

**Crime Prevention Through Social
Development:**

A RESOURCE GUIDE

The John Howard Society of Alberta

1995

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our greatest thanks go to the Board and staff of the Wild Rose Foundation. Not only did they have the courage to fund our vision, but they provided encouragement and allowed flexibility along the way.

Thanks also to the many community groups and agencies with whom we connected throughout the course of the project. Their generosity with their time and expertise are greatly appreciated. It is hoped that these materials will offer something back to those who gave so freely to us.

Finally, we acknowledge the staff and volunteers of the John Howard Societies in Alberta. Their valuable advice on community development and working locally is appreciated.

Table of Contents

PART I: THE THEORY

INTRODUCTION	1
The Challenge	1
What Is Long Term Prevention?	2
The Resource Guide	3
Purpose of the Guide	3
Who Could Use the Guide?	3
CHAPTER 1 - Crime in Canada: An Overview	6
A Caution About Statistics	6
Who Is Committing Crime?	7
Persistent and Occasional Offenders	9
Factors Associated with Persistent Crime	9
Factors Associated with Occasional Crime	12
Who are the Victims of Crime?	14
Personal Victimization	14
Household Victimization	14
The Social Costs of Crime	15
CHAPTER 2 - Crime Prevention through Social Development	19
Crime Prevention	19
Situational Crime Prevention	19
Crime Prevention through Social Development	20
What Does a CPSD Program Look Like?	21
How CPSD Fits into the Overall Prevention Picture	23
Risk Factors and Crime	23
Age	25
Gender	27
Poverty	28
Measuring poverty	29
Poverty and crime	31
Family Disruption and Peer Influence	33
Violence	34
Parenting	35
Negative peer influences	36
Race	39
CHAPTER 3 - Who Is Committed to CPSD?	41
Internationally	41
Nationally	43

The Role of the Federal Government	44
Provincially	45
The Role of Provincial Governments	45
Municipally/Locally	46
The Role of Municipal Governments	47
PART II: THE PRACTICE	
CHAPTER 4 - Making Change: The Impact of CPSD	50
Values, Attitudes and Expectations	50
Policy and Planning	54
Decision-making and Distribution of Power	56
Organizational Structure	59
Evaluation	63
Developing an Evaluation Framework	65
CHAPTER 5 - Planning and Implementing CPSD	67
Educate and Raise Awareness	68
Understanding Crime and CPSD	68
Seeing Your Work as Crime Prevention	69
Identify Your Vision	70
Form Partnerships	71
Elements of the Partnership Environment	72
Suggestions for Partnering	73
Design Your Project	74
Take Inventory	75
Implement Your Project	76
Edmonton Safer Cities Initiatives	76
Other Examples	78
Boyle-McCauley Community Action Project	78
Children and Families Initiative	79
Conclusion	80
References	82

INTRODUCTION

The Challenge

Crime is, by no means, at epidemic proportions in Canada. Nonetheless, there is growing concern among the public that crime is out of control. Despite a significant infusion of resources into crime control,¹ violent crime in Canada (sexual assault, assault, robbery, homicide) has increased steadily since 1977 at an average annual rate of increase of 5%.² Property crime, though more cyclical, was one-third higher by 1992³ although it experienced a 6% decline in 1993.⁴ These crimes increased even though spending on federal and provincial corrections alone increased by over 32% between 1987-88 and 1991-92 to \$1.8 billion.⁵ Meanwhile, policing costs between 1987 and 1992 increased by over 42% to \$5.7 billion.⁶

People don't seem to feel significantly safer as a result of the efforts of the police, the courts and the corrections system. Two out of three Canadians maintain that by the year 2000 they will not feel safe walking around in Canadian cities; presently, 1 in 2 women and 2 in 3 elderly report that they feel unsafe on the streets of their own neighbourhoods at night.⁷ There is a growing concern among the public, legislators and those responsible for criminal justice and crime prevention that a more effective response to crime is needed in Canada.

Some maintain that the solution lies with tougher laws, harsher punishment and longer prison sentences. Some believe it is important to implement long term, preventive alternatives which focus on stopping crime before it happens. Internationally, nationally and locally, there has been a significant surge of interest in long term, social development-based crime prevention approaches.⁸

What Is Long Term Prevention?

The long term prevention approach means investing in solutions that work to prevent problems before they arise. Crime prevention through social development (CPSD) is one such long term prevention approach. CPSD will not replace other crime prevention strategies, but instead would complement them.

Long term prevention, particularly CPSD, is based on partnerships and collaboration among agencies and groups responsible for dealing with the conditions that are associated with crime. This includes those responsible for planning and development, the family, health, employment and training, housing, social services, leisure activities, schools, the police and other sectors of the justice system.⁹ However, saying that CPSD is a feasible crime prevention alternative is one thing; making it a reality is yet another. For the public, it will involve a long and sometimes painstaking process of changing our knowledge, attitudes and expectations of crime and crime prevention. Meanwhile, the agencies and organizations involved in planning and implementing long term prevention strategies may well face having to make fundamental changes, not only to what they do but how they do it.

The John Howard Society of Alberta CPSD Project was created to develop an information package for government and non-government organizations, especially at the local level, committed to implementing long term prevention strategies. Funded by a grant from the Wild Rose Foundation of Alberta, the main tasks of this project have been to research and produce two documents about CPSD: a comprehensive literature review and this Resource Guide.

The Resource Guide

Purpose of the Guide

The purpose of the Resource Guide is to help transform the theory of crime prevention through social development into action. The Guide will not necessarily introduce any new ideas and information about CPSD. The challenge, especially for those whose time and resources are already spread thin, is knowing what to look for and how to find it quickly. The Guide pulls together some of the most useful and relevant information into one place. If you don't find what you need in the Guide itself, you will find suggestions on where to look or whom to ask.

There is no one clear set of rules or guidelines on how to implement CPSD initiatives. However, there are certain issues that will inevitably arise and need to be taken into account when considering the implementation of CPSD initiatives. The Guide will identify and discuss these issues as well as provide background on the concept of CPSD itself. We caution that the Guide will not provide a specific answer or formula for implementing CPSD initiatives. It will not prescribe what to do. The power is in your hands; you will know what to do.

Who Could Use the Guide?

Direct local community involvement and leadership are mainstays of the CPSD approach, so the Guide was devised very much with local government and non-government agencies in mind. However, given the highly collaborative and multiple focus nature of CPSD programs, use of the Guide is by no means restricted to that sector. The Guide would also function not so much as a blueprint but as a reference point for those wanting to work with the systems and agencies already in place to collaboratively implement CPSD initiatives.

PART I:

THE THEORY

CHAPTER 1

Crime in Canada: An Overview

Although Canada can pride itself on being a relatively safe country in comparison with the United States, its rate of violent crime is still higher than many other industrialized countries.¹ While violent crime has been on the increase, is more feared by the public and receives more media attention, property offences have also increased and still make up the largest number of crimes reported in Canada. The 1993 statistics on reported crime reflect some of the main characteristics of the overall crime situation in Canada:

! The 1993 crime rate (incidents per 100,000 population) was 13% higher than the rate a decade ago.²

! Violent crime accounted for 10% of reported criminal code incidents in 1993.³

! Over the past decade, the rate of violent crime increased at a relatively steady pace of 5% annually.⁴

! The rate of youths charged with violent crimes in 1993 increased by only 6%, compared to an increase of 21% in 1989 and 19% in 1991.⁵

! Minor assaults (not involving a weapon or serious physical injury) accounted for 59% of violent crimes reported.⁶

! Property crimes (theft, breaking and entering, fraud, possession of stolen property) accounted for 53% of reported crime.⁷

A Caution About Statistics

It has been said that if you torture a statistic long enough it will tell you anything. This is no less true for the official crime statistics so often used to highlight discussions about crime and crime prevention. Most

official crime statistics do have limitations and must be used with a certain amount of caution. This is not to say that statistics have no use, but it is important to use them more as reference points or indicators than as definitive, irrefutable proof of fact. A main reason official crime statistics are limited is that they reflect only the crimes reported to authorities (apparent crime) and so they do not provide a measure of all crimes actually committed. This renders a whole dimension of actual criminal activity invisible because:

- ! not all crime victims report to the police;
- ! police charging policies can differ;
- ! societal values change, and;
- ! bias exists in the gathering and interpretation of statistics.

There are several points to keep in mind when using statistics:

- ! Avoid using a statistic in isolation, no matter how accurate the mathematics might be.
- ! Assess the numbers in the context of time, location and prevalent social and economic conditions.
- ! Be aware of who is interpreting and presenting the statistics--ask yourself to what extent the statistics presented reflect the assumptions, values and priorities of the presenter concerning crime and crime prevention.⁸

Who Is Committing Crime?

If statistics are any indication, young male adults between the ages of 18 and 34 make up the largest single sector of the population charged with violent and property offences in Canada. Male youths aged 12 to 17 years account for the next largest group accused of violent and property crimes.⁹ Consider the following statistics:

! In 1993, 85% of all persons charged with minor assault, assault with a weapon, assault causing bodily harm and aggravated assault were male and 13% were youths (the majority of which (71%) were also male).¹⁰

! In 1993, 98% of persons charged with sexual assault incidents were males and 15% were youths.¹¹ Of all persons charged with break and enter as the most serious offence, 94% were male and 40% were youths.¹²

! The charge rate for youths has been much higher and has increased faster than the charge rate for adults. In 1986, the youth charge rate was 51 per 1000 youths - 2.2 times the adult rate of 23. By 1992, the youth charge rate had increased to 63 per 1000 youths, 2.5 time the adult rate of 25. However, comparison of youth and adult charge rates should be made with caution as the adult group includes older people who generally commit few crimes. In fact, adult criminal court data indicate that more than half of adult crimes are committed by individuals younger than 35. The young adult (18-34) charge rate is possibly as high as the youth charge rate.¹³

The increased rate and number of youths charged with crimes since 1986 is influenced by several factors. Canadians have become increasingly concerned about youth crime. The media has also given greater attention to youth crime, particularly violent incidents. Youth crime units have been established by many police agencies; as a result, reporting methods for youths charged may have improved. This heightened sensitivity to youth violence and the greater resources for detecting crimes committed by young people may account for the apparent increases in rate and number of youths charged with crimes. The actual level of youth crime may not have increased to the extent that the statistics would suggest.¹⁴

Persistent and Occasional Offenders

Devising effective crime prevention policies and strategies involves knowing who is committing crimes and why. There are two distinct categories of crimes and criminals: occasional and persistent. Knowing the factors that differentiate the infrequent and frequent offender is important in being able to assess the impact of social development strategies.

