efficacy [sic] is the extension of Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy concept to groups Self-efficacy refers to judgements that people make about their individual competency. These judgements have been associated with levels of performance and motivation across a wide variety of domains and situations (e.g., professional, academic, and athletic). Collective-efficacy concerns judgements people make about a group's level of competency.

While the intended effect of a person increasing their self-efficacy is to improve their performance for their own benefit, such as coping with negative experiences like stress or failure (Bandura 1982), increasing one's individual efficacy often goes beyond that individual and can benefit a collective, such as a group or whole neighbourhood or community. In fact, Bandura (1982) illustrates that collective efficacy cannot be created without the prior existence of individual efficacy:

People do not live their lives as social isolates. Many of the challenges and difficulties they face reflect group problems requiring sustained collective effort to produce any significant change. The strength of groups ... lies partly in people's sense of collective efficacy that they can solve their problems and improve their lives through concerted effort. Perceived collective efficacy will influence what people choose to do as a group, how much effort they put into it, and their staying power when group efforts fail to produce results. ... knowledge of personal efficacy is not unrelated to perceived group efficacy. ... collective efficacy is rooted in self-efficacy. Inveterate self-doubters are not easily

forged into a collectively efficacious force. (Bandura 1982: 143)

3.2 Collective Efficacy and Crime

In the study of crime, then, collective efficacy is a property of people or groups of people living in a particular neighbourhood, or the property of what is often very generously referred to as “community.”¹⁹ Sampson et al. (1997: 918) maintain that “[o]ne central [collective] goal is the desire of community residents to live in safe and orderly environments that are free of predatory crime, especially interpersonal violence.” They go on to argue that neighbourhoods will differ in their residents’ willingness and capacity to intervene for the common good, “depend[ing] in large part on conditions of mutual trust and solidarity among neighbors.” ... [S]ocially cohesive neighborhoods will prove the most fertile contexts for the realization of informal social control. In sum, it is the linkage of mutual trust and the willingness to intervene for the common good that defines the neighborhood context of collective efficacy” (Sampson et al. 1997: 919). Sampson et al. (1997: 919) “view neighborhood efficacy as existing relative to the task of supervising children and maintaining public order” and conclude that “the collective efficacy of

¹⁹ Compare Kazemipur and Halli (2000) who note “that there is little agreement on what they [“communitarian approaches”] mean by *community* [emphasis in original]. According to Sampson (1997[b]), although the oldest form of community was neighbourhood, that is, a geographic locale, the word is now increasingly used to refer to common membership in some association or group and shared values and deep commitments. ... *While all sorts of communities exert some influence on social life, local community based on shared space, that is, neighbourhood, remains a particularly important arena “for the realization of common values and the maintenance of effective [informal] social controls”* (Sampson 1997[b]: 2)” (Kazemipur and Halli 2000: 11; emphasis added). The West Town Study research team found that, when respondents talked about “the community,” they had people living in their public housing estate in mind. When they talked about “the neighbourhood,” they were thinking about the same area. Accordingly, their definition of “community” and “neighbourhood” had a distinct geographic, as well as social and socioeconomic dimension. See also Sampson (1997b).

residents is a critical means by which urban neighborhoods inhibit the occurrence of personal violence, without regard of the demographic composition of the population.”

Sampson et al. (1997) found that, after controlling for social composition, collective efficacy was negatively associated with violent victimization. Besides showing that collective efficacy is linked to lower crime rates, they also found that collective efficacy mediates the effects of concentrated disadvantage and residential mobility. In other words, collective efficacy is also negatively associated with victimization rates in areas of concentrated disadvantage, although concentrated disadvantage and residential mobility reduce levels of collective efficacy. This finding points to the usefulness of applying the collective efficacy model to crime in public housing, compared to a social disorganization framework, as it illustrates that collective efficacy can not only exist in high-poverty neighbourhoods but that it can also reduce crime. This is of central importance for this study as West Town public housing neighbourhoods are characterized by concentrated disadvantage, immigrant concentration, and ethnic heterogeneity, characteristics that are said to impair the formation of collective efficacy or social organization.

The previous chapter illustrated that “most community-level research studies have concentrated on street violence and ignored violence of the family” (Block and Skogan 2001: 4), as well as non-criminal victimization. To date, only two studies have analyzed the association between collective efficacy and domestic violence (Block and Skogan 2001; Browning 2002) and their results prevent us from coming up with a consistent conclusion, namely “whether or not it works.” It is important to attempt to resolve this lack of clarity.

Given that the WTS was conducted in public housing, Sampson et al.'s (1997) research would suggest that we should expect relatively small negative associations between collective efficacy in the public housing neighbourhoods and victimization. In other words, collective efficacy should not play a significant role in reducing the victimization rates of neighbourhood residents.

As briefly mentioned before, a number of issues regarding the collective efficacy model warrant more scrutiny. In fact, there is a conspicuous absence of critical examinations of the concept. For example, it remains unclear to date what the origins of collective efficacy are. Is it a product of social action (and associated with social, political, and economic factors), a producer of social action (behaviour) or both? For the purpose of this research, and following Sampson et al. (1997), collective efficacy is only considered a producer of social action. Further, how and why might take collective efficacy different forms in different social contexts. For example, St. Jean (1998) shows that the goals pursued through collective action or efficacy are not universal. Hence, collective efficacy is not necessarily monolithic or uniform throughout a society or neighbourhood. Regarding (violent) gender relationships, it seems important to shed light on the gender, race/ethnicity, and other bases of collective efficacy. Related to this are questions surrounding power and hegemony and interests in the processes of defining the common good.

Another issue that has not received adequate attention, but will be discussed in more detail later, is that the currently used measure of collective efficacy refers to *perceptions of collective efficacy* rather than actual collective efficacy. Nevertheless, the collective efficacy model has great potential to distinguish itself from the social

disorganization framework by explaining different local (i.e., neighbourhood) outcomes, such as victimization, despite macro-level issues like concentrated poverty, low socioeconomic status, etc. To date, to the best of my knowledge, this has not been done, as collective efficacy research on neighbourhood crime continues to travel an established path, namely to study large and diverse statistical areas comprised of pockets of both wealth and social misery, mostly relying on official crime statistics.

3.3 Hypotheses

Using the QNLS, the following hypotheses were tested:

Collective efficacy is negatively associated with:

- the “public” crime street violence against women
- the “public” crime harassment of women
- the “private” crime intimate abuse
- the “private” crime intimate violence

Membership in severely distressed households is negatively associated with:

- collective efficacy
- the victimization of women by “public” crimes (street violence and harassment)
- the victimization of women by “private” crimes (intimate abuse and violence)

CHAPTER FOUR

SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF WEST TOWN

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the historical development of West Town and the six public housing neighbourhoods where this study was conducted. Further, 1986, 1991 and 1996 Census data on this area obtained from Statistics Canada (Statistics Canada 1986, 1991, and 1996a) are analyzed. Specifically, ethnicity and immigration data will be described, as well as poverty, and unemployment – issues of central importance to public housing.

4.2 Historical Development

This section describes how a concentration of low-income households “happened” to end up in West Town and how its residents have been affected by economic changes in the area. Many residents remain unaffected by positive changes, such as economic growth and job creation in the area. In other words, a great number of residents of the City and first and foremost, the poor, have not experienced a “trickle-down-effect” of the economic boom that the City has enjoyed in the previous decade.

4.2.1 The Creation of Public Housing Neighbourhoods as

Urban Areas of Concentrated Disadvantage

Most of the neighbourhoods in West Town were built in the mid- to late 1960's. All West Town public housing estates that participated in the WTS were built between the early to mid-1970's (Ottawa 1977). Most of the West Town neighbourhoods in which public housing estates are located today were already zoned in 1971, while neighbourhoods that did not end up with public housing estates were not zoned at that time (Ottawa 1974).²⁰ When the zoning was changed, it was done to allow for a higher concentration of residents. For example, in April 1972, the area where public housing neighbourhood Two is located (see Map 1) was zoned to contain "apartment[s] (medium density)" like public housing neighbourhood Three. This was changed to "apartments, rows, medium density, 16 - 25 unit per acre" (u.p.a.) in 1976 and row dwellings were subsequently built.

The area where public housing neighbourhood Five is located was zoned as "single family, low density," resulting in the construction of row dwellings as well. Similarly, the area around public housing neighbourhood Four was supplied with row dwellings, after having initially been zoned as "apartment (low density)," which was changed in 1976 to "apartments, rows, medium density, 16 - 25 unit per acre." The area surrounding public housing neighbourhood Three was changed from its 1971 zoning as "apartment, medium density" to "apartments, high density, 75 - 125 u.p.a." in 1976 and is a high-rise. The area around public housing neighbourhood One was rezoned in 1976 to "medium density,

²⁰ Since the actual name of West Town is in the title of this report, it has been replaced with West Town to protect the identity of its residents; the same goes for other publications (Ottawa 1973 and 1976).

apartments, rows, 16 - 25 u.p.a.” and contains, besides row dwellings, a small apartment building. The zoning was not changed in the area where public housing neighbourhood Six is located, which consists of row dwellings and a big apartment building (Ottawa 1974, n.p.).

An August 11, 1998, conversation with the city councillor for West Town revealed that no public housing units have been built in the City since 1977. Thus, all of the West Town public housing estates are between 20 and 25 years old. This councillor was involved with the establishment of low-income housing at that time and noted that, in those days, the city was looking for cheap land on which to build housing for low-income people. At that stage, not only the regional housing authorities were involved, but also non-profit housing organizations, such as *City Living* (which the councillor was part of) and housing cooperatives. These do not count as “public housing” providers but rather as providers of “government-assisted” or more generally, “subsidized” or “social” housing.

In the same conversation, the above councillor also provided an official rationale for the location of public housing in West Town: many buildings housing low-income people were demolished in downtown areas during the course of urban renewal efforts in the 1960’s, resulting in a need to relocate them. City officials encouraged them to move to the newly created neighbourhoods in West Town, most of which had been specifically designed for low-income people. The councillor described the design of many of these neighbourhoods, which “turned out to be public housing neighbourhoods,” as “unfortunate” and “not a very nice place to live.” Aside from the need to house the displaced urban poor, the councillor mentioned the increasing demand for subsidized housing in the urban area. The City needed inexpensive land on which developers were

willing and ready to build. Naturally, the closer land was to downtown, the more expensive it was, making a decision in favour of West Town easier. At the time, no obvious disadvantages for people's relocation was seen since access and transportation routes to downtown were available. For example, two four-lane roads connecting the downtown area to West Town were built then and a highway, making the commute even faster, was being built. Further, an expressway for the sole use of public transportation had already been planned (Ottawa 1973, 1974).

The developments in the City and West Town parallel those in other Canadian cities at the time and can be seen as an example of Canadian housing policy of the day (Adamson 1968; Kiernan 1990). In her analysis of Canadian housing policy trends, Carroll (1990: 91) refers to the years between 1945 and 1968 as the "development phase," during which time "the housing stock in Canada almost doubled." She further notes:

As the new housing was primarily in the suburbs, the exodus from the inner city contributed to the deterioration of the urban core. Urban renewal and slum clearance programs were introduced. As money was available to tear down but not to fix, tearing down became the economic alternative. Existing housing was bulldozed away and new city halls, convention centres, hotels, and public housing were built. ... Urban renewal also displaced low-income people who could not afford to move to the suburbs. (Carroll 1990: 91)

The author's comment regarding the displacement of low-income people is particularly interesting in light of the City's 'decision' of the location of public housing units in West Town. Compare the excerpt from the City's Housing Policy Report of 1977

(Ottawa 1977):²¹

The City ... together with the City of ... will at any one point in time always be accommodating the great majority of households within the Region who can be defined as being in housing need. This pattern of need is consistent with that manifest in most other large City's [sic] in Northamerica. Increasingly as the population of [the Region] grows, larger areas of the City will take on the classic characteristics of the inner city.

These characteristics are already found in a smaller area within the City, comprising the oldest and inner most neighbourhoods In summary, such characteristics are the newest, poorest immigrants to the City [sic], a higher proportion of single and two person households, including students, young professionals, unemployables etc., a high degree of transience of some households and competition in the housing market between the extremes of low and high income households as higher income households "return" to larger older houses through "white painting." *It is unlikely these characteristics will be pronounced or have such serious implications as in other Cities* [sic]. This is largely because of the absence of a commercial or industrial sector which would support and produce a population growth by way of numbers, skills and income similar, for example, to Toronto. (Ottawa 1977: 5; emphasis in original)

The report also acknowledges the reasons for the concentration of low-income people in central locations:

The City rather than the suburban municipalities will continue to provide a source of relatively cheap accommodation and lower income households tend to seek central locations or at least those closest to employment, services facilities and good transportation links. Furthermore, lower income households usually occupy rental housing and the majority of rental units within the Region over the foreseeable future will remain in the City. As lower income households are excluded substantially from the inner City [sic] through the market process then they will relocate in the poorest housing stock elsewhere in the City – apartment buildings

²¹ For an in-depth discussion of Canada's rationale for urban renewal, see Adamson (1968) and Kiernan (1990).

constructed in the 1950's for example. (Ottawa 1977: 5)

Hence, it appears as if an argument based on reason was being constructed to remove the poor from central and valuable locations for development. The report also notes that “[a]lthough ... in the short term at least their locational preference is the City, a proportion of these households will probably have locational preferences outside the City” (Ottawa 1977: 5). The report does not solve the confusion generated by these conflicting conclusions. Instead, it seems to take an approach guided by client demand and foresees that “[t]hese households together with those in need who will “emerge” from suburban locations (especially the elderly and single parents) necessitates the construction of assisted rental housing outside the City *to meet the locational needs of low income households*. (16% new applicants on [the City's] waiting list are from outside the City ..., May 1977)” (Ottawa 1977: 5; emphasis added).

It was then estimated that, between 1977 and 1991, the region would require the construction of 20,000 units “for growth, replacement of demolitions and re-establishing a vacancy rate” (Ottawa 1977: 7), acknowledging the following: “Little housing is on stream for low income households either in the City or Region. In the absence of direct construction of assisted housing for this group in particular there will be a cumulative growth in households experiencing severe housing problems” (Ottawa 1977: 8-9). Consequently, the policy principles developed by the City for its “housing action” included, among others, that:

- The City “shall give priority in construction and acquisition within the next 5 years primarily to low and moderate income family households, the handicapped and low income single persons.”
- The City will “initiate a construction and acquisition programme over the next five years of the following, at least of the levels specified as minimums.”
- The City will “when confronted with choices in land allocations favour public housing unless special circumstances deem otherwise.” (Ottawa 1977: 8-9)

In 1977, approximately 7.6% of the housing units in West Town consisted of government-assisted housing, with the percentage being higher than that in the northern part of West Town and the percentage being lower than that in the southern part. At the time, 95.8% of government-assisted housing in West Town was provided by the City’s Housing Authorities (HA), while most other areas in the city had significantly higher rates of housing provided by non-profit housing corporations, housing cooperatives, and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) (Ottawa, 1977: 39).

Almost one-fifth (18.67%) of all government-assisted or subsidized housing for families and seniors provided by the HA in the City was in West Town (Ottawa 1977: 41). In northern West Town, where public housing neighbourhoods Two, Three, and Five are located, assisted housing made up 10.9% of all existing housing stock in 1977, while in southern West Town, where public housing neighbourhoods One, Four, and Six are

located, only 3.3% of all existing housing stock was subsidized (Ottawa 1977: 42).²² The analysis of Census data presented later in this chapter argues that not much has changed since then.

Recent information obtained from the City's website shows that there are "[a]bout 80 public, municipal and private non-profit and cooperative housing providers across the City manage the social housing stock (about 24,000 units)" (Ottawa 2001b). Further, it is acknowledged that "[t]he vacancy rate for rental housing in [the City] is now 0.7 percent, the lowest in the country. Only 20 new rental-housing units were completed in 1998, and no new social housing has been funded since 1995" and "[t]here are more than 15,000 outstanding applications for social housing in the city, which translates into a five-to-seven-year waiting period" (Ottawa 2001a).

Within a few years, the difficulties finding inexpensive accommodation for the poor got even worse. For comparison, the situation in 1998 was as follows: there were "just under 20,000 units of social housing"²³ in the City. This represents approximately

²² A map displayed in the report (not shown here), illustrating the distribution of assisted housing in the city in 1977, shows that the rates of assisted housing as proportion of existing housing stock in the city were highest in several areas surrounding the downtown area. West Town is the area that is furthest away from downtown. See Map 1 for the exact location of these public housing neighbourhoods. The highway separates West Town north and south and provides a physical barrier inhibiting the movement of people. In all of West Town, one can only get from the southern to the northern part by using one of three roads running that way; there are no tunnels or overpasses for pedestrians. There is only one possibility to cross from the south to the north in the western part of West Town – along a four-lane road, going over the highway – where the six public housing neighbourhoods are located. In this area, public housing estates Four, Five, and Six are located, with neighbourhood Six being separated from the highway by a ten-foot concrete wall on two sides.

²³ As mentioned above, social housing includes public housing units, administered by the Regional Housing Authority and non-profit housing and housing cooperatives, such as City Living.

23.3% of the city's total renting stock and 13.3% of all housing stock. Over 9000 households are registered on social housing lists" (Ottawa 1998). The significant increase in the number of households on the waiting list indicates that little, if any, action was taken. This is even more disturbing since City officials had long been aware of the need for low-income housing, as reports discussed above have shown, although they seriously underestimated that need in the years to come.

4.2.2 Economic History and Economic Trends

This section describes the economic history and trends in the economy with respect to both the City and West Town. The current economic situation of West Town and its residents cannot be understood without a brief examination of past and current developments in the city it is part of. Further, several researchers have argued that economic disenfranchisement creates an environment that is especially conducive to the abuse of women (e.g., Bourgois 1995; Wilson 1996).

4.2.2.1 The City

A pamphlet, introducing the City to Canadians and the world, states: "Over the years, [the City] has evolved from a timber town, to a government town, to a vibrant private-sector driven economy based on high technology enterprises" (Ottawa 1994b: 1). At the time of the "amalgamation," when the Region was transformed into a "mega city," the City was the fourth largest metropolitan centre in Canada and contained the highest number of Ph.D.s in the country. Census data from 1991 indicate that 25.2% of the City residents have a university degree. Other outstanding features of the City are its "strategic

location ... at the centre of Canada's industrial and commercial heartland – the 640-km (400-mile) corridor linking Toronto ... and Montreal” (Ottawa 1994b: 1).

The City's economic development was accelerated in the middle of the 19th century, when, “[b]y the 1860s, lumber barons such as J.R. Booth and E.B. Eddy had created the largest concentration of milling operations in the world” (Ottawa 1994b: 28). In 1857, the City was selected as the permanent capital of the United Province of Canada. The associated expansion of its infrastructure “attracted a wide range of industries – and a growing population – during the remaining decades of the 19th century. In addition to sawmills, the City could boast forges, light manufacturing plants, a match factory, furniture mills, a brewery, rail depots, warehouses and several hydro-electric plants. Especially important were the pulp and paper plants that sprung up as the lumber industry began to decline” (Ottawa 1994b: 1). The City remained an important industrial centre into the first decades of the 20th century.

By 1940, the federal government was a major employer in the region. Its significance has gone down in recent years due to “downsizing” in governments (federal, provincial, regional, and municipal) on the one hand (see Tables 2 and 3), and job growth in other areas, especially the high technology industry, on the other. While almost one-third of total employment was with the federal government in 1976, this was reduced to only one-fifth twenty years later. Despite considerable job losses, the federal government is still the largest single employer in the City with approximately 82,700 employees (Ottawa-Carleton 1996).

Between 1991 and 1996, nearly 10,000 federal government jobs were lost. This constituted the highest job reduction in the federal government ever. For example,

between 1976 and 1981, 3,000 federal jobs disappeared; between 1981 and 1986, it was 3,500; and between 1986 and 1991 only 600. Nevertheless, according to an employment survey conducted by the Regional Municipality, between 1991 and 1996, 34,528 jobs were created and 14,332 jobs lost in the region, with a net employment gain of 20,196 (Ottawa-Carleton 1996: i). “While the recession officially ended in 1993, the regional economy continued to experience setbacks principally due to the federal government announcement of job cuts in the public service and the downsizing that followed” (Ottawa-Carleton 1996: i).²⁴

The growing importance of the high tech sector for the city’s economy becomes clear when one considers the following:

High technology accounted for a little over half of the net job growth in the region between 1991 and 1996, with about 12,700 new jobs created in the period. This growth continues historic trends, which saw a doubling in the number of jobs in each decade between 1976 and 1991 in the high technology classifications within manufacturing and services. ... its employment ranks third after federal government and trade (a combination of whole-sale and retail groups) in 1996. The high technology employment total of some 40,000 jobs was about half of the employment total of all federal government employment combined. ... More than 70% of all jobs in high tech are located west of the ... River. [The City], [and two suburban areas] together share 93% of all jobs with [the City] at 39.7%, [one suburban area] at 29.6% and [the other suburban area] at about 23.6%” (Ottawa-Carleton 1996: ii). ... In the last two decades, employment in high technology has almost increased five-fold. In the last decade alone an 83% increase in employment, or roughly 18,200 jobs, was experienced, almost 70% of it between 1991 and 1996 (Ottawa-Carleton 1996: 31).

Not only have we seen changes in the employers in the city and region over the last

²⁴ The report also notes that there were 403,105 jobs in the region in 1996 at 25,526 locations.

two decades, but the type of employment has changed significantly, too. For example, “[p]art-time jobs now account for nearly one quarter of all jobs in [the Region]” (Ottawa-Carleton 1996: iv). As described in Table 1, much of the growth in part-time employment between 1991 and 1996 was in retail, health and social services, and amusement and recreation. The growth of the importance of part-time jobs began in 1976 and was increasingly accelerated after 1986. Note, too, that a large portion of people holding part-time employment do so out of necessity or lack of full-time employment, rather than the freedom allegedly accompanied by part-time employment:

Nationally, it has been estimated that nearly half of all part-time jobs created since 1981 were occupied by persons wishing to work full-time. This represents a loss of productivity for an economy and a marginalization of persons through part-time employment. Part-time employment is generally characterized as non-unionized temporary rather than permanent, with few or no benefits. In [the Region], most of the increase in part-time employment from 1986 to 1996 has been in service industries. With the exception of high technology services which tend to have a higher proportion of full-time jobs, average weekly earnings in service industries in Ontario are relatively low. ... increase in part-time employment ... part of a larger provincial and national trend. (Ottawa-Carleton 1996: 7-8)

In the services sector, 25,700 new jobs were created in the region: “business services, health and social services, amusement and recreation, and accommodation and food. Business services, establishments primarily engaged in providing services more to the business community than to the general public, accounted for nearly half of this increase, with a growth of 12,400 jobs. About three quarters of this growth was found in high technology computer and related services group” (Ottawa-Carleton 1996: vi). A comparison of Tables 1, 2, and 3 below shows that the significant increase in part-time

employment was accompanied by similar decreases in full-time employment. In several employment groups, a few hundred part-time jobs were created as full-time jobs were cut.

Table 1:
Gains in Total Employment According to Major Groups
in the Region, 1990-1995

	Full-time	Part-time	Total Jobs Gained
Business Services	10,480	1,931	12,411
Health & Social Services	1,300	2,471	3,771
Retail	746	2,992	3,738
Education	1,513	1,550	3,063
TOTAL	14,039	8,944	22,983

Source: Ottawa-Carleton (1996: 15)

Table 2:
Losses in Total Employment According to Major Groups
in the Region, 1990-1995

	Full-time	Part-time	Total Jobs Lost
Federal Government	-4,063	-3,117	-7,180
Communication & Utilities	-3,126 ²⁵	146	-2,980
Wholesale	-2,160	-199	-2,359
Construction	-2,005	956	-1,049
TOTAL	-11,354	-2,214	-13,568

Source: Ottawa-Carleton (1996: 16)

An examination of employment changes in business activity groups (see Table 3) reveals that, in total (i.e., part-time and full-time employment), jobs were created in the service sector (amusement and recreation, business services, etc.), while job losses occurred in government and related sectors, such as “membership organizations.”²⁶ The slight increase in jobs in manufacturing, which almost masks that this sector had 72.5% more part-time employees in 1996 than five years earlier, is due to gains in the high

²⁵ The decline in communication and utilities jobs “is due to local job losses in the public broadcasting and postal services” (Ottawa-Carleton 1996: 9).

²⁶ The following few paragraphs summarize the findings of the Regional Municipality’s Employment Survey, based on Census data, regarding changes in regional employment by business activity group (Ottawa-Carleton 1996: 19-27).

technology sector. Other employment gains took place in the processing of textile and plastic products, while many sectors in traditional manufacturing declined. This development is not unique by any means and has been observed in both the United States and Canada (e.g., Alvi et al. 1999; Duffy et al. 1997; Wilson 1996). In the transportation category, the truck transport industry accounted for 80% of the growth in this industry division. As mentioned earlier, the decline in communication and utilities employment can be attributed to lay-offs in local broadcasting and postal services.

Different from the above, almost all subgroups in the wholesale trade sector lost jobs. For example, lumber, metal products, and machinery equipment and supplies sectors each lost about 300 jobs. The wholesale food industry lost an additional 600 jobs. In the retail sector, 80% of the increase was in part-time jobs. The food and drug sector increased its number of jobs by 16% (plus 1,600 jobs) and the clothing sector increased employment by some 1,000 jobs. The marked increase in finance, insurance and real estate can be explained by the construction associated with the Corel Centre, the new home of the City's National Hockey League team (management and building operations). Associated with this was a marked increase in part-time jobs in this sector while full-time jobs decreased slightly.

In the category of business services, dominant increases were in high technology industries of computer and related services and other scientific and technical services, with job increases of over 9,000. In the same category, there were also increases in offices of lawyers (8% or 325 jobs) and advertising services (23% or 150 jobs). The addition of 2,100 jobs in the miscellaneous category 'Other Business Services,' which includes security and investigation, telephone answering, and soliciting services, accounts for 43%

of all part-time jobs in the business services sector. In the health and social services sector, a decline of jobs in institutional health services took place and the increase in employment came primarily from non-institutional health and social services (2,900 jobs). Within the accommodation and food sector, an increase in food services, mostly bars and restaurants, can be observed, with the majority of new jobs being part-time. An astonishing 272 locations were added to this sector.