Occasional crime tends to be sporadic, comparatively less serious and is usually associated with adolescents. Many people commit one or two delinquent acts in their lifetime; self-report surveys indicate that about 80% of adolescents participate in occasional crimes at some time or another.¹⁵ Persistent crime, on the other hand, tends to involve a variety of offences and often results in a criminal lifestyle that begins early and continues into adulthood. Studies show that a small number of persistent offenders are usually responsible for the majority of crimes. A longitudinal study of males born in Philadelphia in a particular year showed that 6% of those studied were responsible for 52% of the crimes committed. A 1989 Canadian study on multiple recidivism found similar results.¹⁶

Factors Associated with Persistent Crime

There are three major factors that differentiate persistent and occasional offenders. First, persistent offenders become involved in more crime at an earlier age. Second, they continue their involvement in criminal activity longer. Third, persistent offenders they engage in a wide range of criminal activities. One study found that on average, the regular clients of one Canadian court started committing crimes at age 11, were sentenced for the first time around age 15 and that the crimes they committed tended to increase in seriousness.¹⁷

The early life of persistent offenders is also often characterized by family violence and neglect, a neighbourhood environment that includes inadequate housing conditions, difficulties in school and youth

unemployment. Another element often, although not always, present in the early lives of persistent offenders is poverty--a state of economic and social deprivation which aggravates other factors that can increase the risk of persistent criminal behaviour.¹⁸

These children and adults go out believing that the system and the world is against them. They see crime as survival. That's all they're doing--doing the best they can with what they've got.
Sharon Laton, Norwood Community Services

! *Family violence and neglect.*

The family history of persistent offenders is often characterized by parental neglect and discipline which is either inconsistent or excessively physical. Having a parent involved in criminal behaviour, alcohol or drug abuse, and marital conflict, especially during the child's adolescence, also greatly increase the risk of persistent criminal behaviour.¹⁹ Social and technological changes have also created more isolation in the family than there used to be. This increases the risk of family violence, which research indicates can be a factor in the incidence of persistent criminal behaviour. These social and technological changes include: movement away from extended family networks and rural communities to the anonymity of large urban areas; more people living alone and dealing with stress on their own, and; time spent sharing problems being replaced by time spent watching television.²⁰

! *The neighbourhood.*

A neighbourhood characterized by poor housing, lack of recreational, health and educational services and isolation resulting from the disintegration of community supports increases the risk of its members becoming involved in persistent criminal behaviour. In economically and socially deprived neighbourhoods, the concentration of misfortune, the absence of community cohesiveness and support and the enforced idleness of chronic unemployment pulls young people into a downward spiral of discontent, anger and violence that can result in persistent criminal behaviour.²¹

! *Difficulties in school.*

Self-esteem and emotional problems can also result from having difficulty coping with school. A Canadian study found that negative school experiences are a major risk factor in the development of delinquent behaviour and later adult criminality.²² Programs such as the Perry Preschool Program have demonstrated the differences they can make in the lives of children likely to experience difficulties in school. It has been found that graduates of the Perry Preschool Program engage in fewer delinquent activities than children in a control group.²³

! *Youth unemployment and blocked opportunities.*

For visible minority and disadvantaged youth whose delinquency becomes persistent offending, unemployment is yet another setback in a long line of rejections that began in their early school years. Although national unemployment rates do not show a link between unemployment and crime rates, such a link would likely be found for disadvantaged youth.²⁴

! *Poverty.*

Poverty does not make persistent criminal behaviour inevitable. However, poverty does magnify the impact of many of the other risk factors associated with crime, such as family violence and neglect and difficulty with school. Researchers take increasing care to avoid simplistic correlations which equate poverty with crime. However, poverty continues to be linked to crime in a general sense, despite the inability of researchers to prove such a link exists at the individual level. The ghettoized nature of disadvantaged neighbourhoods often means that the risk factors interact more intensely simply because of the tendency of youths with similar problems to befriend one another. Given the tremendous influence of peers in childhood and adolescence, it is not surprising that peer pressure is a key factor in persistent delinquent behaviour.²⁵

Experience so far suggests that the most pressing priorities for social development initiatives would be those that target family violence, unemployed youth and communities and individuals living in poverty. Such CPSD initiatives might stand the best chance of having an impact on the incidence of persistent crime in the long term.

Factors Associated with Occasional Crime

The occasional offender is much more a creature of opportunity. Remove the opportunity and often the occasional offender won't carry out a crime. A persistent offender, on the other hand, would simply look for another target. Also, if the risk of confrontation or being seen is too great or there is not much worth taking, the occasional offender will not break into a residence. Research shows that break-in rates are lower in low income households which are frequently occupied and have visible entry points.²⁶ Other factors which affect the opportunities for occasional crime are:

! *Unattended residences.*

Changes in family, in the labour force and in leisure lifestyles mean that residences are more likely to be empty for longer periods of time . Unattended residences are likely targets for break-ins.²⁷

! *More accessible consumer goods.*

The microchip era has greatly enhanced opportunities for the occasional offender as well. Technology has made electronic gadgets such as televisions, cameras and personal computers for the home much more transportable.²⁸

! *Handguns.*

Studies showing the correlation between handgun ownership and the rate of homicides by handgun suggest strongly that making handguns harder to get reduces the opportunity to use them. This, in turn, can have a direct effect on the rate of occasional crime involving the violence born of handgun use.²⁹

Situational factors are largely responsible for occasional crime, as opposed to the socioeconomic factors usually connected with persistent crime. It is important to recognize, though, that the success of crime prevention initiatives will depend on how directly and effectively all of these factors are addressed. Long term prevention such as CPSD is a particularly useful method of addressing the socioeconomic factors usually associated with persistent crime.

Who are the Victims of Crime?

Personal Victimization

Personal victimization rates (theft of personal property, sexual assault, robbery, assault) indicate that young, urban dwellers report higher rates than older, rural Canadians.³⁰ Unlike results from previous research, the 1993 General Social Survey results indicate that females face greater risk of criminal violence (100 incidents per 1000 population) than do men (84 per 1000 population). While assault rates are very similar for males and females (68 and 66 per 1000 population respectively), females reported much higher rates of sexual assault (29 per 1000) than did males. Males, however, reported robbery rates twice those of females (12 versus 6 incidents per 1000 population respectively).³¹

The age distribution of victimization also varies depending on the type of crime. Canadians between the ages of 15 and 24 reported a personal victimization rate twice that of those 25-44 and over 4 times that of those aged 45-64. These differences become even more pronounced in the case of violent crime: those aged 15-24 are 5 times more likely to be a victim than those 45-64.³²

Household Victimization

Meanwhile, property crime or household victimization rates (break and enter, theft of household property, motor vehicle theft or attempts, and vandalism) vary according to location and economic status. The rates for household victimization are higher in urban areas than in rural areas. The household victimization rate rises steadily with household income, although the pattern varies somewhat across different types of victimizations. The total household victimization rate in urban areas was 66% higher than the rate for rural households and households with incomes of \$60,000 or more had victimization rates 65% higher than households with incomes of less than \$15,000.³³

The overall rates of both personal and household victimization generally stayed the same or decreased between 1988 and 1993. The general victimization picture sketched by the statistics indicates that women, urban dwellers, young Canadians and those participating in more evening activities report higher rates of personal victimization than men, rural dwellers, older Canadians and those engaged in fewer evening activities. The 1993 General Social Survey (GSS) indicated that 24% of Canadians were victims of at least one crime in the previous year.³⁴ This proportion was the same as that observed in 1988 when the GSS victimization survey was first conducted.³⁵

The Social Costs of Crime

The costs resulting from crime are both economic and social. Economic costs focus on the monetary consequences of crime, such as the costs of policing, the courts, corrections and the loss of property. Social costs are the non-monetary results of crime, which are often much harder to measure but whose impact can prove just as devastating.

Social costs are the damages inflicted on a crime victim in terms of physical injury, psychological trauma and feelings of mistrust, vulnerability and fear. The most concise and eloquent definition of social cost can often be found in the testimonial of a crime victim. Social costs can affect both an individual and society. It can also take a toll on the life of the offender as well as the victim. Social costs are difficult to measure because they are very personal; the way a crime generates mistrust, fear and vulnerability varies from person to person.

The emotional and psychological toll of crime on society as a whole is no less insidious. Widespread feelings of mistrust, fear and vulnerability in a community can lurk just beneath public opinion about crime and justice. Feelings of helplessness and anger, whether held by an individual or the public,

are often echoed in calls for tougher young offender legislation, boot camps, caning and curfews. Legislators take their cues about criminal justice and crime prevention policy from what they see as public opinion about crime. Unfortunately, public opinion is based on information drawn primarily from the media which focusses disproportionately on violent crimes that feed the public's biggest fears, and fascinations, with crime.

! *Physical injury.*

The physical injury resulting from a criminal act can range from loss of life to sexual assault. Accidents resulting from driving while legally impaired also add considerably to the annual toll of physical injuries stemming from criminal acts. A 1982 urban victimization survey conducted in Canada reported that crimes involving physical contact resulted in 50,500 nights of hospitalization and 404,700 days spent incapacitated.³⁶

! *Psychological trauma.*

The psychological and emotional effects of crime can last for years and are not always easily measured in monetary terms. They can take the form of the shock, grief and anger suffered by the family members of a murder victim. For the victim of sexual or physical assault, there can be long term emotional trauma which can result in the abuse of alcohol and drugs.³⁷

! *Fear of crime.*

The fear resulting from being a crime victim or even the possibility of being a victim is one of the most pervasive and destructive of the social costs of crime. Whether real or perceived, fear of crime can be a powerful force in determining the quality of life of both individuals and the community. For the individual victim of a crime, this fear can mean a significant and longlasting loss of trust in people and in the

environment in which they live. For some, this takes the comparatively constructive form of increased caution by following basic property and personal safety precautions. But for others, it can leave feelings of insecurity that lead to decisions which significantly alter their living habits, such as no longer going out in the evenings or using available services such as public transportation.³⁸

For the community and society as a whole, public fear of crime can be a powerful force in defining criminal justice policy. As with an individual, this fear can take a constructive form, such as the 1989 European and North-American Conference on Urban Safety and Crime Prevention. This conference proved to be a watershed point in what has become a growing commitment to the safer cities approach to crime prevention both nationally and locally. However, fear of crime can result in widespread feelings of insecurity and vulnerability in society, which perhaps accounts for why a 1989 survey indicated that the Canadian public tends to overestimate the number of repeat offenders. A Law Reform Commission study found that even though only 13% to 17% of first-time violent offenders were reconvicted, almost half of those polled estimated that between 60% and 100% of these offenders would recidivate. The public also tends to overestimate the recidivism rates of parolees. While about 13% of inmates released on parole are reconvicted of a violent crime, over 60% of respondents estimated this percentage to be between 40% and 100%. Finally, the public also believes that the offences increasing the most are violent offences such as murder, which get disproportionate media coverage.³⁹

For those embarking on the social development approach to crime prevention, understanding the social costs of crime is as important as understanding the economic costs. This is because both are concerned with quality of life. Social costs involve the lessening of the quality of life for either an individual

or society. CPSD is about improving quality of life, especially for those most at risk of offending. The impetus of CPSD initiatives often comes from a desire to alleviate the social costs of crime.