The largest job increase in amusement and recreation took place in sports and recreational clubs. Other job growth occurred in spectator sports, motion picture and video distribution, as well as in 'other amusement,' which includes adventure recreational services, indoor play-structure facilities for children, bingo halls, bowling, and billiard establishments. In the "other service" sector, almost half of the increase in jobs occurred in "service to buildings and dwellings," which includes security and janitorial services. Further, there was significant job growth in vehicle renting and leasing. The federal government erased more than 90% of its part-time positions and while the provincial and local governments reduced the number of full-time jobs, they markedly increased the number of part-time jobs. Regarding the provincial government, "protective services [such as police and security services] saw gains in employment but all other administrative services declined" (Ottawa-Carleton 1996: 26).

Table 3:
Changes in Employment by Business Activity Groups
in the Region, 1990-1995

	Full-time	Part-time	Total Employment
Primary Sector	2.3%	28.3%	9.8%
Manufacturing	3.2%	72.5%	7.5%
Construction	-14.7%	50.0%	-6.8%
Transportation	4.3%	18.7%	7.5%
Communication & Utilities	-19.1%	12.3%	-17.0%
Wholesale Trade	-23.9%	-16.4%	-23.0%
Retail Trade	3.2%	15.9%	8.9%
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	-0.7%	73.9%	10.8%
Business Services	34.0%	30.2%	33.3%
Education	7.0%	21.8%	10.7%
Health & Social Services	6.3%	17.6%	10.9%
Accommodation & Food Service	4.3%	19.2%	11.1%

Table 3 (Continued):
Changes in Employment by Business Activity Groups
in the Region, 1990-1995

	Full-time	Part-time	Total Employment
Amusement & Recreation	34.2%	57.3%	48.3%
Personal & Household Services	7.4%	20.6%	11.1%
Membership Organizations	-7.6%	6.5%	-4.2%
Other Service	9.0%	19.2%	12.7%
Federal Government	-5.3%	-92.9%	-9.0%
Provincial Government	-7.9%	41.1%	-4.4%
Local Government	-9.2%	19.9%	-3.4%
Other Government (Embassies, etc.)	-1.0%	32.3%	-0.4%

Source: Ottawa-Carleton (1996: 19-27)

By and large, the trends for the Region identified above also apply to the City. Several of these trends, especially the more general ones like increase in employment in the service sector and in part-time jobs, can also be seen in West Town, which is the focus

of the next section.

4.2.2.2 West Town

The areas in the western part of West Town around the highway, where public housing neighbourhoods One, Four, and Six are located today, were part of the West Town commercial and industrial area and were seen as “major potential industrial and shopping areas” (Ottawa 1973: n.p.; see also Ottawa 1976). The area south of the highway, where public housing neighbourhood Four is situated, was zoned “light industrial” and now contains a large gardening supply store and a small building of one of the local high technology companies. The strip mall between public housing neighbourhoods One and Four is one of the biggest in the area and contains, among other things, a large furniture store and a bookstore. Further, around half a dozen still existing small strip malls close to or in walking distance from the six public housing estates were identified then (Ottawa 1974: n.p.). Conversations with long-term residents conducted during the field research indicate that most of the smaller shopping centres in the neighbourhoods were functional by 1977.

While the regional employment survey (Ottawa-Carleton 1996) provides excellent and accurate information on the region and the parts that it consists of, such as cities and townships, it is difficult to obtain data on West Town as this area does not always coincide with administrative boundaries.²⁷ Nevertheless, the data provided in the report are useful

²⁷ The smallest geographic or administrative units for which data are available in the report are regional wards. West Town is part of two regional wards, one north and one south of the highway, both of which consist of more than just West Town. The northern ward extends further to the west and east, while the southern ward extends further to the west, east, and south (Ottawa 1994a).

to get an impression of the employment situation in West Town and employment opportunities available there. Additionally, differences between northern and southern West Town can be discerned.

In northern West Town, the largest proportion of total employment was in manufacturing (33%), distributed over 24 locations. In this sector, 93% of employment was in the form of full-time jobs. This was followed by the service sector, which provided 28.5% of total employment in this area in 507 locations, with 38% of the jobs being part-time. Almost one fourth (24.7%) of total employment in this area is in retail (359 locations), which is also characterized by a high proportion of part-time employees (59.5%). Health and social services provide 7.9% of total employment in 105 locations, with 43.5% being part-time jobs. Shortly thereafter come accommodation and food (6.9% of total employment in 87 locations, with 63% part-time jobs) and business services (5.9% of total employment in 131 locations, with 88.5% full-time jobs).

The situation is quite different in southern West Town, where about half of total employment (49.7%) is provided by the service sector, which employs people in 464 locations, 44.4% of them part-time. Another difference is that 21.9% of total employment is in education,²⁸ which is not a significant employer in the northern part. Employment is distributed over 44 locations, with 46.2% of the jobs being part-time. The health and social services sector also employs more people in southern West Town than it does in the northern part with 13.1% of total employment (in 126 locations, with 53.5% of the employment being part-time). Similarly, the retail sector, with 10.1% of total employment (in 142 locations, 53% of the jobs are part-time), plays a smaller role here than it does in

²⁸ For example, a local community college campus is located in the area.

the northern part. In contrast to this, the manufacturing and business services sectors play similar roles in both parts of West Town. 30.1% of all employed people work in manufacturing in 21 locations, with 85.7% being full-time jobs and 7% work in business services in 122 locations, with 83.9% of the jobs being full-time.

4.3 Population

This section takes a closer look at the West Town population. The first part uses Statistics Canada data from several Census years to identify sociodemographic and socioeconomic characteristics of this population, as well as changes that have occurred during that time (Statistics Canada 1986, 1991, and 1996a). Particular attention is given to immigration, unemployment, and poverty data. To better illustrate the situation in 1995 and the changes that West Town experienced between 1985 and 1995, maps were created with the help of the GIS software MapInfo. The last part of this chapter also describes the characteristics of West Town public housing residents who participated in the Quality of Neighbourhood Survey (QNLS).

The information provided in this section was generated from Census statistics collected by Statistics Canada (Statistics Canada 1986, 1991, and 1996a). West Town contains 12 Census tracts (CTs), five of which are home to the six public housing estates that are at the centre of the WTS (see Map 1). In one case, there are two public housing estates in the same CT (public housing neighbourhoods Two and Five). West Town also consists of close to 100 enumeration areas (EAs), which constitute smaller geographical units than CTs and contain fewer people (see Map 9). The six West Town public housing estates are located in seven EAs. Public housing neighbourhood Six, consisting of a high

rise and town houses, is located in two EAs. The high rise is in one EA and all the town houses are located in the adjacent EA. In West Town, EAs contain anywhere between just under 50 to close to 1,500 people, whereas CTs in West Town contain from just over 1,500 to close to 7,000 residents.

Changes between the Census years of 1986, 1991, and 1996 draw on Census Tract data as CTs are highly stable units and their boundaries are rarely changed by Statistics Canada. For the latest information (Census 1996) on West Town public housing neighbourhoods and to make comparisons between public housing and non-public housing, we consult, whenever possible, EA level data. EA level data come the closest to representing the characteristics of residents in these public housing estates as they often contain only several hundred more people than live in public housing. This is useful as EA level data can then be used to complement QNLS data. Nevertheless, EAs are not suited for comparisons between Census years since their boundaries are often changed from one Census to another and because data is often suppressed to protect the anonymity of residents in EAs with a small population size.

Overall, the analysis of Census data shows increases in population through internal migration and immigration (which also brought an increase in ethnic heterogeneity with it), unemployment, and poverty. The extent of growth varies among CTs, with the most significant distinguishing criterion being whether it is a public housing CT or not. However, there are two non-public housing CTs that share many, if not most, of the public housing CTs' characteristics, i.e. social and economic problems. This can be explained by

the fact that these CTs contain government-assisted housing other than public housing.²⁹

In the five years between the 1991 and 1996 Census, the population in West Town has increased only modestly (by 0.59%) and stood at 60,675 in 1995 (Statistics Canada 1996a). Among these, 12.8% (7,750 people) resided in EAs containing public housing estates.³⁰ In these areas, about 3,500 individuals lived in approximately 1,200 public housing households. Accordingly, almost every second person in public housing EAs (45.2%) lived in a public housing unit.

Tables 4 and 5 show that slightly fewer people live in public housing CTs than non-public housing CTs (28,743 compared to 31,932). CTs vary in population sizes between 1,783 and 6,798; eight of the 12 CTs have populations of over 5,350, while the remaining have less than 4,200. A comparison of public housing CTs with non-public housing CTs reveals that the population of the former has increased by 2.19%, while the latter have lost 0.85% of their population (Statistics Canada 1991 and 1996a; table not shown).

Population gains in West Town, and in the public housing CTs in particular, can be attributed to immigration and, even more so, internal migration (i.e., of people moving into newly built homes) between 1990 and 1995.

²⁹ The reason why these areas are not identified as public housing CTs (or EAs) is because they do *not* contain public housing and the QNLS was only conducted in West Town public housing estates.

³⁰ Henceforth, EAs containing public housing estates will be called “public housing EAs.” Similarly, CTs containing such estates will be called “public housing CTs.”

4.3.1 Immigration and Ethnicity

25.45% of the population in West Town are immigrants and 28.85% of the immigrant population are recent immigrants (Statistics Canada 1996a). Recent immigrants are people who have immigrated to Canada within the last five years, i.e., in the context of the West Town Study, between 1990 and 1995. In the ten years between 1985 and 1995, the proportion of immigrants has increased in every CT in West Town. The majority of this increase occurred between 1990 and 1995. Whereas immigrants comprised 17.53% of the population in public housing CTs in 1986, they accounted for 20.3% of the population in 1991 and 25.86% in 1996 (Statistics Canada 1986, 1991, and 1996a; tables not shown).

Map 1 shows that close to one-fifth of the population in all West Town CTs in 1995 are immigrants. With the exception of one non-public housing CT, which borders two public housing CTs in which three public housing estates are located, immigrants make up 44.5% of the population. Immigrant concentrations are highest in public housing CTs, ranging from 18.7% to 30.4%. With the exception of three CTs, non-public housing CTs experienced only moderate increases in their immigrant population. This parallels findings reported in U.S. research (e.g., Goering, Kamely, and Richardson 1997) and findings presented by Ley and Smith (1997) who report that immigrants tend to reside in areas of urban areas of concentrated disadvantage in Vancouver, Toronto, and Montreal (see also Duffy 2000). Map 2 shows that the very same CTs with high concentrations of immigrants also have experienced significant influxes of immigrants between 1985 and 1995. With the exception of two CTs, the proportion of immigrants grew by between 45% and 80%.

When it comes to recent immigration, Map 3 shows that in four of the five public

housing CTs, recent immigrants make up between one-fourth and one-third of the population in these areas. Just like with immigration, the non-public housing CT adjacent to the CTs containing public housing neighbourhoods Two, Five, and Six, displays the highest percentage of recent immigrants with 48.52%. Map 4 indicates that the vast majority of West Town neighbourhoods have experienced a very significant influx of recent immigrants between 1985 and 1995. In three of the 12 CTs, the proportion of recent immigrants increased by close to between 50% and 80%, while in five other CTs, it increased by more than 100%. Only two CTs, one public housing and one non-public housing CT, had fewer recent immigrants in 1995 than in 1985. One apparent difference between immigration and recent immigration is that, while the former is more concentrated in public housing CTs, the latter is distributed more equally in West Town areas. Nevertheless, Map 3 still shows that recent immigrants tended to be concentrated in public housing CTs, which is not surprising as many come from war-torn countries and might be in need of government support in the form of welfare, assisted housing, etc.

Map 1: Percentage of Immigrants in West Town Census Tracts, 1995

© 2002 by Christy Sheeran and Andreas Tomaszewski

Sources: Statistics Canada (1996a) and (1996b)

Map 2: Percentage Change of Immigrants in West Town Census Tracts, 1985 - 1995

© 2002 by Christy Sheeran and Andreas Tomaszewski

Sources: Statistics Canada (1986), (1996a), and (1996b)

Map 3: Percentage of Recent Immigrants in West Town Census Tracts, 1995

© 2002 by Christy Sheeran and Andreas Tomaszewski

Sources: Statistics Canada (1996a) and (1996b)

Map 4: Percentage Change of Recent Immigrants in West Town Census Tracts, 1990 - 1995

© 2002 by Christy Sheeran and Andreas Tomaszewski

Sources: Statistics Canada (1991), (1996a) and (1996b)

Since areas of concentrated poverty in West Town and other parts of Canada show a large contingent of “minority” groups reside in them (e.g., Goering et al. 1997; Jargowsky 1997; Kazemipur and Halli 2000; Krivo et al. 1998; Ley and Smith 1997, 2000), it is necessary to examine the extent to which certain ethnic groups are represented in West Town, in general, and in public housing Census tracts, in particular. Tables 4 and 5 below show ethnic groups that figure most prominently in West Town. Africans represent the largest group in the “visible minority” population, with the largest group being from Somalia. This confirms a comment made by the councillor that West Town has the largest concentration of Somalis in the city. Another ethnic group of memorable size are people from East India. Further, a considerable number of Arabic people live in West Town as well. This also echoes findings of Canadian research presented by Fong and Gulia (1999), who studied differences in neighbourhood qualities among different ethnic groups and concluded that, by and large, non-white or non-European groups were more likely to live in neighbourhoods of “lower quality.”

While there are no significant differences in the proportion of East Indians and people who define themselves as “Canadian” living in public and non-public housing CTs, the differences are obvious when it comes to Aboriginals and Somalis. In the latter two groups, the proportion living in public housing CTs is much higher. Tables 4 and 5 not only hint at the relatively strong presence of Somalis in West Town, more importantly Table 4 hints to their strong presence in public housing CTs. For example, in two public housing CTs, where public housing neighbourhoods Two, Five, and Six are located, Somalis make up 4% and 7% of the area’s population, respectively. In the CT surrounding public housing neighbourhood Four, this ethnic group makes up almost 2%.

Table 4:
Selected Ethnic Groups in West Town Census Tracts *Containing* Public Housing, 1995

E t h n i c G r o u p s (%)								
	Population	Aboriginal	Canadian	East Indian	Arabic	Somali	Ethiopian	Eritrean
No. 1	5,611	0.98	23.97	1.96	0.18	0.53	0.00	0.00
No. 2 & 5	5,425	1.29	23.23	1.75	0.74	7.10	0.83	0.00
No. 3	6,719	0.37	21.80	1.86	0.30	0.82	0.22	0.00
No. 4	4,190	0.95	28.52	1.43	2.15	1.91	0.72	0.24
No. 6	6,798	1.84	21.26	2.21	1.40	4.05	1.03	0.81
Total	28,743	1.09	23.76	1.84	0.95	2.88	0.56	0.21

Source: Statistics Canada (1996a)

Table 5:
Selected Ethnic Groups in West Town Census Tracts *Not Containing* Public Housing, 1995

	E t h n i c G r o u p s (%)							
	Population	Aboriginal	Canadian	East Indian	Arabic	Somali	Ethiopian	Eritrean
	6,079	0.49	26.98	0.82	0.82	0.58	0.16	0.00
	3,250	1.38	23.23	2.15	0.77	0.00	1.54	0.00
	5,419	0.18	20.39	0.46	0.65	0.00	0.00	0.00
	5,354	0.19	20.55	0.84	0.37	0.19	0.47	0.00
	3,193	0.47	23.96	2.04	0.47	0.00	0.00	0.78
	1,783	0.00	17.67	1.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	6,854	1.09	16.41	3.57	2.04	2.33	0.58	0.00
<i>Total</i>	31,932	0.54	21.31	1.61	0.73	0.44	0.39	0.11
<i>West Town</i>	60,675	0.77	22.33	1.71	0.82	1.46	0.46	0.15

Source: Statistics Canada (1996a)

4.3.2 Unemployment and Poverty

Map 5 displays the unemployment rates among the adult population in West Town in 1995. One glance at the map reveals that unemployment rates are significantly higher in most of the public housing CTs than in non-public housing CTs. In four of the five public housing CTs, they are above 10%, while this is the case in only three of the seven non-public housing CTs. In the four remaining non-public housing CTs, unemployment rates are between 5% and 7%. Regarding changes in adult unemployment rates in West Town between 1985 and 1995, Map 6 shows that most CTs have experienced significant increases. While the rates remained the same or decreased slightly in one public housing and three non-public housing CTs, unemployment rates increased, in several cases quite significantly, in both types of CTs. This shows that, increasingly, changes in the economy do not only affect the “traditional” group of the poor, but also other people who constitute the “new” group of the “working poor” and the “new urban poor” (e.g., McGahan 1995; Wilson 1996).

The relationship between unemployment and low income or poverty is obvious. Map 7 uses Statistics Canada’s low-income cut-off (LICOs) to show poverty rates in West Town. Just like high unemployment rates, high poverty rates are concentrated in CTs that contain public housing or are close to them. Eight of twelve West Town CTs have poverty rates of 20% and over. Four adjacent CTs have poverty rates of between 33% and 42%, three of which are public housing CTs. Map 8 displays changes in poverty rates and shows that, with the exception of one non-public housing CT, all West Town CTs experienced significant increases in poverty rates. The CT displaying a decrease in poverty rates is the area that also experienced a decrease in unemployment rates from 1985 to 1995 (see Map

6), and had the lowest unemployment (see Map 5) and poverty rate in 1995 (see Map 7).

In public housing neighbourhoods with significant increases in poverty rates between 1985 and 1995, the changes range from 37.5% to 82.6%, while non-public housing CTs that experienced the same, did so to a much stronger degree. The changes range from 66.7% to 300%, showing that, over the past decade, West Town has established itself as an urban area of concentrated disadvantage. The only other area where poverty rates did not increase significantly (by 14.3%; which is the public housing CT containing public housing neighbourhood One) is also the CT with the lowest unemployment rate in public housing CTs in 1995 (see Map 5). This area experienced a slight decrease in unemployment rates from 1985 to 1995 (see Map 6) and had the lowest poverty rate of all public housing CTs in 1995 (see Map 7).

Whereas the incidence of low income in private households was mostly apparent in public housing CTs in 1985 (21.4% versus 9.29% in non-public housing CTs), most of the growth of low-income households over the following five years took place in non-public housing CTs (11.93% versus 22.1% in 1990; Statistics Canada 1986 and 1991; table not shown). In the five years leading to 1995, the incidence of low income grew even more and affected both public housing and non- public housing CTs alike. In 1995, 31.4% of private households in public housing CTs had incomes below the low-income cut-off, compared to 19.71% in non- public housing CTs. The percentage of private households having incomes below the low-income cut-off in West Town was 14.33% in 1985, 16.17% in 1990, and 24.58% in 1995 (Statistics Canada 1986, 1991, and 1996a; tables not shown).

Map 5: Percentage of Unemployed Adults (15 Years of Age and Older) in West Town Census Tracts, 1995

© 2002 by Christy Sheeran and Andreas Tomaszewski

Sources: Statistics Canada (1996a) and (1996b)

Map 7: Percentage of Low-Income Families in West Town Census Tracts, 1995

© 2002 by Christy Sheeran and Andreas Tomaszewski

Sources: Statistics Canada (1996a) and (1996b)

4.3.3 Education

Lastly, because of its close relation to unemployment, underemployment, and subsequently low income (at least as far as legitimate employment income is concerned), it is useful to look at education levels in West Town. In particular, the proportion of the population in EAs with less than grade nine education in West Town in 1995 is described. To allow for better comparisons between public housing and non-public housing neighbourhoods, Map 9 makes use of enumeration area (EA) level data and shows that most public housing EAs contain higher proportions of residents with less than grade nine education than non-public housing EAs. In other words, there is some evidence for the concentration of people with low education levels in, or very close to, public housing EAs.

Of the seven EAs in which the West Town public housing estates are located, one contains between 10% and 14.9% of residents with less than grade nine education and three contain between 15% and 20%. The area surrounded by the EAs with public housing neighbourhoods Two, Five, and Six displays the same level of low education. In all public housing EAs combined, 37.79% of people do not have a high school diploma and 12.13% have less than grade nine education (Statistics Canada 1996a; table not shown).

The percentage without a high school diploma in the seven public housing EAs ranges from 27 to 61%, the percentage with less than grade nine education from 8 to 20% (with one outlier at 2.7%). Aside from a relative concentration of low education levels in, and close to, many public housing EAs there are approximately 15 non-public housing EAs with 10% to 15% of residents with less than grade nine education. In contrast, half of all West Town EAs have only between 0% and 5% of residents with such low education levels.

Map 9: Percentage of Adult Population with Less than Grade 9 Education in West Town Enumeration Areas, 1995

© 2002 by Christy Sheeran and Andreas Tomaszewski

Sources: Statistics Canada (1996a) and (1996c)

4.4 Summary

This chapter relied on official data – government reports and Census data – to describe the historical development of West Town, the economic history and trends of the City and West Town. Further changes in the demographic make-up of areas in West Town, in particular regarding immigration, ethnicity, unemployment, and poverty were described. In sum, the chapter showed that:

- Similar to so many other urban areas in Canada (Hatfield 1997; Kazemipur and Halli 2000; Lee and Smith 1997 and 2000), there is a concentration of the urban poor in West Town.
- The concentration of urban disadvantage in West Town appears to be the result of a planned effort, sustaining arguments that public housing estates, referred to as “cities-within-cities,” are built in parts of urban areas that are already poor (e.g., Venkatesh 2000).
- Recent immigrants and visible minorities make up a substantial portion of the economically disadvantaged residing in West Town.
- The concentration of urban disadvantage has increased in West Town over the past decade.

While there are a number of other areas of concentrated urban disadvantage in the City, the results presented in this chapter are confirmed by Hollingsworth (1999) who examined patterns of social and economic exclusion at the community level in the same city. All developments described above happened despite the fact that the whole region and the City, in particular, have been experiencing unprecedented growth and economic

prosperity, and continue to do so to a large extent. That urban poverty and the concentration of urban disadvantage increased at the same time, shows once more that not everyone benefits from economic success and that a “trickle-down effect” is difficult, if not impossible, to find. It is equally important to realize that the effects of the disappearance of traditional work (e.g., manufacturing) (Wilson 1996) on people with few educational and employment skills is compounded by the emergence of the “new economy” (e.g., Duffy et al. 1997), which is so important in the City. Additionally, due to decisions made by the provincial Government of Ontario, important services for the poor were cut back significantly (e.g., Capponi 1999; Hurtig 1999).

All of these recent and future developments combined, together with an apparent serious lack of commitment on behalf of governments to deal with poverty, make it hard to imagine that the situation will change for the better any time soon. It is relatively easy to imagine, however, following the apathy of governments, that many of these urban areas of concentrated disadvantage in Canada will increasingly deteriorate and many parts of our cities will end up with the reputation of Chicago’s South Side and the like.

CHAPTER FIVE

METHODOLOGY

5.1 The West Town Study: Sample and Data Collection

The data used in this study are from the *West Town Study* (WTS) (DeKeseredy, Alvi, Schwartz, and Tomaszewski, 2002). The WTS was designed and conducted by ALVI Consulting & Communications Inc. with the cooperation of a local community and health centre as part of evaluation research of a “grass-roots” project to increase awareness about drug and alcohol addiction and related problems in West Town public housing neighbourhoods. Professors Shahid Alvi and Walter DeKeseredy headed the research team of which undergraduate students and I were a part. Together with the other researchers, I distributed and collected questionnaires, as well as scheduled and conducted interviews with West Town residents. The exact location of West Town, which is a pseudonym, is withheld to protect the anonymity of West Town residents and those participating in the WTS.

The research design was informed by previous research on urban neighbourhoods and crime, as well as by feminism and left realism. For example, left realists emphasize the importance of preparatory research and contend that only local survey, rather than large-scale, research can reveal the peculiarities of local communities (Crawford, Jones, Woodhouse, and Young 1990; Jones, MacLean, and Young 1986; MacLean 1992). Many feminists emphasize the importance of qualitative research methods and taking violence against women seriously, which also led to the use of methodological triangulation and the participation of community residents in the research (e.g., Maguire 1987; Ryan 1995).

Measures used in the QNLS were adopted from the U.S. National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), the Islington Crime Survey (ICS, Jones et al. 1986; Crawford et al. 1990), the Chicago Urban Poverty and Family Life Study (UPFLS, Wilson 1996), the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN, Sampson et al. 1997),³¹ and survey research on woman abuse, such as the Canadian National Survey (CNS) on woman abuse in Canadian University and College dating relationships (DeKeseredy and Kelly 1993). The WTS employed research strategies deemed sensitive to, and appropriate for, studying crime in public housing neighbourhoods (Fagan, Dumanovsky, Thompson, and Davies 1998; Gwiasda, Taluc, and Popkin 1997; Holzman 1996; Holzman and Piper 1998; Hyatt and Holzman 1999; Piper et al. 1997; Popkin et al. 2000).

The WTS began in the winter of 1998 and consisted of four parts: preparatory research, the Quality of Neighbourhood Life Survey (QNLS), analyses of Census tract (CT) and enumeration area (EA) data from Statistics Canada's Census, and 51 face-to-face interviews with neighbourhood residents. Preparatory research included in-depth conversations and interviews with staff at the local community health centre, public housing residents, people who participated in centre activities, such as drop-ins, local merchants, and probation officers. Sociodemographic and socioeconomic information on West Town residents was obtained by analyzing data collected by Statistics Canada. In particular, data from the Census years 1986, 1991, and 1996 (Statistics Canada 1986, 1991, and 1996a) were analyzed. To obtain a picture of West Town and compare the areas with

³¹ Other surveys on neighbourhoods and crime informing QNLS measures are documented by Sampson (1985) and (1991) and Sampson and Groves (1989).

and without public housing, Census tract (CT) data were used. Enumeration area (EA) data were used to obtain a picture of the immediate area in which public housing estates were located and to supplement information gathered in the QNLS.