We're dealing with their depression. We're dealing with their anxiety. We're dealing with their symptoms. We're not dealing with their social problems. We keep saying, "Let somebody else deal with that."

Marg Brown, Alberta Health, Community and Mental Health

CHAPTER 2

Crime Prevention through Social Development

When trying to understand justice, it is necessary that we look at the crime first and the offender second. When trying to understand crime prevention however, we must also look at the offender. To prevent crime, we must understand what motivated the offender, what opportunities were available, and what circumstances, if they had been different, might have prevented the offence.¹

Crime Prevention

Crime prevention aims to reduce the future risk of crime. There are many kinds of crime prevention strategies, but most fall into two main categories: situational and social development.

Situational crime prevention aims to reduce the opportunities for offenders to commit crime, usually through such measures as law enforcement, corrections and increased personal or property security.

Situational crime prevention is also referred to as target hardening. Social development strategies are those geared toward improving the social and economic circumstances which increase the risk of an individual becoming a persistent offender.

Situational Crime Prevention

Traditionally, community crime prevention favoured the situational approach rather than social development measures. Situational crime prevention has usually been promoted and carried out in cooperation with the police. Some of the more well known community crime prevention efforts encourage public participation in situational prevention activities such as Crime Watch, Neighbourhood Watch and improved security precautions to protect persons and property. Despite the introduction of more community participation in crime prevention during the 1970s and 1980s, the police, the courts and corrections continue to be viewed as the mainstays of both crime control and crime prevention. For many, crime prevention still means bigger guard dogs, electronic security systems, more police and tougher crime

laws. Getting widespread support for the CPSD approach will have to involve broadening the public's perception to include activities it has not readily associated with crime prevention, such as proper housing, school meal programs and family violence initiatives.

Because the "cops, courts and corrections" approach comes into play once a crime has been committed, it has significant limitations in terms of being preventive.² The conventional crime control and prevention model:

- ! fails to cope with the actual quantity of crime;
- ! fails to identify many offenders and bring them to justice;
- ! fails to rehabilitate offenders who do go through the criminal justice system, and;
- ! fails to address the longer term, underlying factors associated with crime and criminality.

Crime Prevention through Social Development

Though not a new concept, CPSD is the focus of increasing interest among those responsible for crime prevention because it is proactive, long term and is guided by the social and economic factors associated with criminal behaviour. CPSD concerns itself only with keeping a crime from happening in the first place.

CPSD is a long term preventive approach which is inextricably bound to the very lives of those at risk because its goal is to improve their quality of life. To be effective, interventions would need to meet the changing needs which emerge in a participant's life over a number of years.

CPSD uses targeted, long term programs aimed specifically at alleviating the combinations of social and economic problems that can increase the risk of criminal behaviour. CPSD addresses a wide range of risk factors connected with crime through the efforts of various social development policies, programs

and services already in existence, such as social housing, education, health, income security and social services. Whatever measures are used, they need to be focussed on specific at-risk individuals and must operate in coordination with several other initiatives at the same time. This is because those most at risk of becoming involved in crime are often struggling with several problems. It is not unusual, for instance, to find the life of an at-risk youth characterized by unemployment, poverty, family violence, woman abuse, learning problems in school and substance abuse. The targeted, coordinated approach of CPSD programs is essential to being able to provide multiple solutions to such multiple problems.

Figure 3 - CPSD Is...

Proactive:	concerned with preventing crime before it happens.
Long term:	aims to improve the quality of life of those most at risk, so interventions must meet the changing needs that emerge in an at-risk person's life over a number of years.
Guided by social & economic factors:	initiates targeted, long term programs aimed at reducing the specific combinations of social and economic problems which can increase the risk of criminal behaviour.

What Does a CPSD Program Look Like?

It is the specific, targeted focus of its programs which makes CPSD different from the general social development programs of the past. Previously, advocates of the social approach to crime prevention argued that general social development programs directed toward the disadvantaged would reduce crime. However, these programs have not proven as effective as expected. More recent studies show that in order to prevent crime, social development programs must be designed to meet the specific needs of those most vulnerable. Ensuring general education for the disadvantaged is one example of a general social development program.

A CPSD-type initiative, on the other hand, would be designed to meet the specific needs of disadvantaged preschool children and their mothers. The Head Start and Perry Preschool programs are two examples of such programs already in operation in Canada. Another example of a targeted program geared for potentially high risk children is the Terra Association School in Edmonton, which allows teenage mothers to continue with their schooling, as well as get training in proper nutrition and parenting skills.

Specific CPSD program activities can vary greatly. However, there are some basic characteristics of a CPSD program which distinguish it from other social programs. A CPSD program would:

- ! *recognize that there is a connection* between specific social and economic conditions and an increased risk of becoming involved in crime;

- ! *target* specific groups or individuals which research has shown are more likely to be at risk of becoming involved in crime;

- ! *integrate* program delivery, which reflects the fact that those most at risk of becoming involved in crime are usually experiencing a combination of problems. The program would address more than one condition at the same time;

- ! *collaborate* with other agencies which have similar goals and with whom a common vision has been jointly built;

- ! *feature long term and short term goals and objectives*. The short and long term objectives would focus on the various factors that can contribute to crime, such as poverty, unemployment, family disruption, substance abuse and inadequate housing, and;

! *evaluate* the short term and long term impact of the program, which would also allow monitoring of the program's progress so that necessary adjustments can be made as participant needs change and evolve.

Figure 4 - A CPSD Program Must Be...

Targeted:	To prevent crime, the program must be designed to meet the specific needs of those most at risk.
Co-ordinated:	It must operate in close collaboration with other initiatives because those most at risk are often struggling with several problems at the same time.
Accessible:	Program resources and activities must be easy to find, easy to use and meet the needs of users rather than the needs of the program process or the sponsoring agencies.

How CPSD Fits into the Overall Prevention Picture

Crime prevention through social development does not function in isolation from the other types of crime prevention. For instance, a comprehensive crime prevention approach for a safer community could feature both situational and social development components. It would address the short term goal of protecting the public through the efforts of the police, courts and corrections, as well as the longer term goal of using targeted social programs to reduce the risk factors associated with criminal behaviour.

Risk Factors and Crime

"Causes" is not the most accurate word to use when talking about factors commonly associated with delinquent behaviour. A cause and effect mindset makes it too easy to assume that the existence of a risk factor inevitably leads to criminality. Besides raising significant ethical concerns, any CPSD program designed on the basis of such a simplistic assumption would be doomed to fail from the start.

The evolution of a connection between an individual's social and economic circumstances and criminal behaviour is far too complex and unpredictable to be attributed simply to cause and effect. Poverty does not cause crime--if it did, then it would be women, not men, making up 98% of the prison population in Canada. If poverty caused crime, white collar crime such as embezzlement or computer fraud and environmental crimes by industry would be non-existent. Nonetheless, poverty during childhood is a recurring theme in the stories of so many persistent offenders that it is considered a significant risk factor. While social factors can combine to increase the likelihood of a person becoming delinquent, experience has also shown that being poor, having a single mother and living in a disadvantaged area, for instance, still does not inevitably produce delinquent behaviour.

Research into risk factors and anti-social behaviour in children also emphasizes the importance of making a distinction between influence and cause. While behaviour problems in early childhood may influence future antisocial behaviour, such early behaviour problems do not necessarily cause later criminality.³ The route from disadvantaged child to delinquent youth is not a straight line. The complex problems of at-risk youth, for instance, have been described as "...a circle of antisocial and self-destructive behaviour. Young persons may enter the circle at any point, by using drugs, for example, or by committing petty crimes or dropping out of school. If they persist in such activity, however--if they remain on the circle--some or all of the other types of antisocial behaviour will begin to appear in their lives."⁴

Such descriptions not only emphasize the non-linear process of becoming delinquent, but the need for an equally non-linear and long term approach to crime prevention. How clearly this non-linear relationship between risk factors and potential criminality is understood and applied at the policy

development and program planning stages will determine how effective the implementation of CPSD initiatives will be in the long run.

There are many factors which can contribute to criminal behaviour, ranging from age and gender to diet and television violence. The Resource Guide will touch on five of these risk factors which are so often discussed in connection with CPSD: age, gender, poverty, family disruption and peer influence, and race. More information about some of the other major risk factors, such as chronic unemployment, difficulties with school, inadequate and unsafe housing and substance abuse can be found in the CPSD Literature Review.

Age

Statistics consistently show that particular age groups commit more offences than others. Being young has long been pointed to as one of the basic risk factors associated with crime. Although adults commit the majority of offences, youths aged 12 to 17 are disproportionately represented in the statistics for violent and property crime.⁵ This may partially explain why the public thinks youths commit the majority of violent and property crimes when, in fact, it is still young adults between 18 and 34 who commit the most crime.⁶ Media distortion of youth crime and the degree of public concern about youth crime contributes to the context in which age is related to crime. Further, methods for detecting and reporting youth crime have improved, so the actual level of youth crime may not have increased to the same degree that the statistics suggest.⁷

Age as a risk factor in connection with crime cannot be looked at in isolation. How age relates to crime must be looked at in the context in which youth crime occurs. This context can include the effects of poverty, racism, woman abuse and family violence, parental and community neglect and problems with

school. Age will continue to be considered a significant risk factor connected with crime. However, the effect that social development based prevention may have is to emphasize the importance of broadening the public's perception of the age-crime connection to automatically include young children. The tendency so far has been to equate the age factor with what official statistics indicate about crime committed by youths between 12 and 17 years. However, research into what generates persistent offending has particularly emphasized the need to focus crime prevention efforts on a child's earliest years. Many persistent delinquents begin their involvement in anti-social activities before adolescence.⁸ Further, studies show that 80% of crimes are carried out by about 20% of offenders, most of whom are repeat or persistent offenders.⁹

This means that CPSD efforts with the best chance of success in the long term will be those aimed at altering the early childhood experiences which increase the risks of criminal behaviour later in life. The importance to crime prevention of the proper care of children early in life was emphasized in presentations to a federal government Standing Committee dealing with the development of a national crime prevention strategy:

...if we don't do it right in the earliest years--and I put that figure at three years; other people put it at two or five--when affection and the capacity to respond to affection are learned, then a vigorous system of trying later on to stamp on social values that are crime-free is doomed. You have to have people who are nurtured to do that.¹⁰

Gender

It is almost impossible to talk about age as a risk factor without referring to the role that gender plays. Males are over-represented in the official crime statistics in proportion to Canada's overall population. While males comprise only 49% of the population, they consistently account for a significant majority of both the adults and youths accused of property and violent crimes. Although the number of females being charged is increasing, males still account for most of the adults and youths charged with property and violent offences (see Figure 5 - Female Offenders). When researchers and those responsible for criminal justice and crime prevention are talking about delinquency, or age and gender as risk factors, they are invariably talking about the effects of being young and male.