5.1.1 Census Data

West Town is home to numerous low-income neighbourhoods containing both government-assisted and non-government-assisted housing and consists of several urban areas of concentrated disadvantage. In fact, official data, analyzed in Chapter 4, reveal that West Town has been home to urban areas of concentrated disadvantage since the mid 1970s, when a significant portion of the economically disadvantaged were relocated from downtown areas as part of urban renewal efforts (Ottawa 1977). The previous chapter also analyzed Census data, showing that a large portion of West Town residents are immigrants and that this population is concentrated in West Town neighbourhoods containing public housing estates. Further, Chapter 4 presented data on the concentration of unemployment, low education levels, and poverty in West Town, using Statistics Canada's low-income cut-off (LICOs).

5.1.2 The Quality of Neighbourhood Life Survey (QNLS)

The QNLS was conducted in six West Town public housing neighbourhoods, located in close proximity to each other (see Map 1). Three of the public housing neighbourhoods (Two, Four, and Five) consist exclusively of townhouses and range in size from approximately 130 to 180 units. Neighbourhood Three is a single high rise made up of approximately 240 apartments, which are occupied by seniors for the most part and

visible minority families who are recent immigrants. The remaining two public housing neighbourhoods consist of a combination of townhouses and apartments. While approximately 200 of the 420 units in neighbourhood Six are located in a high rise, only about 25 of the 150 units in neighbourhood One are in a small apartment building. In total, then, West Town public housing neighbourhoods consist of slightly over 1,200 units, housing approximately 3,500 people.

The research team obtained these numbers from staff at the community health centre and the City's Housing Authority (HA). Based on their estimate that approximately 1,200 units were occupied, an equal number of QNLS questionnaires were distributed in these public housing estates. The HA was unable to provide exact information on how many people resided in each estate. The field research confirmed Popkin et al.'s (2000) finding in Chicago public housing that a considerable number of residents live with their partners, friends, or relatives without the knowledge of authorities.

The QNLS (Appendix A) was conducted in the summer and fall of 1998. Assisted by several residents, the research team distributed QNLS questionnaires to 1,200 occupied households in six West Town public housing estates. A large envelope with "What Do You Think About Your Neighbourhood?" printed on it was deposited in residents' mailboxes. It contained the survey and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. The preamble of the questionnaire stated that participation was voluntary and asked one person in the household over the age of 18 to fill it out. Additionally, respondents were given the telephone numbers for Professors Shahid Alvi and Walter DeKeseredy in case they had questions about the survey. Several West Town residents asked researchers for help filling out the questionnaire due to language or literacy problems. The willingness of respondents

to ask researchers for assistance is not surprising considering that they had spent from several weeks to several months in the neighbourhoods and had established rapport with local residents.

A follow-up to the initial survey mail-out was done approximately four weeks later. Members of the research team visited neighbourhood residents' homes and asked occupants if they had filled out the survey and returned it. In total, 325 usable questionnaires were returned, representing a response rate of 27 percent. Possible explanations for the relatively low response rate include the following:³²

- The majority of public housing residents have low levels of education and many of them might have felt that their writing skills are inadequate. While they might agree to an interview, they may have been not confident enough to complete a written questionnaire (Dillman 1983).
- The questionnaire was only available in English. Consequently, many people may not have participated because of language barriers.
- In light of recent political changes in the province of Ontario, especially to the welfare system, many residents may not have believed the research team's assurances of anonymity and confidentiality and may have chosen not to participate, as they feared their responses would be reported to the welfare office or public housing authorities.

The previous chapter described the City, West Town, and the different areas in West Town, which is useful as it helps put the experiences of West Town public housing

³² This list is taken from DeKeseredy, Alvi, Schwartz, and Tomaszewski (2002).

residents who participated in the Quality of Neighbourhood Life Survey (QNLS) in context. This section showed that West Town public housing neighbourhoods and a large number of QNLS respondents deal with the issues surrounding immigration, ethnic heterogeneity, joblessness, poverty, low education levels, etc. The following discussion refers to Table 6, which displays selected sociodemographic and socioeconomic characteristics of female respondents. Responses refer to the 12 months prior to the survey. A similar table can be found in DeKeseredy, Alvi, Schwartz, and Perry (1999).

Over two thirds of QNLS respondents were female (67.4%; $N=219$). Since this study is only concerned with crimes against women, male respondents were deleted from the data set used for the analysis. Although the QNLS is not representative, it cannot be determined whether this means that women are over-represented in the sample. For example, it may reflect the widely documented “feminization of poverty” (Anderson 1993), which includes a higher likelihood for women to end up poor after a divorce, qualifying them for public housing residency. Further, U.S. research has consistently shown that women constitute the vast majority of public housing residents (e.g., Holzman et al. 1996; Popkin et al. 2000).

The average age of female respondents is 42 and the mean length of their residence in public housing neighbourhoods is seven years and six months. Regarding their main source of income, the vast majority reported it coming from sources other than employment. Jobs were the main source of income for only 17.6% ($N=30$) of respondents. In contrast, almost half of respondents received their income mainly from welfare payments (47.6%; $N=81$) and slightly over one-fourth from disability payments (26.5%; $N=45$). For some, contributions by friends or family members constituted the major source

of income (6.5%; $N=11$), whereas only few had employment insurance fulfilling that role (2%; $N=3$). The latter may indicate that most respondents had either exhausted their eligibility or chose not to apply for benefits in the first place.

Although fewer than half of the women reported their income ($N=101$), the mean individual annual income was \$5,085, comparable to the findings of other studies on female public housing residents.³³ Female QNLS respondents' mean annual household income is \$10,363 ($N=95$). The majority of women are not in the paid labour force: 56.8% ($N=105$) are not working for wages and 18.4% ($N=34$) are retired. Part-time employment is the major form of employment for those in the paid labour force: almost one-fourth of women are working part-time (23.8%; $N=44$), while only 5.9% ($N=11$) report full-time employment. Thus, less than one-third (29.7%; $N=55$) was gainfully employed, at least on a part-time basis.

The relationship between unemployment or underemployment and low education levels was mentioned earlier in the analysis of Census data. QNLS data similarly show that a large number of respondents have low education levels. For example, less than one-third of respondents finished high school (30.7%; $N=62$), while a similar percentage dropped out of high school (28.2%; $N=57$). Additionally, 9.9% ($N=20$) report having less than Grade Nine education. 13.4% ($N=27$) finished vocational or trade school, 9.9% ($N=20$) have some college education, while only 5.4% ($N=11$) have a Bachelor's and 1% ($N=2$) a Master's degree, which might well be outliers. The average educational level of female QNLS respondents is Grade Ten.

³³ For example, in Websdale's (2001: 235) Nashville, Tennessee, sample, respondents' mean annual income was \$5,757, whereas it was \$7,733 in Renzetti and Maier's (2001) Camden, New Jersey, sample.

Close to one-third (31.1%; $N=68$) of women reported living in what Kasarda (1992) calls “severely distressed households,” meaning they displayed at least four of the following five characteristics: being a single parent, being dependent on government assistance, having a low education level, having a low income, or having a poor work history. When comparing women’s marital status, separated or divorced women make up the largest group (29.8%; $N=63$), followed by married or cohabiting women (28.4%; $N=60$). Almost one-fourth of female respondents are single (22.3%; $N=47$) and one-tenth or less are dating (9.5%; $N=20$) or widowed (10%; $N=21$).

In terms of ethnicity (see Question 1.i in Appendix A), 66% ($N=138$) described themselves as English Canadian or French Canadian. However, less than that report having been born in Canada (55.5%; $N=116$). Thus, QNLS data support Statistics Canada’s recent decision to include “Canadian” as an ethnic category since obviously numerous QNLS respondents define themselves as Canadians, despite having been born elsewhere. Other ethnic categories attracting significant numbers of respondents are African (11%; $N=23$), Caribbean (6.7%; $N=14$), and Middle Eastern (6.3%; $N=13$). Just like in West Town public housing Census tracts (see Table 4), Somalis also constitute the largest ethnic “minority” group in public housing neighbourhoods.

Twenty-one female respondents, representing 10% of the sample, are recent immigrants and close to one-third of respondents are members of visible minorities (30.6%; $N=64$)³⁴. This indicates that non-white immigrants are concentrated in poor neighbourhoods, confirming the findings of previous research in the U.S. (Jargowsky

³⁴ That is, they identified themselves as one of the following: Aboriginal, Far Eastern, African, Caribbean, Middle Eastern, or Latin American.

1997; Krivo et al. 1998; Popkin et al. 2000; Websdale 2001; Wacquant 1999; Wacquant and Wilson 1989; Wilson 1996) and Canada (Kazemipur and Halli 2000; Ley and Smith 1997, 2000). One unexpected finding is the low number of Aboriginals in the sample (2.9%; $N=6$), suggesting that this group might be under-represented as research shows high poverty rates among urban Aboriginals (e.g., LaPrarie 1994; Statistics Canada 1996), which would qualify them for public housing.

Table 6:
Selected Sociodemographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics
of Female QNLS Respondents

		<i>N</i>
Average Age	42	219
Mean Length of Stay in Public Housing Neighbourhoods	7 Years, 6 Months	215
Median Individual Income	\$5,085.00	101
Median Household Income	\$10,363.00	95
	%	<i>N</i>
Main Source of Income		170
Job	17.6	30
Employment Insurance	2.0	3
Welfare Payments	47.6	81
Disability Payments	26.5	45
Family or Friends	6.5	11

Table 6 (Continued):
Selected Sociodemographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics
of Female QNLS Respondents

	%	<i>N</i>
Employment		185
Working full-time	5.9	11
Working part-time	23.8	44
Not Working for Wages	56.8	105
Retired	18.4	34
Highest Level of Education		202
Elementary School (Grade 8)	9.9	20
High School (still)	1.5	3
High School Drop-Out	28.2	57
High School	30.7	62
Vocational School	13.4	27
Some College	9.9	20
Bachelor's	5.4	11
Master's	1.0	2
Average Educational Level	Grade 10	198

Table 6 (Continued):
Selected Sociodemographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics
of Female QNLS Respondents

	%	<i>N</i>
Marital Status		211
Married or Cohabiting	28.4	60
Separated or Divorced	29.8	63
Single	22.3	47
Dating	9.5	20
Widowed	10.0	21
Severely Distressed Indicators		
Single Parent	55.3	121
Government Assistance	58.9	129
Less than High School Education	36.5	80
Low Income (Perception)	75.8	166
Poor Work History	47.9	105
Severely Distressed Household	31.1	68
(Yes to at least 4 indicators)		
Additional Variables Important for the Analysis		
At least Part-time Employed	29.7	55
Perception Crime is Problem in N'hood	43.7	86
Perception Disorder is Problem in N'hood	49.2	98

Table 6 (Continued):
Selected Sociodemographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics
of Female QNLS Respondents

	%	<i>N</i>
Ethnic Identification		209
Central American	0.5	1
French Canadian	16.7	35
English Canadian	49.3	103
Aboriginal	2.9	6
British	1.4	3
Eastern European	0.5	1
Southern European	1.0	2
Far Eastern	2.4	5
African	11.0	23
Caribbean	6.7	14
Middle Eastern	6.3	13
Latin American	1.4	3
Country of Birth		219
Canada	55.5	116
Other Ethnic Indicators		
Visible Minority	30.6	64
Recent Immigrant	10.0	21

5.1.3 In-Depth Interviews

The QNLS was supplemented by interviews to “give voices” to respondents and to add “texture” to the survey data. For example, interviews contain residents’ perceptions and examples of collective efficacy and other important information absent in the quantitative data, such as the manifestations and consequences of experiences with “public” and “private” crimes. The research team conducted semi-structured interviews with 51 women and men residing in Census Tracts containing the six West Town public housing estates (see Appendix B for the interview guide). Like the survey instrument, the interview guide was based on preparatory research. Most interviewees lived in West Town public housing estates, while a few lived close to one of them or resided in some other type of government-assisted housing. All interviewees also completed the QNLS questionnaire and were given \$10.00 as a token for their participation.

Respondents were told the following when interviews were scheduled and before they started: (1) participation is voluntary; (2) they will remain anonymous; (3) all information given is confidential; (4) they can decide not to answer questions they are uncomfortable with; and (5) they can stop the interview at any time. All respondents starting the interview completed it. Interviews ranged in time from 30 to 90 minutes with an average of slightly over one hour. Although this study is only concerned with the victimization of women, interviews from women and men are used. It will be noted explicitly when quoting from an interview with a male respondent.

5.2 Definitions and Measurements

Below is a discussion of definitions and measurements used in the analysis.

Unit of Analysis. The unit of analysis is the individual and not the neighbourhood as in Sampson et al.'s (1997) analysis. This decision is based on two reasons. First, because of the small sample size in many of the public housing neighbourhoods, aggregation to neighbourhood levels is not advisable as meaningful multivariate statistical analysis would be impossible. Second, researchers such as Block and Skogan (2001) and Kasarda (1992) point to the advantage of individual-level rather than aggregate data. For example, if an economically disadvantaged group makes up only a small portion of a statistical area, the use of aggregate data will misrepresent their actual situation.

Informal Social Control (InfSoCon). This concept refers to the propensity of neighbourhood residents to intervene for the common good and is measured by five items on a five-point Likert scale (see Appendix A, Question 26). Based on a slightly modified version of Sampson et al.'s (1997) and that of other researchers (e.g., Wilson 1996; Sampson 1991; Sampson and Groves 1989; Veysey and Messner 1999), a summative scale of the informal social control measure was constructed (Chronbach's $\alpha = .86$). Residents were asked about the likelihood ("very likely, likely, unlikely, very unlikely, don't know")³⁵ that their neighbours could be counted on to help if: (a) children were

³⁵ In the QNLS, the response category "don't know" took the place of Sampson et al.'s (1997) category of "neither likely nor unlikely". Their coding scheme was adopted in which "don't know" responses were recoded to the middle category of "neither likely nor unlikely" (Sampson et al. 1997: 924, footnote 21) and looks as follows: very likely = 5, likely = 4, don't know = 3, unlikely = 2, very unlikely = 1. Further, following the above researchers, "anyone providing data for at least one item provided data for the analysis" (Sampson et al. 1997: 924, footnote 21), reducing the valid N for the informal social control scale to 188.

skipping school and hanging out on a street corner; (b) children were spray-painting graffiti on a local building; (c) children were showing disrespect to an adult; (d) a fight broke out in front of their house; and (e) the fire station closest to their home was threatened with budget cuts.

Social Cohesion and Trust (SoCohTr). This concept refers to mutual trust and solidarity among neighbours and is important for the realization of neighbourhood informal social control (Sampson et al. 1997). The measure is a modified version of Sampson et al.'s (1997) and that of other researchers (e.g., Wilson 1996; Sampson 1991; Sampson and Groves 1989; Veysey and Messner 1999) and is also represented by a five-point Likert-type scale consisting of eight conceptually related items (see Appendix A, Question 27) (Chronbach's $\alpha = .83$).

From respondents' answers to the following questions, which asked how strongly they agreed ("strongly disagree, disagree, strongly agree, agree, don't know"), a summative scale was constructed: (a) people around here will help their neighbours; (b) this is a friendly neighbourhood; (c) people in this neighbourhood can be trusted; (d) people in this neighbourhood do not get along with each other; (e) people in this neighbourhood do not share the same values; (f) people in this neighbourhood are willing to baby-sit each other's children; (g) people in this neighbourhood will call the police if a suspicious person is hanging around; and (h) people in this neighbourhood will call the

police if their neighbours have trouble with rowdy teenagers.³⁶

Perceived Collective Efficacy (CollEff). This measure is a modified version of Sampson et al.'s (1997). It is a summary measure that combines the above informal social control and social cohesion and trust scales (Chronbach's $\alpha = .88$).³⁷ It is a modified version because three items were added to Sampson et al.'s (1997) social cohesion and trust scale, as mentioned above. Although implied by the operationalization of its components, it is necessary to emphasize that QNLS participants' responses relate to their perceptions of informal social control and social cohesion and trust and, thus, collective efficacy. After all, to measure informal social control, respondents are presented with scenarios they may or may not have experienced and are asked how likely they think it would be that neighbours could be counted on for help. Similarly, to measure social cohesion and trust, they are asked to agree or disagree with statements about their neighbours and neighbourhood. Hence, the measure is subjective and the term 'perceived' collective efficacy reflects that.³⁸

³⁶ Following the Urban Poverty and Family Life Study (Wilson 1996), the last three items (f, g, and h), absent in Sampson et al. (1997), were added to the QNLS questionnaire. Again, the coding scheme described in the previous footnote was adopted and looks as follows: strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, don't know = 3, disagree = 2, strongly disagree = 1; items d and e were reverse coded. Consistent with the informal social control scale, at least one item of this question had to be answered to provide data for the analysis. As this was not the case with all questionnaires, the valid *N* for the social cohesion and trust scale was reduced to 183.

³⁷ Due to reasons discussed in the previous two footnotes, the valid *N* for the collective efficacy scale was reduced to 171.

³⁸ Note that the discussion always refers to *perceived* collective efficacy even if 'perceived' is omitted, for example, to avoid a long and cumbersome expression.

Types of Victimization. Types of victimization examined can be placed in two distinct categories: “public” and “private” crimes against women. “Public” crimes against women include street violence and harassment, whereas “private” crimes against women include different types of intimate abuse experienced by women at the hands of their dating or live-in partners: psychological abuse, physical violence, and sexual violence. The types of victimization are used as dependent variables that are dichotomous with victimization coded 1.

“Public” Crimes Against Women

Street Violence (Street). A modified version of Sampson et al.’s (1997) measure of personal victimization and DeKeseredy et al.’s (1999) measure of stranger physical violence against women assessed street violence by a single binary item, with response categories yes and no (coded 1 if victimized; Chronbach’s alpha = .61).³⁹ These questions (see Appendix A, Question 28) are revised renditions of those used in the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) and were introduced by the following preamble:

We realize that it may be difficult to discuss your experiences with crime in your neighbourhood. If we may, we would like to ask you a few questions about what happened to you in the last 12 months. Please choose your answer with a check mark.

In the last 12 months:

- Did a *stranger* beat you up, attack you or hit you with something?
- Did *someone you know* beat you up, attack you or hit you with something?
- Did a *stranger* knife you, shoot at you or attack you with a weapon?
- Did *someone you know* knife you, shoot at you or attack you with a weapon?

³⁹ 15.1% of women ($N=33$) reported having been victimized by at least one of the items.

Harassment (Harass). Following DeKeseredy et al. (1999: 506), “four modified versions of items used in the second sweep of the Islington Crime Survey (Crawford et al. 1990), were used to measure harassment” (see Appendix A, Question 28).⁴⁰ The same response categories and coding as above were used and the questions were introduced by the same preamble used to measure stranger and acquaintance street violence.

In the last 12 months:

- Did anyone *on the street, in a bar or other public place* ever insult you because they thought you were homosexual (gay or lesbian)?
- Did anyone *on the street, in a bar or other public place* ever insult you because they did not like your skin colour or religion?
- Did anyone *on the street, in a bar or other public place* ever touch you sexually when you did not want to be touched (for example, your breasts, rear end or genitals)?
- Did anyone *on the street, in a bar or other public place* ever make sexual remarks about you or to you that made you feel uncomfortable?

As pointed out by DeKeseredy et al. (2002), the “concern theoretically was that all of these items measure the potential hostility or lack of civility of the public place, which might be related to a perceived lack of collective efficacy.” This is the justification for using this index despite the low Chronbach’s alpha of .51 which, as the authors note, is acceptable since it consists of only four items.”⁴¹

⁴⁰ 26.5% of the women (N=58) reported victimization by at least one of the items.

⁴¹ Merging both public crime indices into one did not improve the Chronbach’s alpha to a level higher than that of the street violence index. Thus, it was decided to continue the analysis with the two separate indices.

“Private” Crimes Against Women

Following DeKeseredy et al. (1999), violence against female intimates is measured by a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scale 2 (CTS-2) (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, and Sugarman 1995), which is a revised version of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) developed by Straus (1979). Since the shortcomings of the CTS have been discussed in detail elsewhere (e.g., DeKeseredy et al. 1999; DeKeseredy and Schwartz 1998), they are only briefly mentioned here. Most importantly, the CTS only measures conflict-instigated violence, i.e., violence resulting from a conflict between two partners (see preamble to the question below). It neglects control-instigated violence, as well as the contexts, meanings, and motives of such violence, such as whether the act was committed in defense (DeKeseredy et al. 1997; DeKeseredy and Schwartz 1998). While the CTS is usually used in a gender-specific way, with separate questionnaires for females and males, the QNLS used it in a gender-neutral way. Further, since the QNLS did not ask about the perpetrator’s gender, there is no way of knowing whether the abuse happened in a heterosexual or homosexual relationship. Further, there is a growing body of literature showing that many women find psychological abuse more injurious than physical abuse (Kirkwood 1993; Schwartz 2000; Walker 1984).

DeKeseredy et al. (1999: 503-504) note “the QNLS version [of the CTS-2] consists of 21 items and measures three different ways of handling interpersonal conflict in intimate relationships, regardless of whether they are heterosexual, gay or lesbian: psychological abuse, physical violence and sexual violence” (see Appendix A, Question 29). The response categories are yes and no and the preamble to the questions read as follows:

No matter how well a couple gets along, sometimes they disagree, get annoyed with each other, or just have arguments. They also use many different ways to settle their differences. Below is a list of some things that your partner (for example, a husband, wife, girlfriend, lover or date) might have done to you in these situations *in the last 12 months*. Please choose your answer with a check mark.

Psychological Abuse of Women by Intimate Partners (PsychAb). Respondents were asked about the following six situations: *In the last 12 months, did your partner yell at you, insult or swear at you, accuse you of being a lousy lover, call you fat and ugly, destroy something that belongs to you, and threaten to hit or throw something at you* (see Appendix A, Question 29, items a to f)? Response categories were yes and no. An index was created, and if at least one positive response was recorded, it was coded 1 (Chronbach's $\alpha = .77$).⁴² Much criticism has been directed at the use of the above indicators, such as that being yelled at does not constitute psychological abuse. Whether or not this may be correct, there is ample empirical evidence, some of it to be presented later, linking verbal and non-physical assaults and other forms of psychological abuse to intimate violence.

Physical Violence Against Female Intimates (PhysViol). Respondents were asked about the following twelve situations: *In the last 12 months, did your partner grab you, push or shove you, throw something at you that could hurt, slap you, twist your arm or pull your hair, kick you, punch or hit you with something that could hurt, slam you against a wall, choke you, burn or scald you on purpose, beat you up, and use a knife or gun on you* (see Appendix A, Question 29, items g to r)? Again, an index was created and, if at least

⁴² 34.7% of the women ($N=76$) responded positive to at least one of the items of this measure of psychological abuse.

one positive response was recorded, it was coded 1 (Chronbach's alpha = .85).⁴³

Sexual Violence Against Female Intimates (SexViol). To generate this index, respondents were asked about the following twelve situations: *In the last 12 months, did your partner threaten you with physical force to make you have sex, use physical force to make you have sex, and insist on having sex when you didn't want to (but did not use physical force)* (see Appendix A, Question 29, items s, t, and u)? An index was created and, if at least one positive response was recorded, it was coded 1. The low Chronbach's alpha of .45 is not surprising, as the index consists of only three items.⁴⁴ Because the low alpha and the relatively low victimization rates by physical and sexual violence were expected to adversely affect meaningful statistical analysis, two different categories of "private" crimes against women were created, using the previously discussed items. These two categories are described below.

Intimate Abuse (IntimAb). This index incorporates all items discussed above. In other words, if a respondent reported any single one incident of either psychological abuse or physical or sexual violence, it was coded 1, resulting in a Chronbach's alpha of .89.⁴⁵

Intimate Violence (IntimViol). This index incorporates all items making up physical and sexual violence discussed above, *with the exception of psychological abuse*. In other words, if a respondent reported one incident of either physical or sexual violence,

⁴³ 34 women, representing 15.5% of the female sample, reported having been a victim of at least one of the types of physical violence against intimates.

⁴⁴ 7.8% of women ($N=17$) experienced sexual violence at the hands of their intimate partners.

⁴⁵ 35.6% of women ($N=78$) experienced any type of intimate abuse.

it was coded 1, resulting in a Chronbach's alpha of .85.⁴⁶

Sociodemographic Predictors. Several sociodemographic predictors were included in the analysis to assess their relative contributions to perceptions of collective efficacy among respondents and whether the addition of collective efficacy as intervening variables in the logistic regression equations would decrease the effect of sociodemographic predictors on the dependent variable victimization. If the latter is the case and the effect is significant, collective efficacy would act as a mediator of sociodemographic predictors. The following sociodemographic predictors were examined: member of a severely distressed household, age, sex, marital status, visible minority, recent immigrant, neighbourhood birth, length of stay in the neighbourhood, and employment. All sociodemographic predictors are dummy variables, with the exception of age and length of stay in the neighbourhood.

Member of a Severely Distressed Household (SevDistr). Using a modified version of Kasarda's (1992: 56) definition of "severely distressed households," a respondent falls into this category in this study if she answered 'yes' to at least four of the following five characteristics: being a single parent, on government assistance, having less than high school education, and a poor work history.⁴⁷ Membership in a severely distressed household is coded 1; respondents coded 0 are considered belonging to households that are not severely distressed. This dummy variable is used to allow for the examination of variance in the sample of public housing residents, especially regarding its association with

⁴⁶ 19.2% of female respondents (N=42) reported intimate violence.

⁴⁷ It is a modified version as respondents' own perception of having a low income was added and single parent-families do not have to be headed by females.

perceived collective efficacy and victimization.

Age. Age is measured in years and is a continuous variable. It refers to Question 1.a) of the QNLS questionnaire (see Appendix A). It is included in the analysis, as the variable has been proven an important predictor of victimization.

Sex. Sex is a dichotomous variable, with females coded 1, and refers to Question 1.b) of the QNLS questionnaire (see Appendix A). Just like age, the variable is included in the analysis, as it has been proven to be an important predictor of victimization.

Marital Status. Marital status refers to Question 1.c) of the QNLS questionnaire (see Appendix A) and has been divided into five separate dummy variables (yes=1): married or cohabiting (living with someone; mar/coh); separated or divorced (sep/div); single; dating; or widowed. The respective dummy variables are included in the analysis as research has shown that they can impact on people's (especially women's) level of involvement outside of the household and some of them are associated with an increased risk of experiencing intimate violence.