While demographic information about age and gender is comparatively easy to find, equally well-documented information about why being male constitutes a basic risk factor associated with crime is far less copious. However, the Canadian Council on Social Development points out that:

Crime usually involves aggression, risk-taking, and predatory behaviour. Although there is some overlap between the sexes on aggressivity, research indicates that males are more aggressive than females due to both biological differences and the influences of social learning.¹¹

As with age, gender cannot be assessed as a risk factor in isolation from other circumstances that may exist in the lives of children and young adults. Indeed a review of past and present delinquency literature revealed that the risk factors are the same for male and female delinquency.¹² Pinpointing the "influences of social learning" is impossible without considering the risk factors of woman abuse and family violence, for instance. Nor is it possible to talk about gender without looking at the impact of poverty and racism. Getting away from looking at risk factors in isolation is even more pressing for CPSD, where the

effectiveness of initiatives relies so heavily on being targeted to meet the specific needs of certain vulnerable at-risk groups.

Figure 5 - Female Offenders

Fewer female youths than male youths are accused of offences, but the increase in the number of female youths charged is greater than that for males since 1986. The largest number of charges against female youths are for theft under \$1,000, most of which involve shoplifting.¹³ Minor assaults, break and enter and bail violations are also common charges.¹⁴ Females appearing in youth court are generally younger than male youths brought before the court.¹⁵

Poverty

Poverty...is fundamentally about inequality, exclusion, powerlessness and humiliation. Although money is crucial, poverty is also a question of relationships and rights; a question of how people are treated.¹⁶

What do we mean by "poverty?" How we define poverty determines how it is measured and the types of policies and programs developed to deal with its effects. This is no less the case when developing CPSD-type programs. The three basic definitions of poverty in use are absolute poverty, relative poverty and exclusionary poverty.

Absolute poverty is defined as living without the most basic resources for survival such as food, shelter and clothing. Starvation is the basic measure in this definition.¹⁷ For families living in absolute poverty, the sole daily preoccupation is the struggle to find enough food and water to survive another day. The tendency has been to maintain that absolute poverty is exceedingly rare in a country like Canada. Yet, the number of people living on the streets is growing and while it is known that people are dying from starvation and inadequate shelter, especially during Canadian winters, the number of these casualties remains unknown.¹⁸

Relative poverty is defined as families and individuals whose income and other resource levels are scant in comparison to the majority of people in Canadian society.¹⁹ The number of people living in relative poverty fluctuates with economic conditions. The measure of relative poverty is the number of people living below a certain percentage of the average income level of the rest of the country. This arbitrary measure can mask the real circumstances in which many "poor" people are living, because income is not an accurate indicator of quality of life. While low income may not result in starvation, it can negatively affect development and future opportunities, barring impoverished persons from full participation in society.²⁰

Exclusionary poverty is defined as being excluded from our society's basic living requirements and opportunities.²¹ Exclusionary poverty more accurately depicts the quality of life of people living in poverty because it transcends simple economic considerations. It looks at an individual's access to transportation, health care and a nutritious diet and at their opportunities for socializing and participating in community life.²²

Measuring poverty.

A family spending on average more than 57% of its income on food, clothing and shelter is defined as "poor" by Statistics Canada.²³ This Low-Income Cut-Off measure is the most widely accepted relative poverty measure and it varies by family size, by region and by rural or urban location.²⁴ Low-Income Cut-Off figures are also called "poverty lines" in many reports, even though Statistics Canada no longer calculates poverty lines.

Another often-used method of measuring the poverty level calculates the incidence of poverty in a specific year. However, this gives an incomplete picture of poverty in Canada because it looks only at a few characteristics of poverty over a short time. The Economic Council of Canada carried out a study

to find out about the poverty that families experience over time, which is a perspective usually concealed by traditional poverty measuring methods.²⁵

The five-year study revealed that those living in poverty, as a group, are a changing segment of society. There were significantly large turnovers in the number of people becoming poor and escaping from poverty. A large number of Canadians moved out of poverty between 1982 and 1986, an average of 27.4% of those defined as poor (about 410,000 adults and their dependents) each year. However, they were replaced each year by about 4.3% of the non-poor or 400,000 other Canadians.²⁶ Changes in job status and family structure, such as marriage, separation or starting a family, were the main events that caused this movement into and out of poverty. For families where employment earnings were the main source of income:

- ! the risk of poverty for a family with one person employed leapt from 4.6% to 26.9% if that person became unemployed;
- ! a poor family without employment income had a 19.4% chance of moving out of poverty, but that chance increased to 41% when a family member found employment, and;
- ! for those who are married with children, the risk of poverty rose from 3.1% to 37.6% after divorce or separation.²⁷

The study also showed that the duration of the poverty was not the same for everybody. Forty-five percent of the families studied remained poor for the five years of the study. Only about 12% were poor for one year only, while a fairly large number (43%) moved in and out of poverty several times. One of the more disturbing results of the study was the disproportionate number of older single people and single-parent families who made up those experiencing long-term poverty.²⁸

Poverty is not a one-size-fits-all phenomenon. While some Canadians experience long-term poverty, others move out of poverty after a relatively short period. This has considerable implications for the planning and development of CPSD-type programs. The social and economic difficulties faced by people with inadequate income year after year are different from those experienced by people who are poor for a year or two. An effective CPSD program must address the different needs of these two groups.²⁹

Poverty and crime.

Research into the relationship between poverty and crime has yielded inconsistent results. Even studies using unemployment or the poverty line as measures show inconsistent results.³⁰ The relationship between poverty and criminal behaviour is complex and unpredictable. There are too many variables involved and such a variety of different ways individuals cope with poverty that it is not possible to talk of poverty strictly in terms of being a causal factor.

However, history has shown that many of the conditions arising from living in poverty can increase the risk of becoming involved in crime, especially for children. These conditions include poor nutrition and health, problems with school, child abuse and neglect, family violence, living in low income housing projects, inconsistent or poor parenting skills, psychological disorders and early childhood behavioural disorders. Additional factors include the effects of chronic stress, frustration, humiliation and rage over the economic and social costs of living in poverty.

*I think a lot of crime, particularly among youth, is a result of children being bored, lonely, isolated. And that all ties in with poverty.
Ina Flipsen, Neighbourhood Activity Association of Belvedere*

That those living in poverty continue to be over-represented in Canada's crime statistics tends to say more about the criminal justice system and how it keeps official statistics than it says about any link between poverty and crime. Juvenile delinquency, for instance, is not exclusive to poor or working class youth. Self-report studies of adolescents indicate that at least 90% of high school boys engage in some delinquent behaviour.³¹ What makes it easier for people to believe that impoverished youth are responsible for the youth crime problem is the fact that the majority of incarcerated young persons are from poor families. However, this only represents those caught and incarcerated, not the overall youth population that commits crime.³² Why youths from low income families make up a larger proportion of the statistics on juvenile offenders is still the subject of much debate. Reasons given range from the criminal justice system's inherent inequity and discrimination against the disadvantaged to an inevitable, cumulative effect of various stresses that result from living in poverty. Also, middle and upper income youth have access to more money and parental supervision. A youth from a low income family may have less parental supervision because of the time constraints experienced by a working single parent. This youth is also less likely to have the money to participate in school sports or community recreation activities, so would be more susceptible to dropping out of school. Poor families also experience greater difficulty raising children, as low income often deprives the family of many opportunities and necessities associated with basic child rearing.³³

Continued economic hardship, combined with health problems resulting from malnourishment and chronic stress, puts strains on family relationships that may lead to family breakdown. This, in turn, can further add to the stress from the difficulties of a sole parent trying to raise children. Unsatisfactory living conditions are particularly stressful during pregnancy. Fetal development is negatively affected by maternal

stress. Such stress has shown to be closely related to ill-health, neurological problems, slow development and behaviour disturbances in children.³⁴

The CPSD programs with the greatest chance of making a difference in the long run will be those which target those most vulnerable to living in poverty and the multitude of problems arising from it. This will mean designing initiatives specifically for those experiencing such problems as poor nutrition and health, child abuse and neglect, woman abuse and family violence, poor parenting skills, inadequate and unsafe housing and poor school performance. It will also mean challenging the stigma and blame society has traditionally placed on those living in poverty.

Figure 7 - Who is Most At Risk of Living in Poverty?

Single-parent women, older single women and young families with children under 18 are at the greatest risk of living in poverty. A full 58.4% of single-parent families headed by women are poor and 45.2% of single women over the age of 65 are poor. Couples younger than 65 with children under 18 come a close second to single-parent women among the total of poor families.³⁵ Also, between 1986 and 1990 when the average income of all families in Canada increased by 4%, that for young families declined by 9%.³⁶

Child poverty occurs when parents are poor. In 1992, about 18% of children under age 18 in Canada were living in poverty. The child poverty rate has fluctuated somewhat since 1980, hitting a high of 19.6% in 1984 and a low of 14.5% in 1989.³⁷

A main factor increasing the risk of poverty for young families is changes in sources of income. Young families' employment declined between 1986 and 1990. There was a simultaneous increase in proportion of income young families derived from sources such as social assistance. This change in sources of income emphasizes a growing vulnerability of young families to changes in social policies.³⁸

Family Disruption and Peer Influence

Family disruption does not in itself cause crime, but it can combine with other stresses to increase the risk of becoming involved in crime. Family does not have to refer solely to a family unit defined by marriage, blood or expediency. It can also include the close network of friends and acquaintances that

make up an individual's peer group. While family disruption takes many forms, there seem to be three primary sources: violence, inadequate parenting and negative peer influences.

Violence.

As the long held public silence around family violence gradually lifts, the effects of woman abuse and child abuse on a youngster's risk of becoming involved in crime become more apparent. Violence against women within the family has a negative impact on both the woman and her children. One Canadian study found that over 50% of violent young offenders witnessed spousal abuse in the home. Another study found that men who grew up witnessing violence in the home were 1000 times more likely to become abusers of women later in life than men who did not.³⁹ A federal government Standing Committee dealing with developing a crime prevention strategy for Canada acknowledged that violence against women "poses significant risks to the community."⁴⁰ As one researcher into the dynamics of family violence put it:

Childhood abuse breeds abusers... (sic) abused children are three times more likely than the rest of the population to become violent adults. Physically abused children are five times as likely to be violent as adults towards a family member. Sexually abused children are eight times as likely to be sexually violent as adults towards a family member. And severity of childhood abuse does not predict adult problems... (sic) It's not how badly you were beaten. It's whether you were beaten.⁴¹

Sexual abuse also plays a part in increasing the odds of a child later committing sexual offences. A Manitoba study found that over 90% of the 35 young sex offenders studied were sexually abused as children. When they began committing offences the boys were, on average, aged 12.5. Over 70 children were abused by the 35 boys in 750 incidents by the time the boys reached age 14.⁴²

The available statistics seem to suggest that child abuse, especially child neglect, occurs disproportionately among those living in poverty. However, considerable controversy exists over the association between poverty and child abuse. Some maintain that the material and emotional deprivation

inherent in poverty increases the risk of physical child abuse and neglect. However, others suggest that the high statistical correlation between child abuse and poverty is due to the lack of privacy in the lives of low-income families. They say research over-uses reports from the public agencies which are used extensively by those living in poverty. The reason middle and upper income people are under-represented in the statistics may be because they are better able to maintain their privacy.⁴³ The elements of this controversy could also provide a clue as to why the poor, the young and the non-white are over-represented in the crime statistics.

I think people who have been abused as kids will tend to be highly involved with the criminal justice system. It's the way they learned to cope.
Barry Goble, Yellowhead Youth Centre

Parenting.

Lack of parental supervision, parental rejection and lack of parent-child involvement are consistent indicators of delinquent behaviour. Parenting that features inconsistent, overly punitive or too permissive methods of discipline also increase the risk of delinquency, but to a lesser extent. Parental criminality, marital discord, having a single parent and parental health were even less influential, with the least powerful correlate to delinquent behaviour being family size.⁴⁴

Delinquency is by no means the only outcome of ineffective parenting. If it was, criminal behaviour would be seen as a norm not an exception. There are other significant negative effects that are hard to measure. They range from anxiety, fear, anger, hate, apathy and depression to paranoia, multiple personalities and woman abuse.⁴⁵ However, most of the existing research into the factors contributing to delinquency and adult criminal behaviour carry a similar and important message: parenting is crucial. The

way children are treated can have serious repercussions, not only for children, but for parents and the larger society.⁴⁶

Some researchers portray children as an oppressed minority. Oppression is defined as the abuse of authority. The oppression of children continues from one generation to the next because its damage is not recognized. Recognizing childhood oppression and abuse is an essential step toward being able to solve the problems resulting from oppressive parenting.⁴⁷

What the research has to say about the importance of parenting indicates that a significant focus of long term prevention strategies must include providing support for families, especially for those family members primarily responsible for the care of children. At the community level, this support for family members can take in a wide range of programs and initiatives.

Negative peer influences.

The belief that delinquent youth associate with each other is a point of agreement among most researchers exploring how negative peer influences contribute to delinquent behaviour. However, the questions which are still a source of considerable disagreement are:

- ! What exactly are the links between negative peer influence and delinquency?
- ! Are the friendships and associations between delinquents and their peers different from those of non-delinquent youth?
- ! What part, if any, do parenting factors play in determining the type of peers with whom a youth will associate?

The most popular interpretation of the relationship between parenting, peers and delinquency is that ineffective parenting encourages youth to associate with peers who teach them the attitudes that lead to their

becoming involved in criminal behaviour. Some theorists argue that negative peer influence in itself is a primary factor associated with delinquent behaviour and that parenting has only an indirect influence.⁴⁸ Attempts to understand just how peer influence relates to delinquency and how, if at all, peer relationships between delinquent and non-delinquent youth differ have resulted in three particularly widespread ideas.

One such idea is called the "peer influence perspective."⁴⁹ According to this perspective, young people are influenced by the values and behaviour of their peers. It is inadequate parental supervision and discipline which allows adolescents to associate with friends who have a negative influence on them. The peer influence perspective holds that delinquents do not really differ in the number or quality of peer relationships. What is different are the types of behaviours which are encouraged and rewarded within those peer relationships.⁵⁰

A second theory about how peer influence contributes to delinquency holds a considerably different view from that of the peer influence perspective. The "control perspective" holds that inadequate parenting causes some adolescents to be impulsive, self-absorbed and daring, so they are more attracted to activities that involve delinquent behaviour. In this theory, inadequate parenting directly contributes to delinquency. The control perspective also contends that the quality of friendships among delinquents is different from those of non-delinquents. Youths who are impulsive, daring and insensitive are enjoyable companions but they are unreliable and untrustworthy. So, the theorists maintain there is less trust and support among delinquent youths than non-delinquent.⁵¹

A third theory regarding the relationships that exist between parenting, negative peer influence and delinquency offers a compromise to the contrasting contentions of the other two theories. This theory maintains that the development of delinquent behaviour differs for early and late starters. Early starters are

youths who take part in delinquent acts before age 14 and who are seen as having poor social skills because of inadequate parenting. They are aggressive and uncooperative with others, which tends to leave them rejected by their law-abiding peers. Thus, they are driven to associate with deviant peers.⁵² Late starters, on the other hand, do not engage in delinquent behaviour until after age 14. These adolescents have better social skills. They experiment with delinquency in late adolescence when rebellious behaviour is common. Their delinquent behaviour is attributed to negative peer pressure. These youth are seen to have experienced a deterioration in parenting quality due to family crises such as divorce or unemployment. This deterioration facilitates these youths' association with deviant peers and their experimental delinquency.⁵³

According to this model, early starters are at risk of career criminality, whereas late starters tend to grow out of criminal behaviour fairly quickly. The early starter idea is compatible with the control theory because it maintains that inadequate parenting fosters antisocial behaviour and that the relationships with delinquent peers tend to be turbulent and aggressive. The late starter theory, meanwhile, is in keeping with the peer influence perspective because disrupted parenting is seen to contribute only indirectly to delinquency. Also, late starters have adequate social skills and therefore have friendships that do not differ in quality from those of non-delinquent youth.⁵⁴

The testing of these theories could provide information vital to the implementation of CPSD initiatives. For instance, the early starter-late starter perspective indicates that there are different routes to delinquency and that delinquent youths may have very different personal characteristics. This has implications for what types of supports and prevention programs are needed. These theories can also

provide valuable information about who is most at risk and at what stage of a child's life that targeted intervention and support would be most effective.

Race

Talking about race or ethnicity as a factor associated with crime means making it a discussion about racism. Being of a particular race or ethnic group is not the problem. The problem is the fundamentally racist society within which non-white races and ethnic groups are living. Many of society's major institutions which have considerable influence on the quality of people's lives--the law, education, governments, media--were originally set up with structures and attitudes that would ensure that non-white races and ethnic groups were excluded. Most of these institutions have yet to undergo the kind of overhaul or total rebuilding needed to get rid of the racism which continues to keep so many people at an economic and social disadvantage. This disadvantage, in turn, greatly increases the risk of turning to crime as a way of coping.

The race/ethnic factors associated with crime are, in reality, the consequences of keeping people at a social and economic disadvantage. In Canada, Aboriginal people are grossly over-represented in prisons, are far more likely to be under-educated and under-trained and, consequently, are more likely to be chronically unemployed. The consequences of being exposed to the direct and indirect violence and neglect of a racist society include anger, outrage and despair. The incidence of family violence, child abuse and neglect and substance abuse remains epidemic in some Aboriginal communities.

A main objective of CPSD initiatives is to improve the quality of life of those seen to be most at risk of becoming involved in crime. This means that long term crime prevention programs targeted at those at a disadvantage because of racism must reflect the fact that the root of the problem is the racism, not the

race. The subject of race and criminal justice constitutes one of the most controversial and hotly debated issues among researchers and others involved with the politics of crime, policing, crime prevention and social control. A more detailed discussion of the research and issues connected with race/ethnicity as factors associated with crime can be found in the CPSD Literature Review.

CHAPTER 3

Who Is Committed to CPSD?

Crime will never go away entirely, but we can make enormous progress in preventing it. We owe it to ourselves, and our quality of life in Canada, to make our communities as safe as they can be.¹

Interest in new approaches to crime prevention can be found at the international, national, provincial and local levels. In many cases, the "safer communities" or "safer cities" approach is being implemented because of its potential in addressing a wide variety of issues related to crime. The safer communities approach to crime prevention advocates incorporating elements of both opportunity reduction and CPSD. Targeted social programs that address the multiple underlying social factors associated with crime would be one element of a safer communities approach. Other elements might include programs such as Neighbourhood Watch and Block Parents.

Internationally

Canada is by no means a lone voice when it comes to endorsing the social development approach to crime prevention. The safer communities approach has been adopted by the United Nations and by hundreds of mayors, municipal leaders, police executives, judges, urban planners, criminologists and representatives of government and national organizations from around the world. Many countries were experiencing similar concerns throughout the 1980s about crime levels and were realizing the need for a different approach to crime prevention. The 1989 European and North-American Conference provided a focus for these concerns. It also gave momentum to a surge of interest in community-based long term prevention and, with it, a serious look at the role of CPSD.

A main objective of the 1989 European and North-American Conference was to come up with an Agenda for Safer Cities. This Agenda proposed a concrete plan of action to prevent property and

violent crime, reduce the demand for drugs and decrease the feelings of insecurity in cities. According to the Agenda for Safer Cities, the safer communities approach should be: community-based; comprehensive and long term in perspective while still responding to immediate needs; drawn on diverse existing resources, including those of housing, social services, recreation, schools, policing and the criminal justice system; supported by the whole community, and; linked to other community development efforts not traditionally thought of as being primarily crime prevention oriented.²

Within a year of the Montreal conference, the United Nations adopted its resolution on the prevention of urban crime. Based on the Agenda for Safer Cities, the United Nations resolution provides an overview of the crime prevention strategies that must be followed internationally, nationally and locally. It emphasizes that prevention solutions will have to involve partnerships between different levels of government and the various social, urban and criminal justice agencies. It also identifies 30 priority action areas, including daycare for the children of disadvantaged single parents, education, jobs and training, violence against women, and police involvement and collaboration in crime prevention.³

The United Nations also recommends that implementation of this resolution be a priority U.N. program and that an international crime prevention data bank be developed. The United Nations resolution also calls specifically on national governments to: look at approaches which prevent crime by tackling the conditions that can generate crime, including prevention efforts that reduce crime through social and community development; provide regular financing to cities and communities for crime prevention; implement long term solutions, while remaining responsive to short term needs, and; ensure coordination of public, private and voluntary agencies already equipped and committed to dealing with the situations that can generate crime.⁴

Nationally

In the wake of the 1989 Montreal conference, Canada requested that the House of Commons Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General come up with recommendations for a national crime prevention strategy. After four months of hearings, the Committee concluded that:

The time has come for Canadians to get serious about crime prevention and community safety. Our collective response to crime must shift to efforts that reduce opportunities for crime and focus on at-risk young people and on the underlying social and economic factors associated with criminal behaviour.⁵

The Committee reaffirmed that crime cannot be prevented solely by laws and criminal justice services because crime is also a social problem. While it identifies poverty as one of the more pressing of these social problems, the Committee emphasizes that there is no single root cause of crime. Rather, it sees crime resulting from "a constellation of factors that include: physical and sexual abuse, illiteracy, low self-esteem, inadequate housing, school failure, unemployment, inequality and dysfunctional families."⁶ Because crime will always exist in one form or another, the Committee believes that police, court and correctional interventions will be required. However, the Committee also agrees that community-based strategies, supported by government, to reduce criminal opportunities and improve the quality of people's lives are also necessary to enhance public safety.

The first of the Standing Committee's 11 recommendations calls for the federal government to take a national leadership role in crime prevention by developing a national crime prevention policy, in cooperation with the provinces and municipalities. It also sets out the principles and initiatives for such a policy. Another of the Standing Committee's recommendations dealt with the creation of a National Crime Prevention Council. In July, 1994, the 25-member National Crime Prevention Council was established.