Visible Minority (VisMin). This dichotomous variable refers to Question 1.i) of the QNLS questionnaire (see Appendix A). Respondents are defined as belonging to a visible minority if they identified themselves as one of the following: Aboriginal,⁴⁸ Far Eastern, African, Caribbean, Middle Eastern, or Latin American (yes=1). The variable is included in the analysis as one of two proxies for ethnic heterogeneity, which has been found to be negatively associated with collective efficacy.

⁴⁸ It is acknowledged that Aboriginals are generally not defined as visible *minorities*, but rather as a distinct ethnic group. Nevertheless, Aboriginals are categorized as a visible minority in the context of this study because "visible otherness" often discourages interactions with other groups and hence can lead to less social cohesion, etc.

Recent Immigrant (RecImm). Like visible minority, the dummy variable recent immigrant, coded 1 for yes, serves as a proxy for ethnic heterogeneity. It refers to Question 1.g) of the QNLS questionnaire (see Appendix A) and is included in the analysis as a large proportion of recent immigrants, just like visible minorities, are hypothesized to impair the creation of social cohesion and trust and informal social control because of an apparent lack of agreement on values, etc.

Neighbourhood Birth. This dichotomous variable, with neighbourhood birth coded 1 refers to Question 18 of the QNLS questionnaire (see Appendix A). It is included in the analysis as one of the two proxies for residential stability, which previous research has found to be positively associated with collectively efficacy.

Length of Stay in the Neighbourhood. Length of stay in the public housing neighbourhood is a continuous variable measured in years and refers to the time respondents have lived in their public housing neighbourhood as indicated in their answer to Question 16 of the QNLS questionnaire (see Appendix A). This variable is used as a proxy for residential stability. Longer residence indicates higher residential stability.

Employment (Empd). This dichotomous variable refers to Question 2 of the QNLS questionnaire (see Appendix A). Respondents who reported either part-time or full-time employment during the year before the QNLS was administered were coded 1. The variable is included in the analysis as employment, because of the apparent resources accompanied by it, is supposed to encourage numerous aspects of social organization and increase neighbourhood collective efficacy.

Disorder Following Alvi, Schwartz, DeKeseredy, and Maume (2001), a measure was included to assess perceptions of neighbourhood disorder. The following preamble

preceded the questions (see Appendix A, Question 22):

Many people are very concerned about drug use, drug dealing, and other problems in their neighbourhoods. Please tell us if you think that the following things are more of a problem, less of a problem, about the same, or not a problem since you first moved here.

Respondents were then asked about these concerns: (a) vandalism; (b) people drinking alcohol and using drugs (e.g., marijuana, cocaine, crack, heroin) in public places; (c) groups of teenagers hanging around in public places; (d) youth gangs; (e) graffiti (people writing on walls); (f) garbage on the streets and sidewalks; (g) noise; (h) drug dealing; (i) people using drugs (e.g., marijuana, cocaine, crack, heroin) and alcohol; (j) armed robbery; (k) burglary; (l) violent assault; (m) sexual assault; (n) family violence (e.g., wife beating and child abuse); and (o) theft.⁴⁹ Disorder was categorized into three different aspects, which are discussed below.

Drug-Related Disorder (Drugs). This aspect of neighbourhood disorder was measured by items b, h, and i (Chronbach's alpha = .87).

Crime-Related Disorder (Crime). This was measured by items j, k, l, m, n, and o (Chronbach's alpha = .89).

Environmental Disorder (Disord). This was measured by items a, c, d, e, f, and g (Chronbach's alpha = .78).

⁴⁹ The following coding scheme was adopted: more of a problem = 3, about the same or not a problem = 2, less of a problem = 1.

5.3 Data Analysis

The data analysis for this study consists of correlation, cross-tabular, and logistic regression analyses, maps, and analyses of in-depth interviews. Logistic regression analyses were conducted with the quantitative data from the QNLS to test the hypotheses outlined above. Central to the analysis was an examination of the relationship between collective efficacy and the victimization of women by “public” and “private” crimes and how these relationships vary.

To examine factors influencing the relationship between collective efficacy and individual victimization, the empirical models include sociodemographic and socioeconomic characteristics as control variables. These characteristics can have direct effects on the dependent variables in the study. For example, gender and age might have independent effects on collective efficacy and on victimization, such as public harassment. Thus, for each stage of this research, multivariate statistical procedures were used in an attempt to disentangle the effects of sociodemographic and socioeconomic factors from the theoretical factors tested. Therefore, logistic regression analysis was used as a basic and straightforward method of multivariate analysis.

Maps produced with the GIS-software MapInfo are used to document sociodemographic and socioeconomic profiles of West Town and its neighbourhoods, as well as sociodemographic and socioeconomic changes, generated from Census tract and enumeration area level Census data for the years 1986, 1991, and 1996 (Statistics Canada 1986, 1991, and 1996a). Interviews are used to illustrate and complement findings from the quantitative analysis and provide examples of how West Town residents perceive collective efficacy, which the survey could not capture.

CHAPTER SIX
PERCEIVED COLLECTIVE EFFICACY AND
“PUBLIC” AND “PRIVATE” CRIMES AGAINST WOMEN
IN WEST TOWN PUBLIC HOUSING

6.1 Introduction

As discussed in Chapter Three, collective efficacy is hypothesized to be negatively associated with the victimization of women by “public” and “private” crimes. “Public” crimes examined include street violence (robbery, assault) and harassment (homophobic, racial, sexual). “Private” crimes examined include psychological abuse, as well as physical and sexual violence by intimate partners. It was further hypothesized that members of severely distressed households might be at a disadvantage in their ability to mobilize collective efficacy resources compared to those not living in such households and hence would be more likely to be victimized.

The chapter begins with a discussion of female QNLS participants’ sociodemographic characteristics associated with perceived collective efficacy. This will be followed by an examination of “public” crimes (predatory street violence and public harassment) and “private” crimes (psychological partner abuse and physical and sexual partner violence) against female QNLS participants. For each type of victimization, the respective section will describe incidence rates, zero-order correlations, and the relationships between collective efficacy and victimization, based on cross tabular and logistic regression analyses. The chapter ends with a brief summary of the findings, while their implications will be discussed in the last chapter.

6.2 Determining Levels of Perceived Collective Efficacy

As mentioned earlier, to date, there is no standard for an acceptable, ‘good,’ or ‘normal’ level of perceived collective efficacy. In other words, it is not known how high respondents have to score on the perceived collective efficacy index or what proportion of neighbourhood residents need to have a given score for collective efficacy to make a difference. Nevertheless, QNLS data show that some residents perceive collective efficacy to be higher than others and a measure reflecting this difference is needed to examine the relationship between collective efficacy and different types of victimization. Thus, for the purpose of this research, perceived collective efficacy is defined as high when a respondent’s score on the collective efficacy index was equal to or greater than the index’s mean ($M = 1.1945$) of all female respondents. Conversely, scores less than the collective efficacy mean were determined to reflect low perceived collective efficacy.

Following this definition, 55.3% ($N=121$) of the 219 female QNLS respondents perceived collective efficacy to be high (see Table 9). Since the QNLS only contains data on people living in West Town public housing, it cannot be determined whether their perceptions of collective efficacy are different than those of residents not living in public housing. Qualitative data support the impression that there is no consensus among QNLS respondents regarding the level of collective efficacy when barely more than half of them perceive it to be high. Compare the following comments made by different respondents during interviews (with the exception of the first quote all respondents quoted below are female):

Depends on the problem [whether people help each other out]. ...
 These people just deal [drugs] among themselves, not to children.
 If they did, they’d get themselves killed before long. Parents

would be mad. ... I really stay to myself. I know [the coordinator of the family house] and maybe two other people. You know, I've got my own problems, I don't want to deal with anyone else's.

I'm just nervous about going out ... I mean, even during the day. ... I would love to be able to go out by myself at night and not feel nervous. I would love to do that. But I haven't done that since I was fourteen years old. I have not felt safe outside at night by myself since I was fourteen years old and I'm forty! That's three decades, practically, of not feeling safe. Because that's the first time I was raped, when I was fourteen. And all safety issues from then on, I mean, that comes with that. And I knew them. I mean, they were in my, they were in my home afterwards. And I could say nothing because they threatened my life if I told anybody.

Well, there's some breaking and entering and there's some assaults. Although I don't want to give a negative impression. Most people are good. There's a lot of neighbours helping neighbours. It isn't formally set up, but if I help you with your housework, you will help me out with baby sitting. It's sort of an exchange of jobs and helping. ... If they [neighbours] think ... the kids don't have enough food, they'll bring food over. People will help, they will try to. ... I think that there are a lot of people who informally support each other in the [public housing] communities.

There were people I knew that would say, 'We won't steal your car but we will steal your neighbour's.' That's how it used to be. ... If a mother needs someone to baby sit her kids, she will definitely get someone, like a neighbour will definitely take care of the kid for as long as they have to. They [neighbours] are usually pretty good, especially when it comes to kids.

No, we have nice community. In fact, our kids get along great. The whole community showed up to help with the ... building of the park.

Numerous times I've phoned to report domestic problems and stuff like that [to police and security]. I don't know, there's a lot of people in the community who would do that, too. There's lots that would just plug their ears and not listen, turn up their music or whatever. But there's, you know, a number that would do something.

These remarks show that respondents have a wide range and very different perceptions of collective efficacy, ranging from non-existent, depending on the situation, to virtually everywhere. Are different perceptions of collective efficacy consequences of respondents' experiences with victimization or related to sociodemographic characteristics, such as living in a severely distressed household, marital status, age, minority status, etc.? Or are they linked to respondents identifying "broken-windows issues," such as disorder, drugs, and crime, as problems in their neighbourhood? The section below attempts to answer these questions.

6.3 Correlates of Perceived Collective Efficacy

Sampson et al. (1997) found that concentrated disadvantage, immigrant concentration, and residential instability were negatively associated with collective efficacy. While the findings described below are not strictly comparable with those of the Chicago research because of differences in data and measures, they nevertheless point to important issues not raised before. Correlational analyses (see Appendix C for the zero-order correlations) indicate that collective efficacy is significantly positively associated with organizational participation ($r = .173$), involvement with neighbours ($r = .175$), and being single ($r = .153$) ($p < .05$ for all variables). Significant negative associations exist between collective efficacy and disorder ($r = -.361$), crime ($r = -.214$), drugs ($r = -.165$), separated/divorced ($r = -.171$), and dating ($r = -.155$) ($p < .01$ for disorder, crime, and drugs, $p < .05$ for separated/divorced and dating). Neither length of residency in the neighbourhood ($r = -.050$), nor being severely distressed ($r = -.133$) are statistically significant.

These findings differ from Sampson et al.'s (1997) and what their model postulated. First and foremost, no statistically significant association between collective efficacy and being severely distressed (-.133) was found, suggesting that living in a severely distressed household may not be an important factor in determining a respondent's perception of collective efficacy. The relationship might lack statistical significance because respondents living in severely distressed households are not much different from those not living in such households. This is hardly surprising as the QNLS sample is quite homogenous when it comes to respondents' economic situation. Recall from Table 6 that, of the five severely distressed indicators, 49.7% of respondents report poor work histories and between 55.3% and 75.8% report either being a single parent, being on government assistance, or perceiving their income to be low.

The significant positive associations between collective efficacy and organizational participation and involvement with neighbours are not surprising as these activities foster cooperation and trust among neighbours. This lends support to Taylor's (2001) argument that these two variables should be added to the collective efficacy measure. There are a number of opportunities for public housing residents to participate in organizations and get together with other neighbourhood residents. For example, five of the six public housing neighbourhoods had turned vacant units into so-called family or community houses, which are looked after by local tenants' associations and serve as meeting places for them as well as for other formal and informal groups, pursuing religious activities, making crafts, playing cards, etc. These transformed residences also house food banks and a room set aside for spiritual and other counseling. Different programs set up by a local community health centre, such as improving job or parenting skills, offered in the centre or family

houses, provide further opportunities for public housing residents to meet other people.

The following illustrates that programs or opportunities do not only have to exist, but residents have to be aware of them and be able to take advantage of them. For example, a bookstore close to a public housing neighbourhood had a monthly book reading for children. However, most parents in West Town public housing were unaware of this. Further, numerous West Town public housing residents in other neighbourhoods who were interested, indicated there were problems getting there. For example, although a bus ride was “only” \$1.50 one way, this was more than many could afford. Just like middle-class parents, these parents wanted their children to succeed in school. Besides feeling that teachers did not encourage their children as much as “the other kids,” they faced another challenge: many of their struggling children were diagnosed with attention deficit disorder. Consequently, parents wanted to take every opportunity they could get to help their children catch up.

Addressing awareness and transportation issues could increase social cohesion and trust among parents and maybe even lead to the setting up of programs helping school-aged children. Residents made countless remarks highlighting the importance of community houses for their social lives, especially in light of their limited abilities for the pursuit of middle-class leisure activities. Since going to the movies or attending plays were luxuries they could rarely afford and staying at home all of the time is “too boring,” “anything that doesn’t cost money” was a welcome alternative. The following comments by three different women reflect many respondents’ feelings:

Finding friends is important. And sometimes when you’re isolated with a small family and can’t get out much, you kind of feel as if there aren’t going to be too many people there for a support group.

So, I think having things in the community like the chaplaincy or like the tenants' group [tenants' association] is good, too, because it makes you feel as if you're meeting other people and making friends, which is really important.

Well, a lot of time when they [neighbourhood residents] get together at the family house, they basically talk, have card games, and basically volunteer whatever they can, wherever they can in the community itself, but to just basically talk at the family house drop-in centre.

I think that the chaplaincy work that's being put together, I think that's a really good thing that they're doing. I think that the way that the communities like [public housing estate] who get together and do the food festival or they get together ... and they do anything, I mean, when it brings a community together, nothing but good can come out of that. You meet your neighbours, nobody's a stranger, you know. If there's a problem, ... you go and talk to them.

Numerous respondents emphasized the supporting role the chaplaincy played in their lives. Quite a few used it as a replacement for not being able to go to church, not necessarily for religious but social reasons, as they were unable or ashamed to attend a service outside their public housing neighbourhood. A 23-year old mother of three gives the following explanation:

Church, for example, everyone loves church. Well, I can't say everyone but, you know, that's a great place for people to get out, meet people, socialize, all these things. Who wants to go to church when all they have is holes in their pants? Who wants to go to church when they don't have enough for when the basket comes around?

Returning to zero-order relationships, the significant negative associations between collective efficacy and the "broken-windows variables" disorder, crime, and drugs are not surprising. They illustrate that residents' perceptions of whether these are problems in

their neighbourhood impact their assessment of how effective the neighbourhood as a collective is in controlling these. The fact that only one type of victimization (street violence) is significantly associated with only one of the “broken-windows variables” (crime) suggests that respondents’ perceptions of neighbourhood problems may be largely unrelated to personal experiences of victimization. Alvi et al. (2001) reached the same conclusion when examining female QNLS respondents’ fear of crime, which they found not to be associated with prior victimization.

It is not clear what processes are at work in determining the relations between collective efficacy and marital status. While it speaks to reason that being single would allow for more opportunities to participate in activities, thereby increasing perceived collective efficacy – the association between single and organizational participation is .141 ($p < .05$) – the contrary can be the case if these activities result in negative experiences. Similarly, being in a dating relationship may be negatively correlated with perceived collective efficacy via negative associations between dating and involvement with neighbours ($-.137$; $p < .05$) and social cohesion and trust ($r = -.135$; $p < .05$), although the data do not provide any information on why this should be so. It can be surmised, however, that answers may be found in the type of intimate relationship the woman is in (e.g., patriarchal, egalitarian).

6.4 “Public” Crimes Against Women

This section examines the relationship between severely distressed households and victimization and the relationship between collective efficacy and “public” crimes against women. “Public” crimes examined are street violence (robbery, assault) and harassment

(homophobic, racial, sexual). It was hypothesized that women belonging to severely distressed households are more likely to be victimized, that the relationship between collective efficacy and victimization would be negative, and that collective efficacy would act as a mediator of sociodemographic predictors. Before discussing the results of cross-tabular and logistic regression analyses, incidence rates of women's victimization by "public" crimes⁵⁰ will be presented and zero-order correlations between relevant variables will be discussed.

In the QNLS sample, 15.1% ($N=33$) of female respondents experienced at least one act of street violence among those reported in Table 7 below. The two most common acts of street violence experienced by women, assault (7.3%; $N=16$) and threatened assault with a weapon (5.5%; $N=12$), were perpetrated by acquaintances. Threats to a woman's well-being should not be considered minor but need to be taken seriously because while being threatened, the victim is unlikely to be able to foresee what will happen (Stanko 1990). A 19-year old female QNLS respondent described a situation in which a female acquaintance of hers was "being held at gunpoint. ... She had walked out of one of those ... bars and a ... guy went up to her and put a gun to her head. It was lucky because one of her friends, this guy she knew [and was standing] behind him [the assailant], hit him. Anything could have happened."

In any event, experiences like these may well have negative implications for the sense of safety and the quality of life of the person affected. Other acts of street violence experienced by women include robbery (3.7%; $N=8$), attempted robbery (3.2%; $N=7$), and

⁵⁰ Incidence rates of harassment of female QNLS respondents were first discussed by DeKeseredy et al. (1999).

threatened assault by a stranger with a weapon (3.2%; $N=7$). Statistically significant correlates of street violence include all other types of victimization except sexual intimate violence, with the strongest relationship displayed by harassment ($r = .326$; $p < .01$). This shows that female victims of street violence are also likely to have experienced victimization by several other types of crimes, both in public and behind closed doors. Further significant associations exist between street violence and the perception that crime is a problem in the neighbourhood (crime; $r = .192$) and collective efficacy ($r = -.268$) ($p < .01$ for both variables; see Appendix C). The direction of these relationships is little surprising, although causality cannot be determined.

Female QNLS respondents experience harassment in public places more frequently than street violence. 26.5% ($N=58$) were subject to at least one of the behaviours displayed in Table 8 below, with sexual remarks (21.2%; $N=43$) and sexual touching (12.9%; $N=26$) being acts most commonly experienced. These findings indicate, as DeKeseredy et al. (1999: 509-510) note, that “public space is not ‘democratic.’ It is decidedly gendered, to the extent that women’s social behaviour in public places is closely regulated.... Harassment thus can be seen as one such mechanism of social control.” The following comments by two young female respondents sadly illustrate that women normalize being subjected to various forms of sexual harassment. The first comment is from the 19-year old respondent mentioned above, the second comment is from an 18-year old Somalian-born woman:

It was a sexual favour [he asked for]. That sounds much better than saying something else. This happens to me a lot. ... It happens, so I just view it as not a big deal. ... Well, sometimes I just take things in a joking way. ... I’m just like ‘Oh, you’re just joking,’ and I walk away.

Well, you get the guys who say some comment but I wouldn't call that sexual harassment. It's their awkward way of flirting or compliments, it's a sick sense of that.

Statistically significant correlates of harassment are street violence (discussed above) and all types of "private" crimes (see Appendix C), showing that female victims of harassment are also likely to have been victimized by all other types of "public" and "private" crimes examined. While all correlations are significant at the .01 level, the positive relations are strongest between harassment and physical intimate violence ($r = .400$), street violence ($r = .326$), and psychological partner abuse ($r = .323$). A further positive and significant relationship exists between harassment and having at least part-time employment (employed; $.181$; $p < .05$). This association was also found by DeKeseredy et al. (1999: 509), who note "women who work in the paid marketplace are slightly more likely to experience harassment than those who are retired or not working for money." Negative significant associations with harassment include age ($r = -.227$), pointing to the likelihood of women being harassed to decrease as they get older, and collective efficacy ($r = -.220$) ($p < .01$ for both variables).

Table 7:
Incidence of “Public” Crimes Against Women: Street Violence

	Incidence Rates			
	YES		NO	
Street Violence (8 items)	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
In the last 12 months, ...				
Did anyone rob you by a stick up, mugging, or threatening to hurt you	8	3.7%	211	96.3%
Did anyone try to rob you by a stick up, ...	7	3.2%	212	96.8%
Did a stranger beat you up, attack you or hit you with something	4	1.8%	215	98.2%
Did someone you know beat you up, attack ...	16	7.3%	203	92.7%
Did a stranger knife you, shoot at you or attack you with a weapon	3	1.4%	216	98.6%
Did someone you know knife you ...	3	1.4%	216	98.6%
Did a stranger threaten to knife you ...	7	3.2%	212	96.8%
Did someone you know threaten to knife you ...	12	5.5%	207	94.5%
<i>At least one of the above</i>	33	15.1%	186	84.9%

Table 8:
Incidence of “Public” Crimes Against Women: Harassment

	Incidence Rates			
	YES		NO	
Harassment (4 items)	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
In the last 12 months, did anyone on the street, in a bar or other public place ever ...				
Insult you because they thought you were homosexual	4	2.0%	199	98.0%
Insult you because they did not like your skin colour or religion	19	9.3%	185	90.7%
Touch you sexually when you did not want to be touched (your breasts, rear end or genitals)	26	12.9%	176	87.1%
Make sexual remarks about you or to you that made you feel uncomfortable	43	21.2%	160	78.8%
<i>At least one of the above</i>	58	26.5%	161	73.5%

Cross-tabular analyses were conducted to examine the relationships between female respondents' perceived collective efficacy and their victimization by the “public” crimes street violence and harassment. Table 9 below shows that 60.2% ($N=112$) of women not victimized by street violence reported high perceptions of collective efficacy.

In contrast, among victims of street violence, only 27.3% ($N=6$) perceived collective efficacy to be high. These differences are statistically significant and a gamma value of $-.603$ points to a strong negative relationship between high perceptions of collective efficacy and victimization by street violence.

Table 9:
Collective Efficacy and Street Violence

	Low		High		Total	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
No Victimization	74	39.8%	112	60.2%	186	100.0%
Victimization	24	72.7%	9	27.3%	33	100.0%
Total	98	44.7%	121	55.3%	219	100.0%

Chi Sq. = 12.302 df=1 One-sided sig. = .000 $g = -.603$

Table 10 below displays the relationship between women's perceptions of collective efficacy and victimization by harassment. 64.0% ($N=103$) of women not harassed reported high perceptions of collective efficacy. Conversely, of those harassed, only 31.0% ($N=18$) perceived collective efficacy to be high. With a gamma value of $-.596$, the significant negative relationship between high collective efficacy and the harassment of female QNLS respondents is about as strong as with street violence.

Table 10:
Collective Efficacy and Harassment

	Low		High		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Victimization	58	36.0%	103	64.0%	161	100.0%
Victimization	40	69.0%	18	31.0%	58	100.0%
Total	98	44.7%	121	55.3%	219	100.0%

Chi Sq. = 18.713 df=1 One-sided sig. = .000 g = -.596

To assess the relationship between collective efficacy and victimization of female QNLS participants by “public” crimes, logistic regression analyses were conducted. Table 11 displays the correlates of the “public” crimes against women, street violence and harassment. Estimates of coefficients in Models 1 control for age, the perception that crime, disorder, or drugs are a problem in the neighbourhood, education, two different types of marital status (married or cohabiting and separated or divorced), and membership in a severely distressed household. Models 2 additionally control for collective efficacy.

When the independent variables mentioned above are regressed on street violence as the dependent variable, the only statistically significant variable in Models 1 and 2 is crime perception. The positive coefficient shows that when a woman perceives crime to be a problem in her neighbourhood, her logged odds of becoming a victim of street violence

are increased. Without collective efficacy in the model, her logged odds of being victimized are increased by 1.95, while they are increased by 2.1 with collective efficacy in the Model (Model 2). Although the logged odds for being victimized are slightly higher in Model 2, the difference is minimal and not statistically significant. The addition of collective efficacy to the model does not only increase Model 2's level of statistical significance (Model 1: $p < .05$; Model 2: $p < .01$), but also helps Model 2 to account for more of the variation in women's victimization of street violence (27.4% compared to 19.9%). More importantly, a one-unit increase in collective efficacy lowers the logged odds of being victimized by street violence by 2.22 ($p < .01$). In other words, the higher a female respondent's perceptions of collective efficacy were, the less likely she was to have experienced street crime. Again, this relationship may simply be the result of victims perceiving collective efficacy to be low following their victimization.

A logistic regression analysis of the correlates of harassment of women results in similar findings. When collective efficacy is added to the regression model, it lowers the logged odds of women being harassed (by 1.78; $p < .01$). Further, Model 2 accounts for more of the variation in female respondents' harassment (25.2%) than does Model 1 (19.8%). In this analysis, age is the only significant independent variable in both models ($p < .01$), indicating that with every year a female gets older, the logged odds of experiencing harassment are lowered by .051 when collective efficacy is held constant (Model 1) and by .056 when it is not (Model 2). Thus, the older a respondent, the less likely she was to have been harassed. Further, the higher a female respondent perceived collective efficacy to be, the less likely she was to have been harassed. Again, this relationship may simply be the result of victims perceiving collective efficacy to be low

following their victimization. While the difference is not significant, collective efficacy mediated the effect age had on the likelihood of being harassed.

All three types of analyses – correlational, cross-tabular, and logistic regression – show that the associations between membership in a severely distressed household and victimization by both types of “public” crimes is minimal and not statistically significant.⁵¹ The analyses presented above show that collective efficacy has negative associations with victimization by both types of “public” crimes against women. When comparing the relationships between collective efficacy and victimization by both types of “public” crimes, the negative relationship is stronger with street violence than with harassment.

⁵¹ Thus, cross-tabulations are not displayed at all, whereas zero-order correlations between severely distressed and other variables are included in Appendix C.

Table 11:
Correlates of “Public” Crimes Against Women

Variables	<i>Logit Coefficients</i>			
	(S. E.)			
	Street Violence		Harassment	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Age	-.001 (.019)	-.003 (.019)	-.051** (.019)	-.056** (.019)
Crime Perception	1.948* (.774)	2.080* (.820)	.135 (.517)	.168 (.529)
Disorder Perception	-.798 (.738)	-1.489 (.810)	1.146 (.598)	.679 (.624)
Drugs Perception	.214 (.608)	.154 (.640)	-.235 (.443)	-.315 (.451)
Years of Education	.043 (.085)	.021 (.089)	.084 (.069)	.065 (.071)
Employed (yes=1)	.397 (.593)	.189 (.609)	.464 (.473)	.360 (.482)

Table 11 (Continued):
Correlates of “Public” Crimes Against Women

Variables	Logit Coefficients			
	(S. E.)			
	Street Violence		Harassment	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Married/Cohabiting	-.307	-.207	-.531	-.457
(yes=1)	(.641)	(.666)	(.479)	(.490)
Separated/Divorced	.946	.695	.309	.097
(yes=1)	(.547)	(.575)	(.468)	(.491)
Severely Distressed	.040	-.376	.278	-.039
Household (yes=1)	(.577)	(.621)	(.457)	(.483)
Collective Efficacy	-	-2.216**	-	-1.778**
		(.808)		(.665)
Constant	-5.470**	-.936	-2.285	1.538
	(2.000)	(2.548)	(.473)	(2.111)
2-Log Likelihood	123.543	115.057	169.791	162.078
Nagelkerke R ²	.199	.274	.198	.252

* p < .05. ** p < .01.

6.5 “Private” Crimes Against Women

“Private” crimes are crimes occurring between intimate partners and mostly behind closed doors. At times, this means that people who overhear it happen, believe that this is where it should remain: behind closed doors as it is a couple’s private matter. Because public housing estates are densely populated areas, occurrences of “domestics” are often known to people not belonging to these households. The “private” crimes against women examined here include psychological abuse, as well as physical and sexual violence by intimate partners. Recall that QNLS data do not include information on the gender of the perpetrator. Thus, victimization can have occurred in a heterosexual or homosexual relationship.

A comparison of incidence rates of various types of woman abuse as measured by a modified version of the CTS-2 shows that psychological abuse, considered by many as ‘minor,’ is the type of intimate abuse most commonly experienced by female QNLS respondents. Slightly over one-third of respondents (34.7%, $N=76$) had been subjected to at least one of the six forms of psychological abuse displayed in Table 12. Being yelled at (37.8%; $N=68$) and being insulted or sworn at (27.9%; $N=50$) lead the list.

While the analysis is not concerned with psychological partner abuse in itself, it is an important issue to discuss as many women consider it worse than physical abuse (e.g., Schwartz 2000). Further, much physical intimate violence is preceded and/or accompanied by psychological abuse. Correlational analyses (see Appendix C) point to strong and significant positive associations between psychological abuse and physical intimate violence ($r = .588$; $p < .01$) and sexual intimate violence ($r = .326$; $p < .01$), respectively. Further, psychological partner abuse is also positively and significantly associated with

experiences of harassment ($r = .323$; $p < .01$) and street violence ($r = .202$; $p < .01$).

Regarding respondents' sociodemographic characteristics, the following have significant positive associations with psychological partner abuse: part- or full-time employment ($r = .215$; $p < .01$), married or cohabiting ($r = .197$; $p < .01$), and level of education ($r = .144$; $p < .05$). Conversely, significant negative associations can be observed between psychological partner abuse and being a recent immigrant ($r = -.180$; $p < .05$), visible minority ($r = -.173$; $p < .05$), widowed ($r = -.172$; $p < .05$), and age ($r = -.141$; $p < .05$).

In contrast to psychological abuse, there is less disagreement on physical violent contact being an appropriate indicator of intimate violence. 15.5% of women ($N=34$) reported to have experienced at least one of the twelve behaviours described in Table 13 at the hands of their intimate partners. The list is led in order of frequency by being burned or scalded on purpose (18.3%; $N=40$), being grabbed (14.4%; $N=26$), and being pushed or shoved (13.9%; $N=25$). The experience of physical intimate violence has positive and significant associations with sexual intimate violence ($r = .300$; $p < .01$), as well as experiences of harassment ($r = .400$; $p < .01$) and street violence ($r = .242$; $p < .01$). Sociodemographic characteristics of women negatively and significantly associated with physical intimate violence are visible minority ($r = -.192$; $p < .01$) and recent immigrant ($r = -.151$; $p < .05$).

When it comes to sexual intimate violence, 7.8% of women ($N=17$) reported having been subjected to at least one of the three behaviours described in Table 14 by their intimate partners. It was most common for women to have their partner insist on having sex with them when they did not want to (9.4%; $N=17$). The experience of sexual intimate violence is positively and significantly associated with women having part- or full-time

employment ($r = .145$; $p < .05$) and, as discussed above, with all other types of “public” and “private” crimes except street violence. Further, unlike any other types of crimes against women, sexual intimate violence is the only crime lacking a statistically significant negative association with collective efficacy.

As explained in the previous chapter, for the purpose of conducting more meaningful statistical analyses, categories were created to encompass more than one of the three types of woman abuse by intimate partners, thereby increasing incidence rates. “Intimate abuse” refers to respondents who were subjected to at least one type of verbal partner abuse, physical intimate violence, or sexual intimate violence. “Intimate violence” refers to acts experienced by women that exclude violent/non-physical acts, and thus the category includes women who experienced at least one type of either physical intimate violence or sexual intimate violence. Table 14 displays the results of the collapsed categories, showing that 35.6% of female QNLS respondents ($N=78$) experienced intimate abuse and 19.2% ($N=42$) had been victims of intimate violence.

Positive and significant associations exist between intimate abuse and part- or full-time employment ($r = .215$; $p < .01$), married or cohabiting ($r = .185$; $p < .01$) and education ($r = .144$; $p < .05$), whereas significant negative associations exist with recent immigrant ($r = -.186$; $p < .01$), visible minority ($r = -.184$; $p < .01$), and widowed ($r = -.177$; $p < .01$). Intimate violence has a significant positive association with part- or full-time employment ($r = .180$; $p < .05$), while significant negative associations exist with visible minority ($r = -.186$; $p < .01$) and recent immigrant ($r = -.169$; $p < .05$).

In short, the analysis presented so far shows that being married or cohabiting, education and employment have positive associations and being a recent immigrant and

visible minority have negative associations with “private” crimes against women. The negative associations between victimization and recent immigrants and visible minorities were not expected and stand in contrast to other studies. For example, some researchers argue that woman abuse is more prevalent in particular ethnic groups (e.g., Erez 2000; Lucashenko 1996; Websdale 2001; Yoshihama 1999). This should be examined further to determine whether the findings of this study are merely results of the unique QNLS sample, higher rates of underreporting among these groups of women, or whether they reflect a reality distinct from what other studies found.

When people are aware of woman abuse in a neighbour’s household, there are a number of factors determining whether they will do something about it. How seriously do neighbours take the issue? Do they consider it an issue that is everybody’s or none of their business (i.e., do they define the absence of woman abuse part of the common good)? What are their experiences and perceptions of the effectiveness of bringing it out in the open? The following exchange between an interviewer (I) and a female respondent (R) illustrates this:

I: If a couple is not getting along do you find that all the neighbours seem to know?

R: Oh yeah. They do know. They seem to know everybody’s business. It seems to go right around like wildfire. And there’s no way that something really awful were happening that no one would know.”

I: Do you think that since people know that this [domestic violence, child abuse and neglect] is going on, people do something about it?

R: Well, sometimes people call Children’s Aid [Society] and, uhm, but people are really scared about doing that because they have a big sort of paranoid feeling about the Children’s Aid. Some don’t really wanna do that. And then, too, if it’s [the parent] your friend, it’s hard to do that even though you know something bad is happening. ... There was one case where I did

call [Children's Aid] and really not much happened. So I thought, well, I went through all that agony and then, what happened? [Nothing!]

When asked about her perceptions of violence in families living in West Town public housing, a 56-year old female who was involved in a great number of community activities all over West Town, responded: "Well, it would probably be just a few, really. It wouldn't be a large percentage. Maybe one or two in ten." While her estimate is close to the incidence rate discovered by the QNLS, the respondent's comment also shows that she does not consider a figure between 10 and 20% to be out of the ordinary.

Table 12:
Incidence of “Private” Crimes Against Women:
Psychological Abuse by Intimate Partners

	Incidence Rates			
	YES		NO	
Psychological Abuse (6 items)	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
In the last 12 months, did your partner ...				
Yell at you	68	37.8%	112	62.2%
Insult or swear at you	50	27.9%	129	72.1%
Accuse you of being a lousy lover	8	4.5%	170	95.5%
Call you fat and ugly	14	7.9%	164	92.1%
Destroy something that belongs to you	17	9.6%	160	90.4%
Threaten to hit or throw something at you	19	10.7%	159	89.3%
<i>At least one of the above</i>	76	34.7%	143	65.3%

Table 13:
Incidence of “Private” Crimes Against Women:
Physical Violence by Intimate Partners

	Incidence Rates			
	YES		NO	
Physical Violence (12 items)	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
In the last 12 months, did your partner ...				
Grab you	26	14.4%	154	85.6%
Push or shove you	25	13.9%	155	86.1%
Throw something at you that could hurt	6	3.4%	173	96.6%
Slap you	11	6.2%	167	93.8%
Twist your arm or pull your hair	10	5.6%	170	94.4%
Kick you	7	3.9%	172	96.1%
Punch or hit you with something that could hurt	5	2.8%	174	97.2%
Slam you against a wall	8	4.5%	170	95.5%
Choke you	4	2.2%	175	97.8%
Burn or scald you on purpose	40	18.3%	179	81.7%
Beat you up	6	3.4%	172	96.6%
Use a knife or a gun on you	1	0.6%	177	99.4%
<i>At least one of the above</i>	34	15.5%	185	84.5%

Table 14:
Incidence of “Private” Crimes Against Women:
Sexual Violence by Intimate Partners,
Intimate Abuse, and Intimate Violence

	Incidence Rates			
	YES		NO	
Sexual Violence (3 items)	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
In the last 12 months, did your partner ...				
Threaten you with physical force to make you have sex	2	1.1%	178	98.9%
Use physical force to make you have sex	2	1.1%	177	98.9%
Insist on having sex when you didn't want to (but did not use physical force)	17	9.4%	163	90.6%
<i>At least one of the above</i>	17	7.8%	202	92.2%
Intimate Abuse (Psychological Abuse, Physical or Sexual Violence)	78	35.6%	141	64.4%
Intimate Violence (Physical or Sexual Violence)	42	19.2%	177	80.8%

Cross-tabular analyses were conducted to examine the association between female QNLS respondents' perceived collective efficacy and their victimization by the "private" crimes intimate abuse and intimate violence. Table 15 below displays the relationship between women's perceived collective efficacy and intimate abuse. 62.5% (N=88) of women not having experienced intimate abuse reported high perceptions of collective efficacy. In contrast, among female victims of intimate abuse, 42.3% (N=33) perceived collective efficacy to be high. The relationship between the variables is significant and the gamma value of -.387 points to a quite strong relationship between high perceptions of collective efficacy and not having experienced intimate abuse.

Table 15:
Collective Efficacy and Intimate Abuse

	Low		High		Total	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
No Victimization	53	37.6%	88	62.5%	141	100.0%
Victimization	45	57.7%	33	42.3%	78	100.0%
Total	98	44.7%	121	55.3%	219	100.0%

Chi Sq. = 8.209

df=1

One-sided sig. = .003

g = -.387 .

Table 16 below displays the relationship between women's perceived collective efficacy and intimate violence. 59.6% ($N=106$) of women not having experienced intimate violence reported high perceptions of collective efficacy. Conversely, among female victims of intimate violence, just over one third (35.7%; $N=15$) perceived collective efficacy to be high. The relationship between the variables is significant and the gamma value of $-.458$ points to a strong relationship between high perceptions of collective efficacy and intimate violence. The results of the cross-tabular analyses presented here show that the associations between high perceptions of collective efficacy and "public" crimes as well as "private" crimes against women are all negative and statistically significant ($p < .01$), with the strongest negative associations existing with harassment, street violence, intimate violence, and intimate abuse (in order of strength of association).

Table 16:
Collective Efficacy and Intimate Violence

	Low		High		Total	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
No Victimization	71	40.1%	106	59.6%	177	100.0%
Victimization	27	64.3%	15	35.7%	42	100.0%
Total	98	44.7%	121	55.3%	219	100.0%

Chi Sq. = 8.022

df=1

One-sided sig. = .004

g = $-.458$

To assess the relationships between collective efficacy and the victimization of female QNLS respondents by “private” crimes, logistic regression analyses were conducted. Since logistic regression analyses with physical and sexual intimate violence as dependent variables did not produce any statistically significant models or variables, the collapsed categories were used as dependent variables. Table 17 below displays the correlates of the “private” crimes of intimate abuse and intimate violence against women. As in the previous section, estimates of coefficients in Models 1 control for age, the perception that crime, disorder, or drugs are a problem in the neighbourhood, education, two different types of marital status (married or cohabiting and separated or divorced), and membership in a severely distressed household. Models 2 additionally control for collective efficacy.

When the independent variables are regressed on intimate abuse as the dependent variable, the only statistically significant variable is married/cohabiting. While having part- or full-time employment (employed) is significant in Model 1 ($p < .05$), the variable fails to reach significance when collective efficacy is added to the model (Model 2), albeit by a small margin ($\text{sig.} = .054$). The two positive coefficients indicate that the logged odds of becoming a victim of intimate abuse are increased for a woman with part- or full-time employment by .93 and for a married or cohabiting woman by 1.06 (Model 1).

Although the addition of collective efficacy to the model (Model 2) increases a married or cohabiting woman’s logged odds of experiencing intimate abuse slightly (to 1.14) and decreases them for women with at least part-time employment (to .87, not statistically significant), these differences are once again minimal and not statistically significant. The model containing collective efficacy (Model 2) reaches a higher level of

statistical significance (Model 1: $p < .05$; Model 2: $p < .01$) and accounts for more of the variation in the intimate abuse of women (19.4% compared to 16.1%). Further, a one-unit increase in a woman's perception of collective efficacy lowers the logged odds of her becoming a victim of intimate abuse by 1.32 ($p < .01$), indicating that the higher a woman's perception of collective efficacy is, the less likely she is to have experienced intimate abuse. Once more, this relationship may simply be the result of victims perceiving collective efficacy to be low following their victimization.

Similar to above, a logistic regression analysis of the correlates of intimate violence produced married/cohabiting as the only statistically significant variable in both models. Likewise, while employed is significant in Model 1 ($p < .05$), the variable fails to reach significance in Model 2 (again by a small margin; $\text{sig.} = .055$) and separated/divorced also fails to reach significance in Model 2. The three positive coefficients in Model 1 indicate that the logged odds of becoming a victim of intimate abuse are increased for a woman with part- or full-time employment by 1.13 ($p < .05$), for a married or cohabiting woman by 1.26 ($p < .05$), and for a separate or divorced woman by 1.18 ($p < .05$). Again, although the addition of collective efficacy to the model (Model 2) increases a married or cohabiting woman's logged odds of experiencing intimate abuse slightly (to 1.44; $p < .01$), this difference is minimal and not statistically significant.

While Model 1 is not statistically significant, the model containing collective efficacy (Model 2) is ($p < .05$). Model 2 also accounts for more of the variation in intimate violence (21.1% compared to 15.6%). Further, a one-unit increase in a woman's perception of collective efficacy lowers the logged odds of her becoming a victim of intimate violence by 1.82 ($p < .05$). Analogous to "public" crimes, all three types of

analyses – correlational, cross-tabular, and logistic regression – show that the associations between severely distressed and victimization by “private” crimes is minimal and not significant.⁵²

⁵² See previous footnote.

Table 17:
Correlates of “Private” Crimes Against Women

Variables	L o g i t C o e f f i c i e n t s			
	(S . E .)			
	Intimate Abuse		Intimate Violence	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Age	-.013 (.014)	-.013 (.015)	-.016 (.019)	-.018 (.020)
Crime Perception	.379 (.478)	.416 (.491)	.680 (.597)	.725 (.625)
Disorder Perception	.405 (.540)	.028 (.571)	-.025 (.662)	-.587 (.713)
Drugs Perception	-.334 (.434)	-.411 (.441)	-.367 (.499)	-.481 (.515)
Years of Education	.045 (.062)	.031 (.064)	-.008 (.077)	-.025 (.080)
Employed (yes=1)	.928* (.443)	.867 (.450)	1.134* (.541)	1.056 (.551)

Table 17 (Continued):
Correlates of "Private Crimes Against Women"

Variables	Logit Coefficients			
	(S. E.)			
	Intimate Abuse		Intimate Violence	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Married/Cohabiting	1.055*	1.136**	1.261*	1.442**
(yes=1)	(.433)	(.443)	(.532)	(.555)
Separated/Divorced	.071	-.124	1.175*	.973
(yes=1)	(.444)	(.461)	(.544)	(.563)
Severely Distressed	.424	.198	.739	.464
Household (yes=1)	(.426)	(.442)	(.528)	(.549)
Collective Efficacy	-	-1.315*	-	-1.822*
		(.601)		(.738)
Constant	-2.052	.744	-2.653	1.268
	(1.431)	(1.941)	(1.749)	(2.368)
2-Log Likelihood	191.010	185.706	144.077	137.458
Nagelkerke R ²	.161	.194	.156	.211

* p < .05. ** p < .01.

6.6 Summary

The analyses presented above support, in part, what many researchers, community activists, and feminists have long argued, namely that community anti-crime programs do little, if anything, to reduce violence against women in intimate relationships (e.g., Block and Skogan 2001). QNLS data presented here show that the relationship between collective efficacy and “public” crimes against women is stronger and more significant than with “private” crimes against women. While the results do not quite support Block and Skogan’s (2001) assertion that collective efficacy makes no difference for woman abuse in intimate relationships, these results partly support Morenoff, Sampson, and Raudenbush’s (2001: 520) claim that collective efficacy may “extend beyond street-level or public encounters ... to the case of partner violence ‘inside the home.’”⁵³ The question is to what extent does collective efficacy apply to both contexts, i.e., “public” and “private” crimes against women? Unfortunately, data available to date do not allow for a definite answer.

It seems as if the further the type of victimization is removed from the public and the deeper it gets into the private realm, the less effective collective efficacy is. While the results presented here confirm those of other researchers regarding the negative association between collective efficacy and “public” crimes (Sampson et al. 1997), they are less clear when it comes to collective efficacy’s relationship with victimization in intimate relationships, especially more serious intimate violence like sexual assault. Recall that the relationships between collective efficacy and the separate categories of physical and sexual intimate violence lacked statistical significance and had to be combined to allow for

⁵³ Morenoff et al. (2001) refer to an earlier draft of Browning (2002).

meaningful analysis. Potential reasons for the lack of significance need to be explored further and will be addressed in the next chapter.

Results indicate that the factors positively associated with collective efficacy are organizational participation, involvement with neighbours, and being single. Conversely, the factors negatively associated with collective efficacy are respondents' perceptions that disorder, crime, and drugs are problems in their neighbourhood, being in a dating relationship, and being separated or divorced. Further, unlike hypothesized, women living in severely distressed households are neither experiencing lower levels of collective efficacy, nor are they more like to be victimized by "public" or "private" crimes than other women. The differences were minimal and not statistically significant.

CHAPTER SEVEN

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter provides a summary of the research findings presented in the preceding chapters and proposes policies and new directions for future research. Additionally, methodological and theoretical issues will be considered, aiming to help improve future research on collective efficacy and crimes against women, especially “private” crimes.

7.1 Overview

Very little research has been conducted on informal community-based social controls and crime in urban areas of concentrated disadvantage. This study attempted to address this situation by examining collective efficacy and “public” crimes (street crimes and harassment) and “private” crimes (domestic violence) against women in public housing. It identified some gaps in the research on urban areas of concentrated disadvantage, emphasizing public housing neighbourhoods, and crime.

The study attempted to fill some of these gaps by using data from the West Town Study (WTS), a local victimization survey conducted in several public housing neighbourhoods located in a western section of an urban area in eastern Ontario. The WTS consisted of qualitative and quantitative components, the Quality of Neighbourhood Life Survey (QNLS) and used broader definitions of crime, to examine criminal and non-criminal victimization of female public housing residents. One of the most important aspects of this study was to make gender a central component of research on collective

efficacy and crime.

Findings indicate that there is a concentration of the urban poor in West Town, that this concentration of urban disadvantage had been planned, that recent immigrants and visible minorities make up a substantial portion of the “truly disenfranchised” in this area, and that the concentration of urban disadvantage has increased in West Town over the past ten to fifteen years. These changes occurred despite the fact that the city has experienced unprecedented growth and economic prosperity. The increase in the concentration of urban disadvantage at a time of local economic growth shows that not everyone benefits equally from the economic success of a region and that a “trickle-down effect” of prosperity does not always occur.

Chapter Six examined factors associated with collective efficacy and the associations between perceived collective efficacy and the victimization of women by “public” and “private” crimes. While the associations between collective efficacy and both types of crimes were negative, correlational, cross-tabular, and logistic regression analyses indicated that these associations were much stronger and displayed higher levels of statistical significance when it came to “public” crimes. This may partly be the result of measurement issues. Nevertheless, the good news is that a negative association between collective efficacy and “private” crimes was found, indicating that social policies based on an understanding of a modified concept of collective efficacy have the potential to reduce woman abuse. The sections below discuss this in more detail, as well as explore some policy implications of this research.

7.2 Methodological and Theoretical Considerations

Despite the above contributions, several empirical and theoretical considerations need to be raised. Most importantly, causal effects cannot be determined. In other words, it cannot be argued that low collective efficacy leads to victimization, as the former might be a consequence of the latter. To allow for some assessment of causality, the survey should have asked about the time of the victimization, if it affected respondents' sense of safety, perception of collective efficacy, etc. Accordingly, conclusions can only be drawn regarding positive or negative and statistically significant or insignificant associations between variables. This is a major limitation when the task is to find ways to reduce victimization. Also, despite attempts made to address underreporting, victimization rates discussed here should be considered underestimates, as DeKeseredy et al. (1999) have pointed out.

Further, since the QNLS sample is not representative, it is impossible to generalize the findings to the larger public housing population. Likewise, the small sample size did not allow for comparisons between different public housing estates. This is unfortunate as qualitative data from the WTS suggest that there are important differences in how apartment building and townhouse residents experience neighbourhood life. Further, this study was also unable to examine ethnic differences in victimization, although it showed that, with the exception of sexual intimate violence, visible minority women were less likely to report domestic violence. It is unfortunate that this could not be examined since some research shows there is ethnic variation in experiencing woman abuse and disclosing it (e.g., Websdale 2001; Weis 2001). Another limitation refers to the exclusion of male respondents in the data set examined as the focus was on the victimization of women.

Nevertheless, men's perceptions of how neighbours might react to their behaviour may well influence their actions. Thus, future research should be aimed at obtaining larger and representative samples so the above issues can be examined.

Another important empirical consideration pertains to the measurement of collective efficacy. As currently used, it only measures the willingness to intervene in "public" behaviours, but not those occurring behind closed doors, leading Block and Skogan (2001: 104) to ponder if "the usual measures of collective efficacy ... are not appropriate for violence against women" which, as they point out, could explain why they found collective efficacy to make no difference. This, of course, could also question some of the findings presented here.

Browning (2002) addresses the above issue by adding a measure of "norms of non-intervention in intimate conflict" in his study of collective efficacy and domestic violence. When examining the association between norms of non-intervention and collective efficacy, he found that collective efficacy exerts a more regulatory effect in neighbourhoods where the tolerance of violence against women is low. Similarly, measures of male peer support could be added to the instrument as much research has pointed to the importance of male peers in creating a social environment that tolerates and encourages the abuse of female intimates (e.g., DeKeseredy 1988; Schwartz and DeKeseredy 1997).

Also, St. Jean (1998) notes that collective efficacy can have very different meanings. Just like DeKeseredy (1988), who found that social support does not always have positive consequences but can encourage men to abuse their female intimates, St. Jean (1998) found that definitions of "the common good" vary according to the situation,

context, and the people involved. Whereas neighbours might help each other in times of crises, at other times, they might engage in behaviour that harms other residents. For example, they might not report a crime or refuse to cooperate with police if the investigation is directed at someone they want to protect (see also Venkatesh 1997a). Further, Alvi et al.'s (2001: 648) observation that "local drug dealers are known to residents in almost all of the public housing neighborhoods in West Town" did not lead to residents mobilizing to rid their communities of drugs. Thus, collective efficacy can also mean for residents to tolerate the behaviour of abusive men.

There is often disagreement over what is "the common good" and what kind of behaviours should be tolerated or encouraged and which ones should not. In a group of men with strong patriarchal beliefs it is imaginable, then, that collective efficacy could lead to woman abuse, rather than reducing it. The same goes for involvement with neighbours and organizational participation as not only the frequency of interaction matters but also the type of activities and kinds of people involved. Consider people getting together to plan a community event for families, on the one hand, and men getting together to get drunk or high while watching sports, on the other. While both activities might lead to collective efficacy, the "substance" of collective efficacy is considerably different. Similarly, attempts should be made to develop an instrument that can capture the origins and interests involved in the process of defining the "common good."

Since collective efficacy is context-specific, the usefulness of the items making up the scale should also be reevaluated. Few researchers (e.g., Piquero 1999) have considered the validity of measures used in neighbourhood crime research. Take informal social control, for example. The current measure includes questions regarding children skipping

school, hanging out at the street corner, spray-painting graffiti on local buildings, etc.

Thus, the more often a respondent answers that it would be unlikely for another neighbours to intervene, the lower his/her score on the informal social control scale will be. Recently, efforts have been undertaken to improve measures of social and human capital (Aizlewood 2000; Canada Policy Research Directorate 2001; Jenson 1998; Putnam 2001; Strategic Research and Analysis and the Social Cohesion Network 2001; Woolcock 2001). Future research should examine if these modifications resulted in more appropriate measures. Researchers should also consider revising the collective efficacy measure.

Given the many challenges faced by residents of urban areas of concentrated disadvantage, they might not have the luxury to worry much about behaviours described above. However, they need to worry about the lack of resources, infra-structural support, and social networks to “mainstream society” (e.g., to assist finding employment) in their neighbourhoods, as well as social isolation and the threat of victimization for themselves and their children (Fernandez and Harris 1992; Furstenberg 1993; Kaljee et al. 1995; Rainwater 1966; Reingold 1999; Wilson 1996). The particular design of public housing estates, with a dominance of aesthetically unappealing high rises and townhouses might make it hard for many residents to care about the neighbourhood. Consequently, this might even lead to an increase in crime there (e.g., Gillis and Hagan 1979; Sampson 1990).