The Council was to receive \$4 million over the first five years--considerably less than the \$25 million recommended by the Standing Committee. The Council is charged with examining the underlying factors associated with crime, suggesting cost-effective ways to reduce it and developing a road map for action which will help create a safer society. One of the main things the Council will be doing is examining successful provincial and community prevention programs to determine how they could work elsewhere.⁷

The Role of the Federal Government

The federal government consists of a wide range of departments, agencies, programs and initiatives connected with crime prevention. These departments and agencies tend to focus more on the more traditional models of crime prevention, such as the police, courts and corrections. Less obvious but just as important, however, are the major federal government departments which carry out more CPSD-oriented programs. These include Health and Welfare, Canada Mortgage and Housing, Employment and Immigration Canada and Human Resource Development. Recent initiatives such as developing a national crime prevention strategy and establishing a national crime prevention council are attempts to provide a clear and more consistent focus for the federal role in crime prevention.

The key elements of the federal role in CPSD must include: leadership and modelling of a commitment to crime prevention, with particular emphasis on CPSD; crime prevention inventory, information and referral; co-ordination; research; funding and other resource support, and; public education and information.

Provincially

The provinces and territories have demonstrated their commitment to crime prevention mainly by supporting co-ordinated prevention activities by government and non-government organizations. British

Columbia, for instance, supported the development of a non-government crime prevention association. Manitoba has developed a legislatively-based crime prevention council responsible for initiating, facilitating and co-ordinating crime prevention efforts.

Quebec has established regional crime prevention committees and, in 1993, presented its Report of the Task Force on Crime Prevention. Besides being a valuable resource for increasing public awareness and knowledge about crime and crime prevention, the report represents the province's endorsement of CPSD as an integral part of crime prevention. Reflecting the theme of the Agenda for Safer Cities, the Quebec task force suggests "a hybrid model" of crime prevention that makes use of increased individual and collective responsibility, social development and situational strategies.⁸

The Role of Provincial Governments

While there are many crime prevention activities underway using CPSD strategies, the unique role provinces can play in crime prevention strongly suggests a rich potential for accomplishing much more provincially and territorially. Each provincial and territorial government is in a key position to play a major role in promoting CPSD because it already works in partnership with other levels of government, social agencies, associations and the private sector. Also, provincial governments have primary responsibility for many of the social interventions integral to CPSD, such as housing, education, social services, income security and health.

One report on a social strategy for crime prevention in Canada recommends that the role of provincial/territorial governments in crime prevention include:

! demonstrating leadership and fostering a climate in which crime prevention is accepted as an integral part of social policy, especially in connection with education, housing, social services and health;

! co-ordinating the crime prevention resources and activities of all levels of government, the justice system, social agencies and the voluntary sector, and;

! taking responsibility for carrying out specific CPSD activities within the areas of health, education, housing, leisure, social services and the economy.⁹

Municipally/Locally

When the Canadian Justice Minister announced the creation of the National Crime Prevention Council, he paid particular tribute to the Edmonton Safer Cities Initiatives. These initiatives are made up of a variety of crime prevention strategies that include CPSD, community-based policing and opportunity reduction activities. As with the international and national levels, Edmonton's involvement was greatly influenced by the Agenda for Safer Cities adopted at the 1989 conference in Montreal. Please see Chapter 5 of this Resource Guide for more information on the Edmonton experience with CPSD.

Although Edmonton's Safer Cities Initiatives are cited as examples of what can be done at the local level, they by no means represent the only local efforts to implement the safer communities approach. Increasingly, local governments, social service agencies and community organizations are pulling together to develop a wide range of co-ordinated crime prevention strategies which include CPSD programs. For a sampling of just some of the CPSD-type initiatives underway, see the accompanying document entitled, "The Canadian Experience With CPSD."

*Our role in Safer Cities could be just providing individuals with things to do, opportunities, choices. A lot of these kids use their minds when they're here, give us ideas and they learn how to interact with others and sometimes that's a big problem for younger children and even adults--they don't know how.
Rick Holmes, Neighbourhood Activity Association of Belvedere*

The Role of Municipal Governments

The role of municipal governments in CPSD is more action oriented than the roles of other levels of government. The major roles of municipal governments can include: showing leadership in promoting crime prevention by establishing ways to bring together citizens, locally elected officials, public servants, business and ethnic community leaders and representatives from local social service agencies, police services, housing, public transit, leisure, urban planning and economic development agencies; establishing ways to ensure collaborative action and to identify local crime problems and the existing responses to them, and; undertaking an analysis of crime and fear of crime in their communities, with a view to understanding and responding to the situations associated with these problems.¹⁰

It is the policies and actions of municipal governments that can maintain a sense of community. Many of the key elements of CPSD strategies are found within the responsibilities of municipal governments, including policing, transportation, housing, leisure and recreation, urban planning, economic development and community health. The federal and provincial governments may set many funding and policy guidelines, but how effectively they are actually implemented depends on municipal government. The local or municipal level is the real proving ground of CPSD. It is where it all comes together, where CPSD initiatives touch the day-to-day lives of those at risk and make a difference.

*Community is togetherness. Working together for a common goal.
Ina Flipsen, Neighbourhood Activity Association of Belvedere*

PART II:

THE PRACTICE

CHAPTER 4

Making Change: The Impact of CPSD

Implementing CPSD initiatives means being prepared to be both the changer and the changed. Any serious effort to implement CPSD initiatives must, to some degree, have an impact on how an organization or agency sees itself and does its work. Being open to making important changes that may arise as long term prevention strategies are implemented is critical. This chapter will explore the forms some of these changes might take.

Values, Attitudes and Expectations

Prevailing values, attitudes and expectations dictate what individuals, organizations and society believe about why people become criminals, who gets helped and what form that help takes. Perhaps most importantly, they dictate who gets the power to decide whether changes will be real and longlasting, what is really needed and whether sufficient resources, especially money, will be made available to actually do what is needed.

Changes in values, attitudes and expectations happen over time. Simply adopting a new policy position or the latest "in" approach to program delivery will not automatically result in a shift in what an organization may have long valued as important and appropriate. Rather, changes in values and attitudes tend to occur when enough people realize they have more to gain than to lose by looking at or doing things differently. There is no set list of values and attitudes that all groups or agencies must adhere to before they can implement CPSD initiatives. The form that changes in values and attitudes take can vary greatly, depending on an organization's particular history, operating assumptions and administrative style. However,

there are several issues likely to arise in connection with values, attitudes and expectations as organizations implement CPSD initiatives.

! *Political will and commitment.*

Elected officials will need to demonstrate leadership in crime prevention through more than talk. "On the topic of crime, rhetoric has been plentiful, but resources have been scarce."¹ For the most part, crime prevention has suffered from chronic under-financing and a lack of a clear vision, a coordinated focus, political determination and co-operation and commitment on the part of the various authorities.² There also needs to be a shift in attitude whereby CPSD is given the same status and priority as that traditionally accorded to the efforts of police, courts and corrections. The increasing number of local governments stating their commitment to the safer communities approach is another indication of a growing willingness to encourage a change in values, attitudes and expectations about the role of crime prevention.

! *Revenge and punishment.*

The desire for revenge and the belief that punishment is a sure deterrent features prominently in society's ideas about the treatment of crime. CPSD will not succeed if the government and the public fail to understand or acknowledge the role that social and economic circumstances play in the increased risk of criminality. CPSD does not remove individual responsibility for criminal acts. Rather, it holds that all members of society are responsible for addressing the factors associated with increased risk of criminality. Acknowledging the importance of CPSD in addressing crime concerns would make the public less likely to call for increased punishment in their search for improved safety.

! *Co-ordination of efforts.*

A fragmented approach to crime prevention by all the different agencies that have a role to play can no longer be afforded. Turf issues or token compliance among government and non-government groups and individuals will need to be replaced by a demonstrated commitment to co-ordination, co-operation and collaboration. No one isolated agency or level of government can address all the problems related to crime; inter-agency co-operation is essential.

! *Responsibility at all levels.*

The responsibility for supporting and implementing crime prevention initiatives needs to be shared by both the government and non-government sectors. This involves drawing far more on the financial, personnel and technical resources of private and business associations. Business, for instance, would be encouraged to employ more at-risk youth.

! *Investing in long term solutions.*

Crime is one of the symptoms of a society which thinks and acts as if there is no tomorrow. Long term prevention relies far less on short term, quick-fix solutions. Instead, there would be more emphasis on investing in specific social interventions today that can result in considerable future savings in both monetary and human terms. What constitutes a viable program or acceptable "results" will need to be redefined to reflect the reality that prevention involves a longer term, less dramatic and often less visible effect. The belief that preventive efforts can work will be as important as the commitment to making it happen.

! *Less political exploitation of the fear of crime.*

"It is dangerous indeed, when three of the most powerful agents of community education: the police, the politicians, and the media, benefit so directly and dramatically from the fear of crime in the community."¹⁵

The more vulnerable the public feels, the more police protection it wants. Policing institutions benefit in the form of bigger budgets, more personnel and more sophisticated equipment. The politicians gain votes and a way of diverting attention away from more pressing issues, such as the economy. By promoting only legislative change or short term "law and order" measures, the politicians can be seen to possess a firmer understanding and control of the situation than they really have. This, in turn, reassures some members of the public that the politician is "doing something" about making them safer in their communities. The media, meanwhile, profits from the attention attracted by sensational accounts of violent crime and public fear of crime. This attention attracts advertisers and revenue.⁴

Politicians base their responses to crime on public opinion and the public relies mainly on media for information about crime. Much of the information the public gets about crime issues is at best distorted and at worst inaccurate. There needs to be a shift in attitude about crime and crime prevention so that the public's awareness is based more on knowledge than on opinion. This, in turn, could affect the way both politicians and the media respond to crime and crime prevention issues.

! *Broaden the definition of efficiency and effectiveness.*

The prevailing definitions of efficiency and effectiveness have been dictated by the administrative perspective, which focusses almost exclusively on monetary considerations. Anything that keeps operational costs down and produces more for the amount of money spent is deemed efficient. This somewhat limited concept of efficiency stems from the realities facing many administrators of organizations. They are accountable for budgets and are under considerable pressure to show how much has been accomplished with the resources available.

When it comes to assessing the efficacy of activities basically aimed at improving the quality of life, this traditional notion of efficiency is too limited. It needs to be broadened so that it is more inclusive of non-monetary and often immeasurable factors involved in long term prevention. A more inclusive definition might motivate administrators, whether government or nongovernment, to look beyond annual budgets and to consider the value of less obvious, long term results of an activity.

Policy and Planning

Policies are what dictate the direction crime prevention planning should take. Policies and the degree to which they are implemented at the planning stages also illustrate the extent of political commitment to a particular prevention approach. Crime prevention policies in Canada have already undergone significant changes. National and local governments have developed policies which send clear messages to crime prevention planners, organizations and the public that the time has come to make CPSD an integral part of preventing crime. Policies can concern themselves with different phases of the process that takes CPSD from an idea to a workable, effective program. However, there are several basic policies that need to be in place in order for long term, CPSD-type initiatives to really take hold. These basic policies would:

! *Clearly define the concept of prevention.*

This means stating clearly what is meant by prevention and having a broader view of crime prevention that includes the long term, social development approach. It also involves devising policies that address the needs of all the residents of a community. This is an essential premise if initiatives are going to be able to deal with crime before it happens instead of after and if we are to get away from evaluating such interventions based on the crime statistics.

! *Recognize that responsibility for crime prevention extends beyond the law enforcement sector.*

Policies also need to ensure that local governments, in particular, get help in working with the social and economic factors associated with crime. For instance, the federal government would have policies that recognize the role some departments have in assisting CPSD initiatives to succeed. Thus, the federal government policies would include funding these departments so they can fulfil these responsibilities, through supporting programs such as low income housing, pre- and post-natal health initiatives and universal day care.⁵

! *Ensure that funding is provided for locally developed crime prevention initiatives.*

National crime prevention policies need to provide for stable, direct funding of locally developed initiatives, as well as allow greater flexibility in the use of these funds.⁶

! *Emphasize that the community is the focus of crime prevention.*

Government policies, in particular, would encourage and support community-based crime prevention efforts.⁷ Such policies would not only indicate to local neighbourhoods that their concerns about crime are being taken seriously but would also illustrate the government's commitment to community crime prevention while not controlling what the community does in meeting its own needs.

! *Ensure economic policies are tied to social policies.*

The importance of ensuring that economic policies are supportive of social policies is emphasized in the warning that "...any strategy which ignores the need for economic policies leading to full employment and income redistribution can expect to fail."⁸ Social policies proposing interventions which address the underlying factors connected with crime need the support of economic policies which also address unemployment, poverty and inadequate housing.

! *Clearly identify individual target groups.*

Specific at-risk groups, such as children and youth, need to be clearly identified in policies, especially in light of research which shows the value of early intervention.⁹

Decision-making and Distribution of Power

Traditionally, those who make the decisions and control the most resources tend to have the greatest influence over how things get done. Because local community control over decisions about what CPSD programs are needed is essential, those used to having such power almost by default in the past, may be faced with having to share it or relinquish it altogether. The following are some of the variables that can enter into the transfer of decision-making connected with community-based, long term prevention.

! *Local control of community-based projects.*

An important feature of community-based, long term prevention projects is local control. Local residents need to be involved in the planning and the implementation of strategies and programs in more than just an advisory capacity. This includes having final say in decisions about funding, program focus and evaluation.

! *Need for more than token administrative support for community participation.*

Transferring decision-making power over policy, funding and programming decisions will likely involve some power struggles between those who already make the decisions and those who want to make those decisions.

A demand to participate in the decision and programs of an organization is in effect a demand that power be shared or given up.

Even when power is shared, the spirit with which this is done may be anything but cooperative. In most cases where power has come to be shared it was taken by the citizens, not given by the city. There is nothing new about that process. Since those who have power normally want to hang onto it, historically it has had to be wrested by the powerless rather than proffered by the powerful.¹⁰

Planning and implementing community-based CPSD initiatives means ensuring that local community participation in discussions and decision-making is more than a token gesture geared to create the impression of community involvement rather than the reality of it. Accustomed to operating within predictable, closed systems with interest groups or other public agencies that are known quantities, administrators must then work with "outsiders" whose behaviour is unpredictable and with whom they have not built up trust, both personally and professionally.¹¹ The resulting cautious administrative response to increased public participation can be less than enthusiastic. Accusations of "tokenism" arise from frustrated citizens confronted with perfunctory or badly timed community meetings, ritualistic public hearings and handpicked advisory committees.

! *The politics of crime prevention.*

Just as beauty is in the eye of the beholder, so too is crime prevention. The very definition of crime prevention hinges on the political perspective of the sponsoring organization. Implementing CPSD may well demand that groups or agencies work together which have quite different perspectives on what crime prevention is, how it is best implemented and what the standards for evaluation should be. This can be the case even though they may agree that social development is an important part of the overall crime prevention strategy. A central government, for instance, could see crime prevention mainly in economic terms, as a way to reduce the crime rate and the ever increasing costs for policing, courts and corrections. At the local level, meanwhile, crime prevention might well be viewed more as a way to improve the immediate safety and quality of life within the community.

Two shifts need to take place in connection with the politics of crime prevention. First, it must be recognized that the organizations and agencies with the most resources aren't necessarily the best qualified

or equipped to make decisions about the future of community-based CPSD programs. For example, the provincial and federal governments may have more money to put into crime prevention efforts, but their political and administrative expertise is geared more toward controlling rather than preventing crime. Central governments, by the very nature of their history and experience, are more inclined to administer than to empower community-based projects. On the other hand, agencies and organizations at the municipal level have, for both political and logistical reasons, far more practice at incorporating the feedback of community-based groups into decision-making.

Second, CPSD programs must be geared to local needs; key decisions about funding and programming must rest with those working at the local level, even when a substantial share of the financial support may be coming from outside the community at first. This contradicts the idea that the one who pays the piper calls the tune. For CPSD efforts to survive over the long term, it will need to be more a case of the one who pays the piper follows along. Trust, especially in the competence of the local community to know and to provide what is really needed if given the opportunity and the support, will need to play a far larger part in the decision-making process.

! *Consensus decision-making.*

If decisions about CPSD planning and implementation are to be made mostly at the community level, then the usual ways of making those decisions will need to change. One of the main characteristics of a community is its diversity of people, interests, priorities, values, lifestyles, opinions and ideas. Working cooperatively or collaboratively in a community means finding ways of listening to opposing points of view and accommodating deeply held and differing values. Majority rules and top down decision-making methods tend to exclude diverse interests and they are not designed to cope with the complexities of a

community's environmental, economic and social needs. Decision-making based on consensus is a particularly useful alternative because it can bring diverse knowledge and expertise together and encourages creative and innovative solutions to complex problems.¹²

A consensus process is one which allows all those who have a stake in the outcome of CPSD to reach a workable agreement on strategies and actions. With consensus, participants work together to design a way to make decisions that maximize their ability to resolve their differences. It does not mean that participants will agree with all aspects of an agreement, but it does mean that they talk and negotiate to the point where participants are all willing to live with the outcome. The consensus approach does not avoid decisions or lack leadership; rather, consensus encourages leaders to forge partnerships that work to develop solutions. Consensus allows participants to work together and decide on outcomes and actions without imposing the views or authority of one group or individual onto another. There are many forms that a consensus process can take. Each situation, issue or problem prompts the need for participants to design a process specifically suited to the available abilities, circumstances and issues.¹³ Using consensus will also involve changing the assumption that taking longer to make decisions is inefficient or a waste of time. Rather, participants will start to see that taking the time to listen and to incorporate diverse ideas about solutions pays off in the long run.

Organizational Structure

Implementing CPSD initiatives can affect the very structure of an organization. How an organization is set up and carries out its work often reflects its philosophy, values and assumptions about social issues and how they should be resolved. For some organizations, taking on the social development approach to crime prevention may involve making some basic and important shifts in thinking about crime,

why it happens and what can be done to prevent it. These changes in thinking would eventually demand corresponding changes in organizational structure. For some this may involve only minor changes to its existing structure and procedures; for others it may mean wholesale re-organization or even integration with another organization. Just how much an organization or agency would need to change in order to best support CPSD initiatives depends on a variety of things. An organization's traditional mandate, administrative style, views on crime and crime prevention, focus and assumptions behind its goals and objectives, and how and where it gets its money can all affect how much it may have to re-organize itself to effectively support long term, CPSD initiatives. A crucial factor, however, is the extent of an organization's commitment to its vision of a safer community and what it sees as its role in making that vision a reality. Chapter 5 of the Guide details the importance of vision and of understanding how an organization's work is crime prevention.

While the changes in an organization's structure may vary in degree or form, how an organization is set up to support CPSD-type programs must at the very least feature extensive and formal inter-agency contact and co-operation, meet the needs of those most at risk in the community and be sensitive to how structure affects people.

! *Extensive and formal inter-agency contact and co-operation.*

Making a serious commitment to implementing CPSD initiatives means forming partnerships with other groups and agencies with a similar vision for a safer community. No one organization can do it all alone; no single group has all the resources, expertise or time to provide all the different kinds of supports which those at risk often need at the same time. Organizations need to be open to integrating their activities in whole or in part with those of other agencies.

The three most common forms of inter-agency activity are: co-operation, co-ordination and collaboration. The organizational structure needed varies somewhat depending on which type of inter-agency activity is emphasized. Inter-agency contact based mostly on co-operation usually means the organization's structure will probably not look much different. No new inter-agency structure, such as a separate office or department, is needed; people would simply be assigned to carry out the new objectives and to incorporate them into existing policies and procedures. It is not uncommon to find that groups working in human support services have been working on an informal, co-operative basis with each other for years. The disadvantage of these existing co-operative connections is that staffing changes will eliminate the co-operative link. Also, the agency benefits from the co-operation but never formally acknowledges the part it plays. This perpetuates the illusion that the official structure and procedures are working more effectively than they really are. More formal co-operation between agencies allows trust and information flow to develop but does not interfere with the autonomy and power of each agency. Co-operation has proven effective in achieving narrowly focussed, short term objectives.¹⁴

Co-ordination is more formalized inter-agency effort and usually means a separate new office or department. Staff are re-assigned to carry out the new objectives, which can range from short to intermediate in term. Collaborative inter-agency efforts, meanwhile, also require the creation of a new office or department within the organizational structure and staff are likewise re-assigned to the new unit. Since collaborative objectives tend to be long term and broadly focussed, ongoing maintenance and staff participation play a larger role than in a co-ordinated venture. Also, with co-ordination the primary loyalty is to the individual agency and the secondary loyalty is to the inter-agency effort. When activities are based on collaboration, the primary loyalty is to the inter-agency effort.¹⁵

The barriers which have traditionally protected agencies and organizations from outside interference will not necessarily have to be broken down. However, agencies who work with similar at-risk groups and have similar mandates must be encouraged to work more closely together, perhaps even in the same facility. It is not unrealistic to envision a type of facility where a wide range of support and program resources are not only readily available, but easily visible to those who need them.

! *Must meet the needs of the community.*

An organization providing CPSD-type programs will need to be capable of responding to local needs and incorporating local participation into key decision making. It will also have to accurately assess local needs and determine whether they are being met to the satisfaction of those in the community who need the help. A good program improves the lives of those for whom it was designed. Community development is a valuable tool for planning and implementing sound, community-based prevention initiatives. Agencies and organizations will need to "re-tool" their operations and assumptions so they don't continue to fall into the trap of administering rather than empowering community-based programs and their participants.