Further, attempts should be made to replace subjective (perceived) with objective measures (Piquero 1999) as there is an important difference between what people *think* and what they actually *do*. In the collective efficacy context, the following wording is currently used: “*Could* you count on your neighbours *if* ...” which is the preamble to the items measuring informal social control. In contrast, an objective measure would start

with “*Can you or could you count on your neighbours when*” Based on objective measures, comparisons between neighbourhoods would also make more sense, as it would preclude researchers from comparing apples with oranges. The need to generate better measures is emphasized by both Bandura (1982) and Sampson (2000), who sums it up as follows:

What is needed is a concerted effort to enhance the science of ecological assessment (“ecometrics”) by developing systematic procedures for directly measuring social mechanisms in community context, and by developing tools to improve the quality of community-level research (Raudenbush and Sampson 1999). I would argue that an important yet neglected econometric strategy is systematic social observation (Sampson and Raudenbush 1999). The ultimate goal would be to understand processes of change in the community as a social system, along with the role of individual social actions in shaping collective properties. (Sampson 2000: 713)

Once these issues are addressed and implemented in future research, confidence in the validity of the results will increase.

7.3 Policy Implications

The findings of this study carry a number of implications for policy. The beginning of this millennium provides us with a unique chance to rethink public housing neighbourhoods as we have known them for so long, as many of these “projects” in Canada, and especially the U.S., have to be closed down or renovated at great expense (Popkin et al. 2000).

7.3.1 Creating the “Social Mix”

Now, opportunities for de-isolation and renewed desegregation efforts and what Dansereau et al. (1997) call the “social mix” exist. The social mix refers to the design and structure of a neighbourhood “to encompass a variety of housing tenures and price levels in order to offer a maximum possibility of choices to households of different socio-economic profiles (e.g., young families, seniors, one-person households, etc.) and financial means” (Dansereau et al. 1997: 2-3).

The advantages of such an arrangement are numerous. For one, the increased possibility of contact and interaction across class and ethnic lines can increase social interaction and lead to higher levels of social cohesion and trust, a precursor to informal social control and, thus, collective efficacy. Further, the widespread presence of employed residents would open up informal job networks to the unemployed (e.g., Wilson 1996). Additionally, the social isolation of poor residents would be reduced, as well-maintained and adequately funded institutions like schools and community centres would provide “functional” support to these communities. At present, most of these are desperately missing in urban areas of concentrated disadvantage (Fernandez and Harris 1992; LaFree 1998; Wilson 1996).

A welcome side effect would be that poor residents would no longer be discriminated against on the basis of their address, an experience shared by many residents from well-known “ghetto neighbourhoods.” Wilson (1996) has illustrated this phenomenon and the WTS research team came across it as well. For example, neighbourhood residents repeatedly noted that youths living in public housing would not use any of the bus stops located in close proximity to their homes but rather take a longer

walk so other passengers would not know immediately that they live “there.”

Replacing neighbourhood social disorganization and hopelessness with increased opportunities and institutional support can also lead to improved educational performance of poor residents living in the social mix. In fact, all of the improvements mentioned above have been found to be true in studies of people and places where such policies have been implemented (see Cook 1988; Curtis 1985; Kaufman and Rosenbaum 1992; Peterson, Krivo, and Harris 2000; Popkin, Rosenbaum, and Meaden 1993; Reingold 1999; Rosenbaum, Popkin, Kaufman, and Rusin 1991; Lavrakas 1985; and Sampson, Morenoff, and Earls 1999).

7.3.2 Confronting Crime in Public Housing, *Including Crimes Against Women*

While the connection between the particular design of public housing neighbourhoods and crime has long been recognized, it can be argued that this knowledge was put in practice the wrong way. Rather than radically modifying the concept of public housing neighbourhoods, the only things that were modified were particular design features of buildings or public housing neighbourhoods. In most cases, this led to increased formal social control of the poor living in public housing, e.g., through increased security patrols and cameras. This approach, developed in the early 1970s (Newman 1972), is still quite popular as evidenced by an extensive amount of research, much of which is supported by the U.S. National Institute of Justice.⁵⁴ Although some of these approaches might in fact lead to a reduction of crime in these locales, much of this can be

⁵⁴ See, for example, Cisneros (1995), Feins, Epstein, and Widom (1997), Rosenbaum (1988), Rosenbaum, Lurigio, and Davis (1998), Merry (1981), Taylor (1998), and Taylor and Harrell (1996).

attributed to the displacement of crime, meaning it simply happens elsewhere. Not surprisingly and understandably, this might be all the same to many residents of neighbourhoods plagued with crime, as all they want is that crime “stays away.”

Just like research on crime in urban areas of concentrated disadvantage tends to focus on street crimes at the expense of violence against women (see Popkin et al. 1995, 1999, and 2000; Rosenbaum 1988; Rosenbaum et al. 1998; Rouse and Rubenstein 1978), these anti-crime measures in public housing are rarely directed at woman abuse. This, however, does not mean that the situation of the poor, especially abused women, is unaffected by them. The recent “one strike and you’re out” initiative, directed at removing gangs, drug dealers, and violent criminals from public housing, has been detrimental to poor abused women. For example, Renzetti (2001) demonstrates how this policy makes it more difficult for these women to leave their abusers as it puts them at risk of losing their subsidized residence because of the abuser’s behaviour (see also J. Smith 1999). Whether or not this leads to even more abuse, as perpetrators can be relatively confident that their partners have few options available, is an empirical question that can only be answered empirically. Still, it is clear that such an approach is of little help in reducing violence against women in intimate relationships. Fortunately, this policy might not be in place much longer after several organizations have filed lawsuits, claiming it violates the U.S. Constitution in that it discriminates against poor women (e.g., Kauth-Karjala 2002).

7.3.3 Community-Building and Creating Woman Abuse-Free Environments

As noted out in the review of the literature, much research points to the effectiveness of informal community-based social controls in controlling and preventing

crime. The analysis presented here shows that this may also be the case in public housing neighbourhoods, which are characterized by concentrations of urban disadvantage.

Contrary to previous social disorganization research, neighbourhoods like this were thought to be unable to use collective efficacy to reduce crime. Although resources for community-building might be scarce in these neighbourhoods, it is essential to identify, mobilize, and use these resources and potentials of individuals for the purpose of community-building, which can be one of the most effective means of crime control (DeLeon-Granados 1999). It is only through the action and interaction of individuals, organizations, and social groups that they can be taken advantage of and used to identify elements of the “common good.”

How can community-building occur in neighbourhoods where resources are limited and the desire and potential to bring about change is hidden? Venkatesh (1997b) sheds some light on how this can be achieved. He emphasizes the cooperation of individuals, organizations, and social groups, which can strengthen community capacities and lead to day-to-day stability in poor neighbourhoods. The incentive to mobilize frequently comes from members of local church groups, social service coalitions, and non-state-affiliated community health centres, who feel that certain issues need to be problematized. In fact, churches are increasingly involved in (social) organization and crime-reduction efforts in urban areas of concentrated disadvantage in the U.S. by trying to get “at-risk” populations involved in “mainstream” activities like sports, regular school attendance and so on (see Klein 1997 and Leland 1998).

Other initiatives consist of getting neighbourhood residents together in “town hall” meetings where attempts are made to establish a consensus on what the local elements of

the common good are. Equally useful, and maybe more effective in involving residents, are traditional get-togethers, such as dances, BBQs, and sports events, which can be financially supported by organizations, local merchants, etc. Another way that community-building can occur is through resident involvement in organizations, especially tenants' associations, as well as structured and organized neighbourhood activities that are interesting, accessible, and known to public housing residents. This could make residents feel more empowered and "in charge" of their neighbourhood.

The presence and accessibility of local associations would also make organizational participation and getting together with other neighbourhood residents more likely. This is especially facilitated when a place is available in the neighbourhood that can be used for these purposes. In several, but not all West Town public housing neighbourhoods, an empty townhouse, the "family" or "community house" fulfilled that role. These houses were open during the days and, at times, during the evenings and were frequented by residents to meet others and chat, play games like cards, or get food and other supplies from the food bank.

A major challenge, of course, is not only to get more residents involved, but also the financing of the above activities in light of the shrinking of the social service sector. While volunteerism provides much of the person power, resources, especially financial, are needed as well. As the state retreats from providing these, contributions by foundations like Trillium in Ontario (which funds many of the activities of the West Town Health & Community Centre) and charitable organizations like the United Way are left to pick up

the slack.⁵⁵

However, as Block and Skogan (2001) and this study show, just because collective efficacy may reduce street or “public” crimes, this is not necessarily the case with woman abuse or “private” crimes. It has been argued that the nature or “substance” of collective efficacy differs considerably, depending on “public” or “private” crimes. Further, increasing collective efficacy is not enough, as it will not reduce “public” crimes against women significantly unless living in an environment free from such crimes is defined as part of the common good. Thus, attempts have to be made at neighbourhood and societal levels to change the culture towards one that is not conducive to, and tolerant of, woman abuse.

In addition to the importance of dealing with adults, it is equally important to teach children early on that woman and girl abuse is not accepted nor ignored. After all, attitudes we learn as children are not only often kept but also passed on and rarely questioned. Tomaszewski (1993) and Ollis and Tomaszewski (1993) point to the importance of integrating appropriate programming in the curriculum at schools so boys and girls are socialized into a culture free of gender-based violence. Projects like these can also be implemented at the neighbourhood level in youth organizations.

An important obstacle in this particular environment is unemployment. A number of researchers have pointed to the pressures disenfranchised men feel to exert their masculinity through the use of violence, including violence against their intimates, because of their lack of (meaningful) employment (Alvi et al. 2001; Bourgois 1995; DeKeseredy et

⁵⁵ Coincidentally, or not, the provincial Government of Ontario uses the continuing of services provided to the poor – albeit by different providers – as an example of the benefits of less government and more individual responsibility by citizens.

al. 1999; Wilson 1996). While street violence might be reduced through the measures discussed above, it is questionable that this can be achieved regarding woman abuse, without improving the employment situation of the urban poor.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:

QUALITY OF NEIGHBOURHOOD LIFE SURVEY (QNLS)

QUALITY OF NEIGHBOURHOOD LIFE SURVEY

- This is a survey on the quality of life in your neighbourhood. It is being conducted by Professors Walter DeKeseredy and Shahid Alvi. We are very interested in your feelings about your neighbourhood, your relations with other people living in your neighbourhood, your work and social experiences. We think you will find this survey interesting.
- We would like **you OR one person** in your house or apartment to complete this survey. The person who completes the survey *must be 18 years of age or older*.
- Please read the instructions for each section carefully and answer each question as honestly as you can. Any information you provide will be kept **COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL**. Also, you do not have to complete the survey if you do not want to.
- If you have problems understanding some of the questions because English is not your first language, would you please ask someone to help you complete this survey?
- When you have completed it, please *put it in the envelope, seal it, and return it to the individual who gave it to you*.
- The results of this study will, hopefully, improve the quality of life in your neighbourhood. If you have any questions, you can contact Walter DeKeseredy or Shahid Alvi at (613) 520-2600 extension 2594 or extension 2627.
- Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

1. First, we would like to ask you some background questions. Please **CHOOSE YOUR ANSWER WITH A CHECK MARK** ✓. Where there are blanks, please write out the answer.

PLEASE NOTE YOUR RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL.

a. How old are you?

b. What is your sex?

- ☐ Male
☐ Female

c. Are you....

- ☐ Single
☐ Dating someone
☐ Living with someone
☐ Married
☐ Divorced
☐ Separated
☐ Widowed

d. Do you have any children?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No **IF NO, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION f.**

e. How many children live with you who are...

Less than 5 years old

5 to 12 years old

13 to 17 years old

18 and older

f. What country were you born in?

g. Have you immigrated to Canada within the last five years)?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

h. Are you a refugee from another country?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

i. Which of the following groups do you MOST identify with?

- ☐ Central American (El Salvador, Honduras, etc.)
☐ Scandinavian (Denmark, Sweden, Norway)
☐ French Canadian
☐ English Canadian
☐ Aboriginal (e.g., Metis, status/non-status Indian, Inuit)
☐ British (Scotland, Wales, England, Ireland, N. Ireland)
☐ Western European (France, Germany, Holland, etc.)
☐ Eastern European (Russia, Poland, Baltic States, Hungary, etc.)

- ☐ Southern European (Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece, etc.)
☐ Far Eastern (Japan, China, India, etc.)
☐ African (specify if North, Central or South) _____
☐ Caribbean
☐ Middle Eastern (Israel, Lebanon, Iran, Iraq, etc.)
☐ Latin American
☐ Other (please specify) _____

- j. How many years of elementary or high school education have you completed?

Years

- k. What is your level of education (for example, high school, B.A. degree, Masters degree)?

Now, we would like to ask you some questions about your work situation. Please **CHOOSE YOUR ANSWER WITH A CHECK MARK** ☒. Where there are blanks, please write out your answer.

2. **DURING THE PAST 12 MONTHS**, were you mainly:

- ☐ Working full-time
☐ Working part-time
☐ Not working for a wage
☐ Retired

3. If you **DID NOT WORK FOR PAY** during the past 12 months, were you...

- ☐ Unemployed but looking for work
☐ Unemployed but not looking for work
☐ Unable to work because you were ill or disabled
☐ Unable to work because you were taking care of your home, friends or family
☐ Going to school?

IF YOU WERE NOT WORKING FOR A WAGE, PLEASE CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 3.

IF YOU WERE WORKING, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 4.

4. **BEFORE** the last 12 months, were you unemployed?

- ☐ Yes IF YES, PLEASE ANSWER QUESTION 5.
☐ No IF NO, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 6.

5. How long were you unemployed **BEFORE** the last 12 months?

6. Where did you usually go to work during the last 12 months?

- ☐ In your neighbourhood
☐ Downtown Ottawa
☐ Another part of Ottawa (such as Ottawa South)
☐ Another city or town in the Ottawa Carleton Region (such as Nepean or Kanata)
☐ Another province (such as Québec)
☐ Other (please specify) _____

7. Please describe the type of work you **MOSTLY DID** in the job or jobs you had in the last 12 months (for example: store manager, teacher, nurse, janitor, nurse, car mechanic, bartender, etc.)

8. How many jobs did you have at the same time during the last 12 months?

9. Are you NOW...

- ☐ Working full time
- ☐ Working part-time
- ☐ Not working for pay
- ☐ Unemployed and looking for work
- ☐ Unemployed and not looking for work
- ☐ A volunteer

10. At the moment, are you...

- ☐ Unable to work because of an illness or a disability
- ☐ Unable to work because you are taking care of your home or family members
- ☐ Going to school

The next few questions are about your personal and household income. Please choose your answer with a check mark ☒ Where there are blanks, please write out your answer.

YOUR ANSWERS WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL.

11. About how much money did YOU make working during the last 12 months?

\$

12. IN TOTAL, about how much money did you AND your family members earn in the last 12 months?

\$

13. What was your MAIN source of income in the last 12 months?

- ☐ From my job
- ☐ Employment insurance benefits
- ☐ Welfare payments
- ☐ Disability payments
- ☐ Life insurance payments
- ☐ From family members or friends
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

14. How would you rate your household income?

- ☐ High income
- ☐ Middle income
- ☐ Low income

15. Thinking about your household income these days, do you feel you are:

- ☐ Living comfortably on present income
- ☐ Coping on present income
- ☐ Finding it difficult on present income
- ☐ Finding it VERY difficult on present income

The next questions are about how you see YOUR neighbourhood and neighbours. Where there are blanks, please write out the answer.

16. How long have you lived in your present neighbourhood?

17. Where is your neighbourhood located?

18. Were you born in your present neighbourhood?

☐ Yes

☐ No

19. Please tell us how safe you would feel about the following situations. Please choose your answer with a check mark ☒.

	Very Safe	Reasonably Safe	Neither Safe nor Unsafe	Somewhat Unsafe	Very Unsafe
a. walking alone after dark	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. riding a bus alone after dark	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. riding a bicycle alone after dark	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. walking alone to your car in a parking lot after dark	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. waiting for public transportation alone after dark	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. waiting for a friend, family member, or co-worker to drive you home after dark	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. walking past people you don't know, while alone after dark	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. being alone in your home after dark	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

20. Since you moved to your neighbourhood, would you say it has become a better place to live, has gotten worse, or is about the same as it was when you first moved here?

- ☐ Better
☐ Worse
☐ About the same
☐ Don't know

21. Overall, how satisfied are you with living in your neighbourhood?

- ☐ Very satisfied
☐ Somewhat satisfied
☐ Somewhat dissatisfied
☐ Very dissatisfied

22. Many people are very concerned about drug use, drug dealing, and other problems in their neighbourhoods. Please tell us if you think that the following things are MORE OF A PROBLEM, LESS OF A PROBLEM, ABOUT THE SAME, or NOT A PROBLEM since you first moved here. Please choose your answer with a check mark (✓).

	More of a problem	Less of a problem	About the same	Not a problem
a. Vandalism	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. People drinking alcohol and using drugs (e.g., marijuana, cocaine, crack, heroin) in public places	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Groups of teenagers hanging around public places	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Youth gangs	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Graffiti (people writing on walls)	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Garbage on the streets and sidewalks	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Noise	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Drug dealing	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. People using drugs (e.g., marijuana, cocaine, crack, heroin) and alcohol	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Armed robbery	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. Burglary	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. Violent assault	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. Sexual assault	☐	☐	☐	☐
n. Family violence (e.g., wife beating and child abuse)	☐	☐	☐	☐
o. Theft	☐	☐	☐	☐

23. If you knew someone who needed help with their drug or alcohol problem, do you know of a place or a program in your neighbourhood that could help?

☐ Yes

☐ No

IF YOU ANSWERED YES, PLEASE WRITE THE NAME OF THE PLACE(S) OR PROGRAM(S) IN THE SPACE BELOW

24. Have you heard of the Safe People Project?

☐ Yes

☐ No

IF YES, PLEASE TELL US WHERE OR HOW YOU HEARD ABOUT THE PROGRAM. PLEASE LIST THESE BELOW.

The next questions are about your relations with neighbours and other members of your neighbourhood. Please choose your answer with a check mark (✓). Where there are blanks, please write out the answer.

25. How often do you or people you live with get together (either in the neighbour's or your own home)?

- ☐ Every day
- ☐ A few times a week
- ☐ Once a week
- ☐ A few times a month
- ☐ Once a month
- ☐ A few times a year
- ☐ Once a year
- ☐ Hardly ever

26. Sometimes, neighbours try to help solve problems in their community. For each of the following situations, please tell us if your neighbours could be counted on to help solve these problems.

Could you count on your neighbours to help if...

	Very likely	Likely	Unlikely	Very Unlikely	Don't Know
a. children were skipping school and hanging out on a street corner?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. children were spray-painting graffiti on a local building?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. children were showing disrespect to an adult?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. a fight broke out in front of your house?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. the fire station closest to your home was threatened with budget cuts?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

27. For each of the following statements, please tell us if you STRONGLY DISAGREE, DISAGREE, NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE, AGREE, or STRONGLY AGREE.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know
a. People around here will help their neighbours	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. This is a friendly neighbourhood	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. People in this neighbourhood can be trusted	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. People in this neighbourhood do not get along with each other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. People in this neighbourhood do not share the same values (for example, politeness, hard work, respect for others)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. People in this neighbourhood are willing to babysit each other's children	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. People in this neighbourhood will call the police if a suspicious person is hanging around	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. People in this neighbourhood will call the police if their neighbours have trouble with rowdy teenagers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

28. We realize that it may be difficult to discuss your experiences with crime in your neighbourhood. If we may, we would like to ask you a few questions about what happened to you in the last 12 months. Please choose your answer with a check mark (✓).

IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS:		YES	NO
a.	Did anyone break into your home, car or garage?	☐	☐
b.	Was anything of yours stolen that was kept OUTSIDE your home (such as a bicycle, toy or lawn furniture)?	☐	☐
c.	Was anything of yours stolen from INSIDE your home, car or garage?	☐	☐
d.	Was your pocket picked or purse snatched?	☐	☐
e.	Did anyone ROB you by a stick up, mugging or threatening to hurt you?	☐	☐
f.	Did anyone TRY to rob you by a stick up, mugging or threatening to hurt you?	☐	☐
g.	Did a STRANGER beat you up, attack you or hit you with something?	☐	☐
h.	Did SOMEONE YOU KNOW beat you up, attack you or hit you with something?	☐	☐
i.	Did a STRANGER knife you, shoot at you or attack you with a weapon?	☐	☐
j.	Did SOMEONE YOU KNOW knife you, shoot at you or attack you with a weapon?	☐	☐
k.	Did a STRANGER THREATEN to knife you, shoot at you or attack you with some other weapon?	☐	☐
l.	Did SOMEONE YOU KNOW THREATEN to knife you, shoot at you or attack you with a weapon?	☐	☐
m.	Was your car, truck, motorcycle or bicycle stolen?	☐	☐
n.	Did a STRANGER force you to have sex when you did not want to?	☐	☐
o.	Did SOMEONE YOU KNOW force you to have sex when you did not want to?	☐	☐
p.	Did anyone hit or beat you because they did not like your skin colour or religion?	☐	☐
q.	Did anyone ever force you to have sex when you did not want to because they did not like your skin colour or religion?	☐	☐
r.	Did a police officer ever injure you (for example, by twisting your arm, hitting or beating you)?	☐	☐
s.	Did anyone hit or beat you because they thought you were homosexual (gay or lesbian)?	☐	☐
t.	Did anyone ON THE STREET, IN A BAR OR OTHER PUBLIC PLACE ever insult you because they thought you were homosexual (gay or lesbian)?	☐	☐
u.	Did anyone ON THE STREET, IN A BAR OR OTHER PUBLIC PLACE ever insult you because they did not like your skin colour or religion?	☐	☐
v.	Did anyone ON THE STREET, IN A BAR OR OTHER PUBLIC PLACE ever touch you sexually when you did not want to be touched (for example, your breasts, rear end or genitals)?	☐	☐
w.	Did anyone ON THE STREET, IN A BAR OR OTHER PUBLIC PLACE ever make sexual remarks about you or to you that made you feel uncomfortable?	☐	☐

29. No matter how well a couple gets along, sometimes they disagree, get annoyed with each other, or just have arguments. They also use many different ways to settle their differences. Below is a list of some things that your partner (for example, a husband, wife, girlfriend, lover or date) might have done to you in these situations in THE LAST 12 MONTHS. Please choose your answer with a check mark (✓).

IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS, DID YOUR PARTNER ...	YES	NO
a. Yell at you?	☐	☐
b. Insult or swear at you?	☐	☐
c. Accuse you of being a lousy lover?	☐	☐
d. Call you fat and ugly?	☐	☐
e. Destroy something that belongs to you?	☐	☐
f. Threaten to hit or throw something at you?	☐	☐
g. Grab you?	☐	☐
h. Push or shove you?	☐	☐
i. Throw something at you that could hurt?	☐	☐
j. Slap you?	☐	☐
k. Twist your arm or pull your hair?	☐	☐
l. Kick you?	☐	☐
m. Punch or hit you with something that could hurt?	☐	☐
n. Slam you against a wall?	☐	☐
o. Choke you?	☐	☐
p. Burn or scald you on purpose?	☐	☐
q. Beat you up?	☐	☐
r. Use a knife or a gun on you?	☐	☐
s. Threaten you with physical force to make you have sex?	☐	☐
t. Use physical force to make you have sex?	☐	☐
u. Insist on having sex when you didn't want to (but did not use physical force)?	☐	☐

30. For each of the following situations, please tell us if you think that your local police force does a GOOD JOB, an AVERAGE JOB, or a POOR JOB. Please choose your answer with a check mark (✓).

	Good Job	Average Job	Poor Job	Don't Know
a. Enforcing the laws	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Quickly responding to calls	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Easy to talk to	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Giving information to the public on ways to reduce crime	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Preventing crime	☐	☐	☐	☐

The next questions are about your use of alcohol and drugs in the last 12 months. Please choose your answer with a check mark (✓). Again, your answers will be **STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL**.

31. How often on average did you drink alcoholic beverages **IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS**?

- ☐ Once a week
- ☐ 2 or 3 times a week
- ☐ 4 to 6 times a week
- ☐ Every day
- ☐ Once or twice a month
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Never
- ☐ Don't know

33. How many of your friends use drugs (such as hash, marijuana, cocaine crack, speed, etc.)?

- ☐ All or almost all of them
- ☐ Most of them
- ☐ Some of them
- ☐ None or almost none
- ☐ Don't know

32. How often on average did you use drugs **IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS**?

- ☐ Once a week
- ☐ 2 or 3 times a week
- ☐ 4 to 6 times a week
- ☐ Every day
- ☐ Once or twice a month
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Never
- ☐ Don't know

34. How often **IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS** did you use drugs you bought from a drugstore?

- ☐ Once a week
- ☐ 2 or 3 times a week
- ☐ 4 to 6 times a week
- ☐ Every day
- ☐ Once or twice a month
- ☐ Other
- ☐ Never
- ☐ Don't know

35. Would it be **VERY HARD, HARD, EASY, or VERY EASY** for anyone to buy the following drugs in your neighbourhood? Please choose your answer with a check mark (✓).

	Very Hard	Hard	Easy	Very Easy	Don't Know
a. Marijuana	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Powder Cocaine	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Crack	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Heroin	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. LSD	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Hash	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Ecstasy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Speed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Other illegal drugs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

36. The next questions are about doing various activities with other people in your neighbourhood. IN A TYPICAL MONTH in the last 12 months, how often have YOU done each activity WITH PEOPLE in your neighbourhood? Please choose your answer with a check mark (✓).

	Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Very Rarely	Never
a. Gone to movies, theatres or plays	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Played sports	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Watched sports events	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Went to bars, pubs or nightclubs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Went to church, mosque, synagogue or another religious centre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Went out for a meal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Went to town hall meetings, tenants association meetings, and so on	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Played cards or Bingo	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Went to work or attended classes at night	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

37. Do you belong to any social clubs or organizations in your Neighbourhood (for example, Boy Scouts, volunteer organizations)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

38. Thank you for completing this survey. We would like to remind you that everything you have told us will remain STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL. If you would like to make some more comments, please write them in the space below, or on the back of this page.

APPENDIX B:
WEST TOWN STUDY INTERVIEW GUIDE

INTERVIEW NUMBER _____

INTERVIEWER _____

DATE: _____

Interviewer: Introduce self, tell them you are researchers from Carleton University, then read following:

Thank you for agreeing to do this interview. We are doing research on people's experiences in their neighbourhoods. We are especially interested in your experiences with things like crime, the resources and services available in your community, and your overall feelings about living in this neighbourhood. The interview will take about an hour, and we would like you to complete a survey that is related to this study after the interview. We will then pay you a fee of \$10 as a token of our thanks.

Note age and sex of respondent, and the neighbourhood in which respondent lives. Do not ask address. Note interview number, date, and your name on tape and on this schedule

READ: Let's begin by talking about your neighbourhood.

1. What is your overall view of the neighbourhood? What is it like to live there? How satisfied are you with living in this neighbourhood?

PROBE: in general for the types of problems they encounter in the neighbourhood (unemployment, job training, illiteracy, crime, safety in schools, drug/alcohol abuse, teen pregnancy, household violence, racial and other discrimination etc.)

READ: The next thing I would like you to talk about is your work or employment situation

2. Are you working now? How long have you been employed/unemployed? What do you/did you do?

PROBE: for their skill set, what they see as the main problem in getting and keeping a job, what they plan to do for work in the future, what other ways they earn money
READ: I want get your views on crime in this neighbourhood.

3. Do you see or hear about crime in your neighbourhood or close to it? What kinds of crime?

PROBE: for how they have heard of this, gossip, hearsay, who is involved in it (youth, gangs, adults), who are the crimes against.

4. Compared to other communities in the city, do you think your neighbourhood has less, more or about the same amount of crime?

5. Have you or anyone you know been the victim of a crime in this community?

PROBE: for type of crime(s), when it/they happened (in last year especially)

6. In the past 12 months has anyone deliberately hit you or used a weapon of any kind against you or used force on you in any way? Has anyone threatened you to do that? This can include strangers and people you know well. Has either of these two scenarios happened to anyone you know?

PROBE: for description of incident(s), and whether it happened to respondent or someone they know. PROBE also for context, meaning and motives of incidents.

7. How safe do you think your community is?

PROBE: If respondent says community is unsafe, PROBE for perceptions of why unsafe, and what they do to protect themselves

8. What do you think could be done to improve the safety of the neighbourhood?

9. Do you see any alcohol or drug problems in the neighbourhood?

PROBE: what kind of problems, level of problem, who is having the problems

If you had a friend who needed help with a drug or alcohol problem, do you know of a place or program in your neighbourhood that could help?

INTERVIEWER: note name of place if respondent knows one, how they heard of the resource

Can you tell me something about family life in your neighbourhood?

10. In general, what do you think life is like for families living in your neighbourhood?
11. How do the members of families in your neighbourhood get along?
12. What kinds of childcare issues do you or others with children in your neighbourhood face?
13. Do you think there is any conflict in some families in this community? Do you see or hear about any wife abuse or child abuse?

PROBE: for types of violence they see in other families and ALSO IF THEY PERSONALLY HAVE EXPERIENCED THIS but DO NOT mention the term "violence" in relation to their OWN experiences. Try to elicit perceptions from male and female respondents about domestic violence in the community. Also, PROBE for perceptions of WHY there is domestic violence. ASK if they think that there is some relationship between economic factors and domestic violence. If yes, clarify.

READ: I would like you to tell me a little about everyday life in the neighbourhood

14. Do people in your neighbourhood get together to socialize? What do people do when they get together? Youth - Adults

PROBE: If respondent is female, PROBE for their perceptions of men and male social activities in the housing projects.

Would you say that people in the neighbourhood would help each other in a crisis or bad situation?

PROBE: for why or why not

READ: Now I want to ask you a final set of questions. Thinking about your own life....

15. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being extremely satisfied, how satisfied are you with your life overall?

PROBE: for satisfaction with health, job or major activity, finances, family relations, friendships, social life in the community, respondents neighbours.

16. Can you tell me what you consider to be the most important events that have shaped your life?

PROBE: for things that may have prevented them from achieving their goals.

17. Are there any other things we have not discussed that you would like to mention?

THANK RESPONDENT FOR DOING INTERVIEW, PROVIDE THEM WITH A SURVEY, AND ASK THEM TO COMPLETE IT EITHER THERE OR LATER SO THAT YOU CAN PICK IT UP.

APPENDIX C:

ZERO-ORDER RELATIONSHIPS AMONG MAJOR VARIABLES

	Street	Harass	PsychAb	PhysViol	SexAb	IntimAb	IntimViol	MarCoh	SepDiv	Single
ColEff	-.268**	-.220**	-.155*	-.194*	.026	-.149*	-.170	.060	-.171*	.153*
Street	1	.326*	.202**	.242**	.069	.193**	.216**	-.058	.079	.029
Harass		1	.323**	.400**	.213**	.332**	.391**	-.067	.053	.090
PsychAb			1	.588**	.326**	.980**	.619**	.197**	-.103	-.031
PhysViol				1	.300**	.576**	.880**	.048	.062	-.040
SexViol					1	.390**	.596**	.090	-.034	.056
IntimAb						1	.655**	.185**	-.093	-.040
IntimViol							1	.091	.049	-.056
MarCoh								1	-.390**	-.321**
SepDiv									1	-.332**
Single										1
Dating										
Widow										
Edu										
Empd										
VisMin										
RecImm										
Age										
Disorder										
Drugs										
Crime										
InfSoCon										
SoCohTr										
IwN										
OrgPart										
SevDistr										

** p < .01. * p < .05.

[illegible]

REFERENCES

- Adamson, R.T. (1968): "Housing Policy and Urban Renewal." In N.H. Lithwick & G. Paquet, eds., *Urban Studies: A Canadian Perspective*. Toronto, ON: Methuen.
- Agnew, R. (1999): "A General Strain Theory of Community Differences in Crime Rates." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 36 (2): 123-155.
- Agnew, R. (1992): "Foundation for a General Strain Theory of Crime and Delinquency." *Criminology* 30 (1): 47-87.
- Agnew, R. and H. Raskin White (1992): "An Empirical Test of General Strain Theory." *Criminology* 30 (4): 475-499.
- Aizlewood, A. (2000): *Social Cohesion Indicators Workshop Report, June 26-27, 2000*. Hull, Que.: Department of Canadian Heritage (Strategic Planning and Policy Coordination).
- Alvi, S.; M. Schwartz; W. DeKeseredy; and M. Maume (2001): "Women's Fear of Crime in Canadian Public Housing." *Violence Against Women* 7 (6): 638-661.
- Anderson, E. (1999): *The Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. New York: Norton.
- Anderson, E. (1990): *Streetwise: Race, Class and Change in an Urban Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Anderson, M. (1993): *Thinking About Women: Sociological Perspectives on Sex and Gender*. Third Edition. Toronto: Macmillan.
- Bandura, A. (1982): "Self-Efficacy Mechanism in Human Agency." *American Psychologist* 37 (2): 122-147.

- Bandura, A. (1977): "Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change." *Psychological Review* 84 (2): 191-215.
- Baron, S. and T. Hartnagel (1997): Attributions, Affect, and Crime: Street Youths' Reactions to Unemployment. *Criminology* 35 (3): 409-434.
- Bellair, P. (2000): "Informal Surveillance and Street Crime: A Complex Relationship." *Criminology* 38 (1): 137-167.
- Bellair, P. (1997): "Social Interaction and Community Crime: Examining the Importance of Neighbor Networks." *Criminology* 35 (4): 677-703.
- Blau, J. and P. Blau (1982): "The Cost of Inequality: Metropolitan Structure and Violent Crime." *American Sociological Review* 47 (1): 114-129.
- Block, R. and W. Skogan (2001): *Do Collective Efficacy and Community Capacity Make a Difference 'Behind Closed Doors'? Report to the National Institute of Justice, December*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Bourgois, P. (1995): *In Search of Respect: Selling Crack in El Barrio*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourgois, P. and E. Dunlap (1993): "Exorcising Sex-for-Crack: An Ethnographic Perspective from Harlem." In M.S. Ratner, ed., *Crack Pipe as Pimp: An Ethnographic Investigation of Sex-for-Crack Exchanges*. New York: Lexington, 97-132.
- Brandwein, R.A. (ed.), (1999): *Battered Women, Children, and Welfare Reform: The Ties That Bind*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Braithwaite, J. (1995): "Inequality and Republican Criminology." In Hagan and Peterson, eds., 277-305.

- Braithwaite, J. (1993): "Shame and Modernity." *British Journal of Criminology* 33 (1): 1-18.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989): *Crime, Shame, and Reintegration*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Brewer, J.; B. Lockhart; and P. Rodgers (1998): "Informal Social Control and Crime Management in Belfast." *British Journal of Sociology* 49 (4): 570-585.
- Brill, W. and Associates (1975): *Victimization, Fear of Crime, and Altered Behavior: A Profile of the Crime Problem in Four Housing Projects in Boston*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- Browne, A.; A. Salomon; and S. Bassuk (1999): "The Impact of Recent Partner Violence on Women's Capacity to Maintain Work." *Violence Against Women* 5 (4): 393-426.
- Browne, A. and S. Bassuk (1997): "Intimate Violence in the Lives of Homeless and Poor Housed Women." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 67: 261-278.
- Browning, C. (2002): *The Span of Collective Efficacy: Extending Social Disorganization Theory to the Case of Partner Violence*. Unpublished manuscript, Ohio State University, Department of Sociology.
- Bui, H.N. and M. Morash (1999): "Domestic Violence in the Vietnamese Immigrant Community." *Violence Against Women* 5 (7): 769-795.
- Bursik, R. (1988): "Ecological Theories of Crime and Delinquency since Shaw and McKay." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Society of Criminology, Cincinnati, OH.
- Bursik, R. (1984): "Social Disorganization and Theories of Crime and Delinquency." *Criminology* 26 (4): 519-551.

- Bursik, R. and H. Grasmick (1993): *Neighborhoods and Crime: The Dimensions of Effective Community Control*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Byrne, J. and R.J. Sampson (eds.), (1986): *The Social Ecology of Crime*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Canada, Policy Research Directorate (2001): "Social Inclusion: Special Issue." *Horizons: Policy Research Initiative* 4 (1).
- Capponi, P. (1999): *The War At Home: An Intimate Portrait of Canada's Poor*. Toronto, ON: Viking/Penguin.
- Carroll, B. (1990): "Housing." In R. Loreto & T. Price, eds., *Urban Policy Issues: Canadian Perspectives*. Toronto, ON: McClelland & Stewart, 86-106.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2000): "Low Income Linked to Risk of Abusive Relationship." *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 49: 691-694.
- Chambliss, W. (1994): "Policing the Ghetto Underclass: The Politics of Law and Law Enforcement." *Social Problems* 41 (2): 177-194.
- Cisneros, H. (1995): *Defensible Space: Detering Crime and Building Community*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- Connell, R.W. (1987): *Gender and Power*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Cook, C. (1988): "Components of Neighborhood Satisfaction: Responses from Urban and Suburban Single-Parent Women." *Environment and Behavior* 20 (2): 115-149.
- Côté, S. (2001): "La Contribution Des Capacités Humaines et Sociales." *Isuma: Canadian Journal of Policy Research / Revue Canadienne de Recherches sur les Politiques* 2 (1): 25-33.

- Crawford, A.; T. Jones; T. Woodhouse; and J. Young (1990): *Second Islington Crime Survey*. London: Middlesex Polytechnic Centre for Criminology.
- Curcio, W.T. (1999): *Domestic Abuse, Sexual Trauma, and Welfare Receipt: Prevalence, Effects, and Implications for Poverty Theory*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University (Dept. of Sociology).
- Curtis, L.A. (1985): "Neighborhood, Family, and Employment: Toward a New Public Policy Against Violence." In L.A. Curtis, ed., *American Violence and Public Policy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Dansereau, F.; A. Germain; and C. Éveillard (1997): "Social Mix: Old Utopias, Contemporary Experience and Challenges." *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 6 (1): 1-23.
- DeKeseredy, W. (1992): "Confronting Woman Abuse in Canada: A Left Realist Approach." In J. Lowman and B. MacLean (eds.), *Realist Criminology: Crime Control and Policing in the 1990s*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 264-282.
- DeKeseredy, W. (1988): *Woman Abuse in Dating Relationships: The Role of Male Peer Support*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholar's Press.
- DeKeseredy, W.; S. Alvi; M. Schwartz; and B. Perry (1999): "Violence Against and the Harassment of Women in Canadian Public Housing: An Exploratory Study." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 36 (4): 499-516.
- DeKeseredy, W.; S. Alvi; A. Tomaszewski; and M. Schwartz (2000): "Joblessness, Poverty, and Inner-City Crime: The Current State of Canadian Sociological Knowledge." In Alberto Godenzi, ed., *Frieden, Kultur, und Geschlecht [Peace, Culture, and Gender]*. Fribourg, Switzerland, Fribourg University Press.

- DeKeseredy, W.; S. Alvi; M. Schwartz; and A. Tomaszewski (2002): *Under Siege: Joblessness, Drugs, and Predatory Street Crime in a Vulnerable Canadian Urban Community*. Manuscript in submission.
- DeKeseredy, W. and K. Kelly (1993): "The Incidence and Prevalence of Woman Abuse in Canadian University Dating Relationships." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 18 (2): 137-159.
- DeKeseredy, W. and B. MacLean (1991): "Exploring the Gender, Race and Class Dimensions of Victimization: A Left Realist Critique of the Canadian Urban Victimization Survey." *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 35: 143-161.
- DeKeseredy, W. and B. MacLean (1990): "Researching Woman Abuse: A Left Realist Critique of the Conflict Tactics Scale." *Canadian Review of Social Policy* 25: 19-27.
- DeKeseredy, W.; D. Saunders; M. Schwartz; and S. Alvi (1997): "The Meanings and Motives for Women's Use of Violence in Canadian College Dating Relationships: Results from a National Survey." *Sociological Spectrum* 17: 199-222.
- DeKeseredy, W. and M. Schwartz (1998): *Woman Abuse on Campus: Results from the Canadian National Survey*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DeKeseredy, W. and M. Schwartz (1996): *Contemporary Criminology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- DeKeseredy, W. and M. Schwartz (1991): "British Left Realism on the Abuse of Women: A Critical Appraisal." In R. Quinney and H. Pepinsky (eds.), *Criminology as Peacemaking*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 154-171.

- DeLeon-Granados, W. (1999): *Travels Through Crime and Place: Community Building As Crime Control*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Dillman, D. (1983): "Mail And Other Self-Administered Questionnaires." In Rossi, Wright, and Anderson (eds.), *Handbook of Survey Research*, Orlando, FL: Academic Press, pp. 359-377.
- Dimmock, G. (2000): "Stepmother Accused of Keeping Girl in Clothes Dryer as Punishment: Police Charge Ottawa Woman with Assault, Confinement." *Ottawa Citizen Online*, June 27.
- Duffy, A. (2000): "The Dark Side of the New Economy: New Immigrants are Faring Worse than Previous Generations, Study Discovers." *Ottawa Citizen Online*, April 27.
- Duffy, A.; D. Glenday; and N. Pupo (eds.), (1997): *Good Jobs, Bad Jobs, No Jobs: The Transformation of Work in the 21st Century*. Toronto, ON: Harcourt Brace Canada.
- Dunworth, T. and A. Saiger (1994): *Drugs and Crime in Public Housing: A Three-City Analysis*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Ellickson, R. (1991): *Order Without Law: How Neighbors Settle Disputes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Elliott, D.; W.J. Wilson; D. Huizinga; R.J. Sampson; A. Elliott; and B. Rankin (1996): "The Effects of Neighborhood Disadvantage on Adolescent Development." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 33 (4): 389-426.
- Ellis, D. and W. DeKeseredy (1996): *The Wrong Stuff: An Introduction to the Sociological Study of Deviance*. 2nd edition. Scarborough, ON: Allyn & Bacon Canada.

- Erez, E. (2000): "Immigration, Culture Conflict and Domestic Violence/Woman Battering." *Crime Prevention and Community Safety* 2 (1): 27-36.
- Fagan, J.; T. Dumanovsky; J.P. Thompson; and G. Davies (1998): "Crime in Public Housing: Clarifying Research Issues." *National Institute of Justice Journal* 235 (March): 2-9.
- Farley, J. (1982): "Has Public Housing Gotten a Bum Rap? The Incidence of Crime in St. Louis Public Housing Developments." *Environment & Behavior* 14 (4): 443-477.
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities (1993): *Community Development, Quality of Life and Fear of Crime in Ten Public Housing Communities in Canada*. Ottawa, ON: Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.
- Feins, J.; J. Epstein; and R. Widom (1997): *Solving Crime Problems in Residential Neighborhoods: Comprehensive Changes in Design, Management, and Use*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Fernandez, R. and D. Harris (1992): "Social Isolation and the Underclass." In Harrell and Peterson, eds., *Drugs, Crime, and Social Isolation: Barriers to Urban Opportunity*, 257-293.
- Fine, M. and L. Weis (2000): "Disappearing Acts: The State and Violence Against Women in the Twentieth Century." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 25 (4): 1139-1146.
- Fong, E. and M. Gulia (1999): "Differences in Neighborhood Qualities Among Racial and Ethnic Groups in Canada." *Sociological Inquiry* 69 (4): 575-598.
- Foster, J. (1995): "Informal Social Control and Community Crime Prevention." *British Journal of Criminology* 35 (4): 563-583.

- Foster, J. (1990): *Villains: Crime and Community in the Inner City*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Furstenberg, F., Jr. (1993): "How Families Manage Risk and Opportunity in Dangerous Neighborhoods." In W.J. Wilson, ed., *Sociology and the Public Agenda*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Geis, K. and C. Ross (1998): "A New Look at Urban Alienation: The Effect of Neighborhood Disorder on Perceived Powerlessness." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 61 (3): 232-246.
- Gillis, A.R. and J. Hagan (1979): *Density, Delinquency, and Design: Formal and Informal Control and the Built Environment*. Research Paper 109. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto, Urban and Community Studies.
- Glaeser, E. (2001): "The Formation of Social Capital." *Isuma: Canadian Journal of Policy Research / Revue Canadienne de Recherches sur les Politiques* 2 (1): 34-40.
- Goering, J.; A. Kamely; and T. Richardson (1997): "Recent Research on Racial Segregation and Poverty Concentration in Public Housing in the United States." *Urban Affairs Review* 32 (5): 723-745.
- Goodman, L.A. (1991a): "The Prevalence of Abuse Among Homeless and Housed Poor Mothers." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 61 (4): 489-500.
- Goodman, L.A. (1991b): "The Relationship Between Social Support and Family Homelessness: A Comparison Study of Homeless and Housed Mothers." *Journal of Community Psychology* 19: 321-332.

- Gwiasda, V; N. Taluc; and S. Popkin (1997): "Data Collection in Dangerous Neighborhoods: Lessons from a Survey of Public Housing Residents in Chicago." *Evaluation Review* 21 (1): 77-93.
- Hagan, J. and B. McCarthy (1997): *Mean Streets: Youth Crime and Homelessness*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Hagan, J. and B. McCarthy (1992): "Street Life and Delinquency." *British Journal of Sociology* 2 (4): 533-561.
- Hagan, J. and R. Peterson (eds.), (1995): *Crime and Inequality*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hagedorn, J. (1988): *People and Folks: Gangs, Crime and the Underclass in a Rustbelt City*. Chicago, IL: Lake View Press.
- Hann, R. and K. Ashbury (1993): *Reclaiming Urban Neighbourhoods: Assessing New Strategic Approaches to Security in 11 Canadian Social Housing Communities*. Ottawa, ON: Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.
- Harrell, A. and C. Gouvis (1994): *Predicting Neighborhood Risk of Crime*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Harrell, A. and G. Peterson (eds.), (1992): *Drugs, Crime, and Social Isolation: Barriers to Urban Opportunity*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press.
- Hartnagel, T. and W. Lee (1990): "Urban Crime in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* (Oct.): 591-606.
- Hatfield, M. (1997): *Concentrations of Poverty and Distressed Neighbourhoods in Canada*. Ottawa, Ont.: Human Resources Development Canada, Applied Research Branch, Strategic Policy.

- Hirschfield, A. and K.J. Bowers (1997a): "The Development of a Social, Demographic and Land Use Profiler for Areas of High Crime." *British Journal of Criminology* 37 (1): 103-120.
- Hirschfield, A. and K.J. Bowers (1997b): "The Effect of Social Cohesion on Levels of Recorded Crime in Disadvantaged Areas." *Urban Studies* 34 (8): 1275-1295.
- Hirschfield, A.; P. Brown; and P. Todd (1995): "GIS and the Analysis of Spatially-Referenced Crime Data: Experiences in Merseyside, U.K." *International Journal of Geographical Information Systems* 9 (2): 191-210.
- Hollingsworth, J. (1999): *Coalition of Community Health Resource Centres Catchment Areas Comparison Report: Summary of Findings*. Unpublished manuscript. Ottawa, ON: Social Planning Council of Ottawa-Carleton.
- Holzman, H. (1996): "Criminological Research on Public Housing: Toward a Better Understanding of People, Places, and Spaces." *Crime and Delinquency* 42 (3): 361-378.
- Holzman, H.; R. Hyatt; and J. Dempster (2001): "Patterns of Aggravated Assault in Public Housing: Mapping the Nexus of Offense, Place, Gender, and Race." *Violence Against Women* 7 (6): 662-684.
- Holzman, H. and L. Piper (1998): "Measuring Crime in Public Housing: Methodological Issues and Research Strategies." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 14 (4): 331-351.

- Holzman, H.; C. Kudrick; and K. Voytek (1996): "Revisiting the Relationship Between Crime and Architectural Design: An Analysis of Data from HUD's 1994 Survey of Public Housing Residents." *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development & Research* 2 (1): 107-126.
- Hurtig, M. (1999): *Pay the Rent or Feed the Kids: The Tragedy and Disgrace of Poverty in Canada*. Toronto, ON: McClelland & Stewart.
- Hyatt, R. and H. Holzman (1999): *Guidebook for Measuring Crime in Public Housing with Geographic Information Systems*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- James, S. (1997): "Crime Prevention and Public Housing: The Dynamics of Control." In P. O'Malley and A. Sutton, eds., *Crime Prevention in Australia: Issues in Policy and Research*. Annandale, AUS: Federation Press.
- James, S. (1993): "Crime Prevention and Public Housing." *Socio-Legal Bulletin: Newsletter of the Nation* 9.
- Jargowsky, P. (1997): *Poverty and Place: Ghettos, Barrios, and the American City*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Jenson, J. (1998): "Mapping Social Cohesion: The State of Canadian Research." S.l.: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Johnson, H. (1996): *Dangerous Domains: Violence Against Women in Canada*. Scarborough, ON: Nelson Canada.
- Jones, T.; B. MacLean; and J. Young (1986): *The Islington Crime Survey*. London, UK: Gower.

- Kaljee, L.; B. Stanton; I. Ricardo; and T. Whitehead (1995): "Urban African American Adolescents and their Parents: Perceptions of Violence Within and Against their Communities." *Human Organization* 54 (4): 373-382.
- Kasarda, J. (1992): "The Severely Distressed in Economically Transforming Cities." In Harrell and Peterson, eds., *Drugs, Crime, and Social Isolation: Barriers to Urban Opportunity*, 45-98.
- Kaufman, J.E. and J.E. Rosenbaum (1992): "The Education and Employment of Low-Income Black Youth in White Suburbs." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 14 (3): 229-240.
- Kauth-Karjala, M. (2002): "Eviction Sparks ACLU Lawsuit: Ypsilanti Woman Who Reported Attack Became Target of Public Housing's 'First Strike' Policy." *Ann Arbor News*, Online Edition, February 7, http://www.mlive.com/news/aanews/index.ssf?/xml/story.ssf/html_standard.xml?/base/news/1013098225253164.xml
- Kawachi, I.; B.P. Kennedy; and R.G. Wilkinson (1999): "Crime: Social Disorganization and Relative Deprivation." *Social Science & Medicine* 48 (6): 719-731.
- Kazemipur, A. and S.S. Halli (2000): *The New Poverty in Canada: Ethnic Groups and Ghetto Neighbourhoods*. Toronto, ON: Thompson Educational Publishing.
- Kennedy, L.; R. Silverman; and D. Forde (1991): "Homicide in Urban Canada: Testing the Impact of Economic Inequality and Social Disorganization." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 16 (4): 397-410.
- Keyes, L. (1992): *Strategies and Saints: Fighting Drugs in Subsidized Housing*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

- Kiernan, M. (1990): "Land Use Planning." In R. Loreto & T. Price, eds., *Urban Policy Issues: Canadian Perspectives*. Toronto, ON: McClelland & Stewart, 58-85.
- Kinsey, R.; J. Lea; and J. Young (1986): *Losing the Fight Against Crime*. London: Basil Blackwell.
- Kirkwood, C. (1993): *Leaving Abusive Partners*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Klein, J. (1997): "In God They Trust: Washington Faces a New Challenge: Should It Let the Churches Take Over the Inner Cities?" *The New Yorker*, June 16: 40-48.
- Koss, M.; L.A. Goodman; A. Browne; and L.F. Fitzgerald (eds.), (1994): *No Safe Haven: Male Violence Against Women at Home, at Work, and in the Community*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Krivo, L.; R. Peterson; H. Rizzo; and J. Reynolds (1998): "Race, Segregation, and the Concentration of Disadvantage." *Social Problems* 45: 61-80.
- Kurz, D. (1998): "Women, Welfare, and Domestic Violence." *Social Justice* 25 (1): 105-124.
- LaFree, G. (1998): *Losing Legitimacy: Street Crime and the Decline of Social Institutions in America*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- LaPrairie, C. (1995): "Seen But Not Heard: Native People in Four Canadian Inner Cities." *Journal of Human Justice* 6: 30-45.
- LaPrairie, C. (1994): *Seen but not Heard: Native People in the Inner City*. Ottawa, ON: Department of Justice Canada.
- Lavrakas, P. (1985): "Citizen Self-Help and Neighborhood Crime Prevention." In L. Curtis, ed., *American Violence and Public Policy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Lee, M. (2000): "Community Cohesion and Violent Predatory Victimization: A Theoretical Extension and Cross-National Test of Opportunity Theory." *Social Forces* 79 (2): 683-706.
- Leland, J. (1998): "Savior of the Streets." *Newsweek*, June 10: 20-25.
- Lemieux, V. (2001): "La Capital Social Dans Les Situations de Coopération et de Conflit." *Isuma: Canadian Journal of Policy Research / Revue Canadienne de Recherches sur les Politiques* 2 (1): 82-86.
- Lenton, R.; M.D. Smith; J. Fox; and N. Morra (1999): "Sexual Harassment in Public Places: Experiences of Canadian Women." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 36 (4): 517-540.
- Ley, D. and H. Smith (2000): "Relations Between Deprivation and Immigrant Groups in Large Canadian Cities." *Urban Studies* 37 (1): 37-62.
- Ley, D. and H. Smith (1997): *Is There an Immigrant "Underclass" in Canadian Cities?* Vancouver, BC: Vancouver Centre of Excellence (Research in Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis; Working Paper 97-08).
- Liebow, E. (1967): *Tally's Corner*. Boston, MA: Little Brown.
- Lloyd, S. and N. Taluc (1999): "The Effects of Male Violence on Female Employment." *Violence Against Women* 5 (4): 370-392.
- Lofaro, T. (1997): "Neighbours to Watch Over Troubled Apartments: Residents Hope to Destroy Stigma of Baseline Court." *Ottawa Citizen*, September 27, C3.
- Lowman, J. and L. Fraser (1995): *Violence Against Persons Who Prostitute: The Experience in British Columbia*. Technical Report. Ottawa, ON: Department of Justice. Available at <http://users.uniserve.com/~lowman/violence.htm>

- Lucashenko, M. (1996): "Violence Against Indigenous Women: Public and Private Dimensions." *Violence Against Women* 2 (4): 378-390.
- MacLean, B. (1992): "A Program of Local Crime Survey Research." In B. MacLean and J. Lowman, eds., *Realist Criminology: Crime Control and Policing in the 1990s*, Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 336-366.
- MacLeod, J. (1995 [1987]): *Ain't No Makin' It: Aspirations and Attainment in a Low-Income Neighborhood*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Maher, L. (1995): "In the Name of Love: Women and the Initiation into Illicit Drugs." In R.E. Dobash, R.P. Dobash, and L. Noaks (eds.), *Gender and Crime*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 132-166.
- Maguire, P. (1987): *Doing Participatory Research: A Feminist Approach*. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts.
- Malos, E. and G. Hague (1997): "Women, Housing, Homelessness and Domestic Violence." *Women's Studies International Forum* 20 (3): 397-409.
- Mama, A. (1989): "Violence Against Black Women: Gender, Race and State Responses." *Feminist Review* 32: 30-48.
- Mamalian, C. and N. LaVigne (1999): "The Use of Computerized Crime Mapping by Law Enforcement: Survey Results." *National Institute of Justice Research Preview* (January).

- Maxfield, M. and E. Babbie (1995): *Research Methods for Criminal Justice and Criminology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- McCarthy, B. and J. Hagan (1992): "Mean Streets: The Theoretical Significance of Situational Delinquency Among Homeless Youths." *American Journal of Sociology* 98 (3): 597-627.
- McCarthy, B. and J. Hagan (1991): "Homelessness: A Criminogenic Situation?" *British Journal of Criminology* 31 (4): 393-410.
- McGahan, P. (1995): *Urban Sociology in Canada*. 3rd ed. Toronto, ON: Harcourt Brace Canada.
- McMahon, M. (1999): *Women on Guard: Discrimination and Harassment in Corrections*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- McNulty, T. and S. Holloway (2000): "Race, Crime, and Public Housing in Atlanta: Testing a Conditional Effect Hypothesis." *Social Forces* 79 (2): 707-729.
- Mehrotra, M. (1999): "The Social Construction of Wife Abuse: Experiences of Asian Indian Women in the United States." *Violence Against Women* 5 (6): 619-640.
- Menard, A. (2001): "Domestic Violence and Housing: Key Policy and Program Challenges." *Violence Against Women* 7 (6): 707-721.
- Merry, S. (1981): "Defensible Space Undefined: Social Factors in Crime Control Through Environmental Design." *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 16 (4): 397-422.
- Miles-Doan, R. (1998): "Violence Between Spouses and Intimates: Does Neighborhood Context Matter?" *Social Forces* 77: 623-645.
- Miles-Doan, R. and S. Kelly (1997): "Geographic Concentration of Violence Between Intimate Partners." *Public Health Reports* 112: 135-141.

- Miller, J. (1997): "Assessing the Nature of Violence Against Young Women in an Urban African-American Community." Unpublished Manuscript, Dept. of Criminology & Criminal Justice, University of Missouri at St. Louis.
- Morenoff, J.; R.J. Sampson; S. Raudenbush (2001): "Neighborhood Inequality, Collective Efficacy, and the Spatial Dynamics of Urban Violence." *Criminology* 39 (3): 517-559.
- Nash, J. and G. Bowen (1999): "Perceived Crime and Informal Social Control in the Neighborhood as a Context for Adolescent Behavior." *Social Work Research* 23 (3): 171-186.
- Newman, O. (1972): *Defensible Space*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- O'Brien, P. (1995): "From Surviving to Thriving: The Complex Experience of Living in Public Housing." *Affilia* 10 (2): 155-178.
- Olson, P. (1982): "Urban Neighborhood Research: Its Development and Current Research." *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 17 (4): 491-518.
- Ollis, D. and I. Tomaszewski (1993): *Gender and Violence Project: Position Paper*. Canberra, AUS: Australian Government Public Service (AUSTROM).
- Ottawa (2001a): *City Services: Financial and Employment Support*. Online document, available at http://www.city.ottawa.on.ca/city_services/finempsupport/8_7_1_en.shtml.
- Ottawa (2001b): *City Services: Housing*. Online document, available at http://www.city.ottawa.on.ca/city_services/housing/12_1_en.shtml.
- Ottawa (1998): *City Services: Social Housing*. Online document, available at http://www.city.ottawa.on.ca/city_services/social_housing.html.

- Ottawa (1994a): *Neighbourhood Fact Sheets*. City of Ottawa: Dept. of Planning and Development.
- Ottawa (1994b): *Ottawa: An Economic Profile*. City of Ottawa: Office of the Mayor.
- Ottawa (1977): *City of Ottawa Housing Policy, June 1977*. City of Ottawa Community Development: Housing Advisory Committee.
- Ottawa (1976): *West Town Development Plan for Planning District One*. City of Ottawa: Planning Branch.
- Ottawa (1974): *West Town Area Preliminary Development Plan, June 1974*. City of Ottawa: Planning Branch.
- Ottawa (1973): *West Town Existing Conditions Report*. City of Ottawa: Planning Branch.
- Ottawa-Carleton (1997): *Employment in Ottawa-Carleton: Results of the 1996 Employment Survey*. Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton: Planning & Development Approvals Department.
- Ottawa Citizen* (1998): "Teens Attack Cyclist With Tree Branches." July 23, D3.
- Paludi, M. (ed.), (1991): *Ivory Power: Sexual Harassment on Campus*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.
- Park, R. and E. Burgess (1928): *The City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Parker, L.E. (1994): "Working Together: Perceived Self-Efficacy and Collective Efficacy at the Workplace." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 24 (1): 43-59.
- Pattillo, M. (1998): "Sweet Mothers and Gangbangers: Managing Crime in a Black Middle-Class Neighborhood." *Social Forces* 76 (3): 747-774.
- Pearson, J.; N. Thoennes; and E. Griswold (1998): "Child Support and Domestic Violence: The Victims Speak Out." *Violence Against Women* 5 (4): 427-448.

- Peterson, R.; L. Krivo; and M. Harris (2000): "Disadvantage and Neighborhood Violent Crime: Do Local Institutions Matter?" *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 37 (1): 31-63.
- Pettitway, L. (1996): *Honey, Honey, Miss Thang: Being Black, Gay, and on the Streets*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Pinderhughes, H. (1997): *Race in the Hood: Conflict and Violence Among Urban Youth*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Piper, L.; R. Lucas; R. Shiery; and W. Rohe (1997): *How to Conduct Victimization Surveys: A Workbook*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Housing and Urban Development (Office of Policy Development and Research).
- Piquero, A. (1999): "The Validity of Incivility Measures in Public Housing." *Justice Quarterly* 16 (4): 793-818.
- Popkin, S.; V. Gwiasda; L. Olson; D. Rosenbaum; and L. Buron (2000): *The Hidden War: Crime and the Tragedy of Public Housing in Chicago*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Popkin, S.; V. Gwiasda; D. Rosenbaum; J.M. Amendolia; W.A. Johnson; and L. Olson (1999): "Combating Crime in Public Housing: A Qualitative and Quantitative Longitudinal Analysis of the Chicago Housing Authority." *Justice Quarterly* 16 (3): 519-557.
- Popkin, S.; L. Olson; A. Lurigio; V. Gwiasda; and R. Carter (1995): "Sweeping Out Drugs and Crime: Residents' Views of the Chicago Housing Authority's Public Housing Drug Elimination Program." *Crime and Delinquency* 41 (1): 73-99.

- Popkin, S.; J. Rosenbaum; and P. Meaden (1993): "Labor Market Experiences of Low-Income Black Women in Middle-Class Suburbs: Evidence from a Survey of Gautreaux Program Participants." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 12 (3): 556-573.
- Putnam, R. (2001): "Social Capital: Measurement and Consequences." *Isuma: Canadian Journal of Policy Research / Revue Canadienne de Recherches sur les Politiques* 2 (1): 41-52.
- Putnam, R. (2000): *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Rainwater, L. (1990): *Behind Ghetto Walls*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Rainwater, L. (1966): "Fear and the House-as-Haven in the Lower Class." *American Institute of Planners Journal* 32: 23-31.
- Raphael, J. (2001a): "Domestic Violence as a Welfare-to-Work Barrier." In C. Renzetti and L. Goodstein, eds., *Sourcebook on Violence Against Women*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Raphael, J. (2001b): "Public Housing and Domestic Violence." *Violence Against Women* 7 (6): 699-706.
- Raphael, J. (2000): *Saving Bernice: Battered Women, Welfare, and Poverty*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Raphael, J. (1996): *Prisoners of Abuse: Domestic Violence and Welfare Receipt*. Chicago, IL: Taylor Institute.
- Raphael, J. (1995): *Domestic Violence: Telling the Untold Welfare-to-Work Story*. Chicago, IL: Taylor Institute.

- Raphael, J. and R. Tolman (1997): *Trapped by Poverty, Trapped by Abuse: New Evidence Documenting the Relationship Between Domestic Violence and Welfare*. Chicago, IL / Ann Arbor, MI: Taylor Institute / University of Michigan Research Development Center on Poverty, Risk and Mental Health.
- Raudenbush, S. and R.J. Sampson (1999): "Assessing Direct and Indirect Effects in Multilevel Designs with Latent Variables." *Sociological Methods & Research* 28 (2): 123-153.
- Reingold, D. (1999): "Social Networks and the Employment Problem of the Urban Poor." *Urban Studies* 36 (11): 1907-1932.
- Rennison, C.M. and S. Welchans (2000): *Intimate Partner Violence*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report (May). Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice.
- Renzetti, C. (2001): "'One Strike and You're Out': Implications of a Federal Crime Control Policy for Battered Women." *Violence Against Women* 7 (6): 685-699.
- Renzetti, C. (1992): *Violent Betrayal: Partner Abuse in Lesbian Relationships*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Renzetti, C. and S. Maier (2001): "'Private' Crime in Public Housing: Fear of Crime and Violent Victimization among Women Public Housing Residents." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Atlanta, GA.
- Rich, T. (2001): "Crime Mapping and Analysis by Community Organizations in Hartford, Connecticut." Washington, D.C.: NIJ Research in Brief (March).
- Rohe, W. and R. Burby (1988): "Fear of Crime in Public Housing." *Environment and Behavior* 20 (6): 700-720.

- Roncek, D.; R. Bell; and J. Francik (1981): "Housing Projects and Crime: Testing a Proximity Hypothesis." *Social Problems* 29 (2): 151-166.
- Rosenbaum, D. (1988): "Community Crime Prevention: Review and Synthesis of the Literature." *Justice Quarterly* 5 (3): 323-394.
- Rosenbaum, D.; A. Lurigio; and R. Davis (1998): *The Prevention of Crime: Social and Situational Strategies*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Rosenbaum, J.; S. Popkin; J. Kaufman; and J. Rusin (1991): "Social Integration of Low-Income Black Adults in Middle-Class White Suburbs." *Social Problems* 38 (4): 448-462.
- Ross, C.; J. Mirowsky; and S. Pribesh (2001): "Powerlessness and the Amplification of Threat: Neighborhood Disadvantage, Disorder, and Mistrust." *American Sociological Review* 66 (4): 568-591.
- Rountree, P.W. and B. Warner (1999): "Social Ties and Crime: Is the Relationship Gendered?" *Criminology* 37 (4): 789-813.
- Rountree, Pamela Wilcox; Kenneth C. Land; and Terance D. Miethe (1994): "Macro-Micro Integration in the Study of Victimization: A Hierarchical Logistic Model Analysis Across Seattle Neighborhoods." *Criminology* 32 (3): 387-414.
- Rouse, V. and H. Rubenstein (1978): *Crime in Public Housing: A Review of Major Issues and Selected Crime Reduction Strategies*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Housing and Urban Development (Office of Policy Development and Research).
- Rupert, J. (1999): "Death 'in the Blink of an Eye:' Young Father of Two Stabbed in Argument with Stranger." *Ottawa Citizen Online*, January 31.

- Rupert, J. (1998a): "Brother, Sister Charged in Opium Bust: Drug Transported in Religious Plaque." *Ottawa Citizen*, August 29, C4.
- Rupert, J. (1998b): "Woman Faces Arson Charge: Suspect Sought Psychiatric Help Prior to Blaze." *Ottawa Citizen*, August 29, C3.
- Russell, D. (1984): *Sexual Exploitation: Rape, Child Sexual Abuse, and Workplace Harassment*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Ryan, J. (1995): *Doing Things the Right Way: Dene Traditional Justice in Lac La Martre, N.W.T.* Calgary, AB: University of Calgary Press and Arctic Institute of North America.
- Salomon, A. (2000): "The Etiology, Course and Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence Against Extremely Poor Women." Paper presented at the National Institute of Justice's Research Conference on Violence Against Women and Family Violence, Washington, DC.
- Sampson, R.J. (2000): "Whither the Sociological Study of Crime?" *American Review of Sociology* 26: 711-714.
- Sampson, R.J. (1997a): "Collective Regulation of Adolescent Misbehavior: Validation Results from 80 Chicago Neighborhoods." *Journal of Adolescent Research* 12 (2): 227- 244.
- Sampson, R.J. (1997b): "What 'Community' Supplies." Proceedings of the National Community Development Policy Analysis Network Conference. S.l.: Brookings Institution.
- Sampson, R.J. (1991): "Linking the Micro-and Macrolevel Dimensions of Community Social Organization." *Social Forces* 70 (1): 43-64.

- Sampson, R.J. (1990): "The Impact of Housing Policies on Community Social Organization and Crime." *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 66 (5): 526-533.
- Sampson, R.J. (1985): "Neighborhoods and Crime: The Structural Determinants of Personal Victimization." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 22 (1): 7-40.
- Sampson, R.J. and B. Groves (1989): "Community Structure and Crime: Testing Social Disorganization Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (4): 774-802.
- Sampson, R.J. and J. Laub (1994): "Urban Poverty and the Family Context of Delinquency: A New Look at Structure and Process." *Child Development* 65: 523-540.
- Sampson, R.J. and S. Raudenbush (2001): "Disorder in Urban Neighborhoods – Does it Lead to Crime?" *National Institute of Justice Research Brief*, February.
- Sampson, R. and S. Raudenbush (1999): "Systematic Spatial Observation of Public Spaces: A New Look at Disorder in Urban Neighborhoods." *American Journal of Sociology* 105 (3): 603-651.
- Sampson, R. and W.J. Wilson (1995): "Toward a Theory of Race, Crime, and Urban Inequality." In Hagan and Peterson (eds.), *Crime and Inequality*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 37-54.
- Sampson, R.J.; J. Morenoff; and F. Earls (1999): "Beyond Social Capital: Spatial Dynamics of Collective Efficacy for Children." *American Sociological Review* 64: 633-660.

- Sampson, R.J.; S. Raudenbush; and F. Earls (1997): "Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy." *Science* 277: 918-924.
- Schwartz, M. (2000): "Methodological Issues in the Use of Survey Data for Measuring and Characterizing Violence Against Women." *Violence Against Women* 6 (8): 815-838.
- Schwartz, M. and W. DeKeseredy (1997): *Sexual Assault on the College Campus: The Role of Male Peer Support*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Schuller, T. (2001): "The Complementary Roles of Human and Social Capital." *Isuma: Canadian Journal of Policy Research / Revue Canadienne de Recherches sur les Politiques* 2 (1): 18-24.
- Shaw, C. and H. McKay (1942): *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Short, J., Jr. (1997): *Poverty, Ethnicity, and Violent Crime*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Skogan, W. (1990): *Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Neighborhoods*. New York: Free Press.
- Sloan, V.J.; L.A. Jason; and E. Addlesperger (1996): "Social Networks Among Inner-City Minority Women." *Education* 117 (2): 194-199.
- Smith, J. (1999): "Cleaning Up Public Housing By Sweeping Out the Poor." *Habitat International* 23 (1): 49-62.
- Smith, M.D. and N. Morra (1994): "Obscene and Threatening Telephone Calls to Women: Data from a Canadian National Survey." *Gender & Society* 8: 584-596.
- Smith, M.W. (1999): *Abuse and Work Among Poor Women: Evidence from Washington State*. Washington, D.C.: The Medstat Group. Unpublished Report. Available at <http://www.ssw.umich.edu/trapped/sl-smith.pdf>.

- St. Jean, P.K.B. (1998): "Elaborating Collective Efficacy as it Relates to Neighborhood Safety." Unpublished manuscript. Department of Sociology, University of Chicago.
- Stanko, E.A. (1985): *Intimate Intrusions: Women's Experiences of Male Violence*. London: Routledge.
- Statistics Canada (1996a): *Census 1996: Public Use Microdata File*. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada (1996b): *Census Tract Electronic Boundary File*. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada (1996c): *Enumeration Area Electronic Boundary File*. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada (1991): *Census 1991: Public Use Microdata File*. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada (1986): *Census 1986: Public Use Microdata File*. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Strategic Research and Analysis and the Social Cohesion Network (2001): *Holding the Centre: What We Know About Social Cohesion*. Online Document. Available at <http://www.criteres.umontreal.ca/Stamley-communication-e.pdf>.
- Straus, M. (1979): "Measuring Intrafamily Conflict and Violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 41: 75-88.
- Straus, M.; R. Gelles; and S. Steinmetz (1981): *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family*. New York: Anchor.

- Straus, M.; S. Hamby; S. Boney-McCoy; and D. Sugarman (1995): *The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS-2 Form A)*. Durham N.H.: University of New Hampshire, Family Research Laboratory.
- Sullivan, M. (1989): *Getting Paid: Youth Crime and Work in the Inner City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Susser, I. (1998): "Inequality, Violence, and Gender Relations in a Global City: New York, 1986 - 1996." *Identities* 5 (2): 219-247.
- Taylor, L. (1994): "Unwelcome Companions." *Canada and the World Backgrounder* 60 (2): 23-25.
- Taylor, R. (2001): "The Ecology of Crime, Fear, and Delinquency: Social Disorganization Versus Social Efficacy." In R. Paternoster & R. Bachman, *Explaining Criminals and Crime*, Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury, 124-139.
- Taylor, R. (1998): "Crime and Small-Scale Places: What We Know, What We Can Prevent, and What Else We Need To Know." In *Crime and Place: Plenary Papers of the 1997 Conference on Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, 1-22.
- Taylor, R. (1997): "Social Order and Disorder of Street Blocks and Neighborhoods: Ecology, Microecology, and the Systemic Model of Social Disorganization." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 34 (1): 113-155.
- Taylor, R. and A. Harrell (1996): *Physical Environment and Crime*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Thomas, W. I. and F. Znaniecki (1958 [1918-20]): *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. 5 vols. Boston: Brager.

- Tienda, M. (1991): "Poor People and Poor Places: Deciphering Neighborhood Effects on Poverty Outcomes." In Joan Huber, ed., *Macro-Micro Linkages in Sociology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tjaden, P. and N. Thoennes (2000a): *Extent, Nature, and Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey. Research Report*. Washington, D.C./Atlanta, GA: National Institute of Justice/Center for Disease Control.
- Tjaden, P. and N. Thoennes (2000b): *Full Report of the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. Washington, D.C./Atlanta, GA: National Institute of Justice/Center for Disease Control.
- Tjaden, P. and N. Thoennes (1998): "Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey." Washington, D.C.: NIJ Research in Brief (November).
- Tolman, R. (1999): "Guest Editor's Introduction to the Special Issue on 'Welfare, Work, and Domestic Violence: Current Research and Future Directions for Policy and Practice.'" *Violence Against Women* 5 (4): 355-369.
- Tolman, R. and J. Raphael (2001): "Guest Editors' Introduction to the Special Issue on 'Welfare, Poverty, and Domestic Violence.'" *Violence Against Women* 7 (2): 123-
- Tolman, R. and J. Raphael (2000): "A Review of Research on Welfare and Domestic Violence." *Journal of Social Issues* 56 (4): 655-682.

- Tolman, R. and D. Rosen (2001): "Domestic Violence in the Lives of Women Receiving Welfare: Mental Health, Substance Dependence, and Economic Well-Being." *Violence Against Women* 7 (2): 141-158.
- Tomaszewski, A. (2001): Review of *The Hidden War: Crime and the Tragedy of Public Housing in Chicago* by Susan Popkin et al. (Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press), in *Violence Against Women* 7 (6).
- Tomaszewski, A. (1997): "Rethinking Inner-City Crime Research in Canada: Theoretical and Methodological Aspects." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Society of Criminology, San Diego, CA.
- Tomaszewski, I. (1993): "Preventing Adult Sexual Assault: Violence, Gender and Power, and the Role of Education." In P. Eastal (ed.), *Without Consent: Confronting Adult Sexual Violence*. Canberra, AUS: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Veenstra, G. (2001): "Social Capital and Health." *Isuma: Canadian Journal of Policy Research / Revue Canadienne de Recherches sur les Politiques* 2 (1): 72-81.
- Venkatesh, S.A. (2000): *American Project: The Rise and Fall of a Modern Ghetto*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Venkatesh, S.A. (1997a): "The Social Organization of Street Gang Activity in an Urban Ghetto." *American Journal of Sociology* 103 (1): 82-111.
- Venkatesh, S.A. (1997b): "The Three-Tier Model: How Helping Occurs in Urban, Poor Communities." *Social Service Review* 71 (4): 574-607.
- Veysey, B. and S. Messner (1999): "Further Testing of Social Disorganization Theory: An Elaboration of Sampson and Grove's "Community Structure and Crime"." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 36 (2): 156-174.

- Wacquant, L. (1999): "Urban Marginality in the New Millennium." *Urban Studies* 36 (10): 1639-1647.
- Wacquant, L. and W.J. Wilson (1989): "The Cost of Racial and Class Exclusion in the Inner City." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 501: 8-25.
- Walker, J. (1997): "Non-Linear Analysis for Neighborhood Research: A Theoretical, Model and Design." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences; Louisville, KY.
- Walker, L. (1984): *The Battered Woman*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Walklate, S. (1998): "Crime and Community: Fear or Trust?" *British Journal of Sociology* 49 (4): 550-569.
- Warner, B. and P.W. Rountree (1997): "Local Social Ties in a Community: Questioning the Systemic Nature of Informal Social Control." *Social Problems* 44 (4): 520-536.
- Weatherburn, D.; B. Lind; and S. Ku (1999): "'Hotbeds of Crime'? Crime and Public Housing in Urban Sydney." *Crime & Delinquency* 45: 256-271.
- Websdale, N. (2001): *Policing the Poor: From Slave Plantation to Public Housing*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Weis, L. (2001): "Race, Gender, and Critique: African-American Women, White Women, and Domestic Violence in the 1980s and 1990s." *Signs* 27 (1): 139-169.
- Weisburd, D. and T. McEwen (eds.), (1997): *Crime Mapping and Crime Prevention*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

- Welsh, B. and C. Roy (1996): *Safer Social Habitat: North American and European Meeting on Preventing Crime in Public Housing Communities*. Ottawa, ON: Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation.
- White, J. and M. Koss (1991): "Courtship Violence: Incidence in a National Sample of Higher Education Students. *Violence & Victims* 6: 247-256.
- Wilkinson, R.G. (1998): "Mortality, the Social Environment, Crime and Violence." *Sociology of Health and Illness* 20 (5): 578-597.
- Williams, C. and J. Windebank (2000): "Self-Help and Mutual Aid in Deprived Urban Neighbourhoods: Some Lessons from Southampton." *Urban Studies* 37 (1): 127-147.
- Williams, J.C. (1998): "Domestic Violence and Poverty: The Narratives of Homeless Women." *Frontiers* 19 (2): 143-165.
- Wilson, W.J. (1996): *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Knopf.
- Wilson, W.J. (1987): *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Woolcock, M. (2001): "The Place of Social Capital in Understanding Social and Economic Outcomes." *Isuma: Canadian Journal of Policy Research / Revue Canadienne de Recherches sur les Politiques* 2 (1): 11-17.
- Yoshihama, M. (1999): "Domestic Violence Against Women of Japanese Descent in Los Angeles: Two Methods of Estimating Prevalence." *Violence Against Women* 5 (8): 869-897.
- Zorbaugh, H. (1961 [1926]): "The Natural Areas of the City." In G. Theodorson, ed., *Studies in Human Ecology*, New York: Harper and Row, 45-49.