! *More awareness of how structure affects people.*

An organization's involvement in providing CPSD-type programs will also demand a greater awareness of the effect that organizational structure has on people. In order to succeed in the long term, community-based initiatives must be accessible. Further, participants need to feel they are an important part of making it happen. If an organization has a closed, rigid structure, changes would be needed to make the communication among participating agencies more responsive.

We work really flexibly. We don't have any hard rules. We work with people's lives and no hard rules can be applied to that. That's one of our greatest strengths; it's also one of our greatest weaknesses.
Tania Janke, Candora Society

Evaluation

Evaluation will play a role in the successful implementation of CPSD initiatives. Both those delivering the programs and those funding them need some kind of measure that shows what is happening as a result of the time, energy and money spent on a particular activity. However, because CPSD programs are geared toward long term change in the quality of people's lives, traditional evaluation methods and standards are not always suitable. It is impossible to isolate or control all the factors and elements that impact on the lives of program participants in order to determine the effect of one program. This means that the groups and agencies implementing CPSD initiatives will also find themselves needing to push for significant changes in why and how program evaluation is done. One change in awareness about evaluation that needs to be encouraged involves making evaluation part of the project plan and building it in from the beginning. The evaluation process may change during the program, but so will the program.¹⁶

The development of this Guide included a consultation with a sampling of agencies and organizations in Edmonton which work directly or indirectly with at-risk individuals. The consultation identified six major evaluation issues and needs that these agencies face. The more pressing concerns about program evaluation that these agencies and organizations identified were:

! *Trust.*

Not everything can be measured with a ruler or a calculator, so a certain amount of trust needs to be incorporated into the evaluation process, especially between those funding the project and those responsible for carrying it out.

! *Sharing evaluation resources.*

Evaluations could be made less costly and their results more accessible by having one person do such time-consuming tasks as keeping statistics for several groups at the same time.

! *Recognizing the validity of anecdotal information.*

Information drawn from the more subjective methods, such as storytelling and anecdotal records, needs to be acknowledged as being as legitimate as quantitative information.

! *Timing.*

Evaluations need to be carried out over longer periods of time than the fiscal year.

! *Purpose.*

The purpose of evaluations should place a greater emphasis on finding ways of improving services and doing a better job with the existing resources than on funding.

! *Attitudes and expectations.*

The attitudes and expectations of politicians and the public need to change concerning what constitutes legitimate results and program success.

If there's anything that has to happen in evaluations it is that you have to get more soft data included. Where people can talk to clients and talk to staff and actually document some cases where you actually see change. Actually try and track down what the change is and do some follow-up with clients who've been through a program.
Keith Purvis, Native Counselling Services of Alberta

Developing an Evaluation Framework

One way to resolve some of the evaluation issues highlighted by the Edmonton agencies and organizations is for those implementing long term projects to develop their own evaluation framework. An evaluation does not have to be done by an expert, nor does it have to be a source of threat or anxiety because it might indicate failure. It is important to recognize that you are evaluating a process, an ongoing program that may change along the way. The evaluation should ask the questions: What is happening? What is happening that was intended? What is happening that was not intended? What unintended consequences of the program were also unanticipated? How was the program experienced?¹⁷ The following steps can be used to develop an evaluation process that is best suited to the needs of long term projects, such as CPSD:

1. *Know what you need.* Why are you evaluating? What are you trying to accomplish with the evaluation?

2. *Assess your stakeholders.* Who needs to know what and why?¹⁸ It is important at this stage for programmers, funders and evaluators to discuss the questions to be asked in the evaluation.¹⁹ Then you decide which evaluation strategies will give you the information you require.

3. *Clearly outline the project goals.* What difference is the project supposed to make, to whom and how? Again, it is critical that all parties are consulted and agree on the goals of the program.²⁰

4. *Clarify the questions you want to ask.* Pinpoint exactly what it is you want to know about the program.

5. *Find out where to go for the information.* Decide how you are going to find the information needed, what kind of information will be kept or discarded and what the tracking methods will be. It is important to keep in mind that those working directly with a project are in the best position to provide detailed information.

6. *Understand what is important to you.* This means knowing what the underlying principles and philosophy of the project are, as well as what principles and philosophy are important to you. Because you are part of the evaluation, not separate from it, an evaluation needs to be consistent with your own values.

7. *Understand the evaluation approach being used.* Ensure that the evaluation approach being used is meaningful to you. If the evaluation doesn't answer the questions you need to know, what are the implications of this for what you do?

8. *Define roles.* Clearly define what roles you and the evaluator play in the evaluation.

9. *Choose the evaluator.* Who is selected to actually conduct the evaluation will be based on the decisions made and information collected in the course of carrying out the previous 8 steps.²¹

CHAPTER 5

Planning and Implementing CPSD

As seen in the previous chapter, the implementation of CPSD initiatives will necessitate major change on the part of those responsible for crime prevention and those who are involved in community development and service provision. While the previous chapter detailed the types of changes needed, one is left asking: What can we do and how do we do it? One hopes to read about a given solution: if you do this then the crime problem will cease, or this is how you do it, this is the program to run. The problem with this expectation is that CPSD programs are designed to address local problems and are targeted at a specific group which has unique needs. This chapter will not provide prescriptive advice on which programs to run.

Instead, it will outline 6 basic tasks in implementing CPSD programs. In the course of describing the six tasks involved in implementing CPSD-type activities, examples and ideas for actions or programs will be suggested. The six basic tasks are as follows:

1. Raise your awareness and knowledge of CPSD.
2. Identify your vision of a safer community.
3. Connect with those who share your vision.
4. Choose the issues you want to focus on and design your project(s).
5. Take stock of your existing resources and strengths, as well as what additional resources and strengths you can readily access and develop.
6. Implement and evaluate your project.

While these tasks are presented in what appears to be a linear fashion, the order presented will not always be appropriate. Also, it may be that certain tasks will be revisited and revisions made as more is learned throughout the process of implementation. The development and implementation of several CPSD-type initiatives will also be discussed.

There are many different agencies, organizations and governments that can provide the impetus to implement CPSD; the impetus can come from the mayor, city council, city bureaucrats, leaders of local non-profits or concerned citizens. The process of implementation will be slightly different depending on who is doing the implementation. The tasks as described here apply to any group, organization or level of government wishing to become involved in CPSD. One example might be a municipal government wanting to establish a CPSD implementation committee or task force. Another example might be any agency or group that is already working to address the factors associated with crime such as poverty, unemployment or family disruption. In most cases, such agencies would not currently identify what they do as crime prevention. Nevertheless, their programs are, in fact, preventive in nature. The tasks outlined below will assist social development groups in understanding that what they do is crime prevention, even if they choose not to formally recognize that outcome.

Educate and Raise Awareness

Understanding Crime and CPSD

It is critical to the implementation of any CPSD initiative that all partners in the effort have a clear understanding of what they mean by crime prevention. The differences between situational crime prevention and crime prevention through social development have to be well understood. In addition, there must be sensitivity toward and appreciation of the relationships between the various economic and social

factors associated with crime. This understanding must be present for all partners to understand what they can do individually and collectively to prevent crime.

Seeing Your Work as Crime Prevention

One of the biggest obstacles to overcome in the implementation of CPSD is getting existing service providers to recognize what they do as crime prevention. Every community has agencies and organizations which address the factors associated with crime. For example, an association that provides services for pregnant teens such as school, day care, counselling and parenting classes is involved in CPSD. The recognition that clients have multiple needs and the effort to meet those needs is an example of a CPSD-type program. Yet, it is unlikely that such an organization would have included crime prevention in their vision, goals or objectives, although some may have recognized this aspect of their work on an informal level. Most of the agencies contacted during the agency consultation phase of this project had not heard of CPSD and did not formally recognize their work as crime preventive. However, after some discussion of the concept of CPSD, all agreed that their work was related to crime prevention and that crime prevention was an unanticipated outcome of their work. It is unclear, however, whether these agencies would be willing to give any formal recognition to crime prevention as an outcome.

Part of the problem with agencies formally recognizing their programs or services as crime prevention is the fear that someone will ask them to demonstrate that they have prevented crime through their program. Of course, given the interrelated nature of the factors associated with crime, it would be impossible for any one group to demonstrate that their program in particular led to a decrease in the crime rate. It is important to remember that CPSD is about changing quality of life, not about reducing crime statistics. The outcome measure relates to an improvement in quality of life; we cannot expect to see any

reduction in crime statistics until CPSD is implemented on a more coordinated, integrated, broad-based level. Rather than social development agencies including crime prevention as a goal or objective, it is recommended that they include it in their vision.

Often, when you hear of the concept of CPSD, it resonates with what you or your agency believes about your work but have been unable to articulate. As you learn more about it, you will start to see ways to integrate it into your work. It can be useful to take the 6 tasks outlined in this chapter for implementing CPSD and apply them at an abstract level to your work. Reviewing these tasks may help you to begin to see your work as CPSD.

Identify Your Vision

The first step in the successful implementation of any CPSD initiative is the identification of your vision of a safer community. Nielsen summarized this step as follows:

To develop and build your community, you must know who you could become. You need a vision, a picture of what you want your community to become. The choices we make in life are based on visions. When we choose to prevent crime, we have a vision of what our community would be like without it.¹

The vision statement should not be limited to what is reasonable to achieve; it should truly reflect what you wish to be true. It is different from the goals and objectives as it will not be subject to evaluation or measurement. It is meant to be a wish or an aspiration for what you would like your community to be like. The vision statement should be long term, not just what is achievable in this fiscal year or even in the next five years. The vision statement should include the target group for your project or program, such as children or youth, and should state what you wish for them in the long term. Finally, it should be stated as briefly as possible; this will ensure that you are very clear about what your vision is. If you find it difficult

to state your vision in one sentence, then it is likely that you are trying to be too specific in your vision and you need to try to be a bit more of a dreamer.

*My vision is to have zero tolerance in terms of family violence. I want to be alive to know that I don't have to do this job anymore. I'd love to work myself out of a job -- to say that I don't need to do this stuff anymore.
Maria David-Evans, Edmonton Safer Cities Initiative*

Edmonton's "Success by 6" is a collaborative effort consisting of government, community non-profit groups, businesses and communities dedicated to strengthening pre-school children and their families through prevention and integrated service delivery in education, social services and health.² The vision statement of Success by 6 is a good example of a vision for a CPSD initiative. Their vision reads as follows: "Edmonton -- a nurturing community that values **ALL** (emphasis in original) children and works together to help them succeed."⁵

Form Partnerships

When someone has a vision for a safer community, they begin to share that vision with others, to seek out others who may have an interest in working together to achieve that vision. The existence of a shared vision and values leads to partnerships to work on the implementation of the plan for achieving the vision. As previous chapters have illustrated, there are many factors associated with crime and no one factor addressed in isolation will have an impact. Particularly in the area of implementing CPSD initiatives, the need for partnerships is critical. Partnerships allow for shared responsibility in meeting the needs of those exposed to multiple risk factors for criminal involvement. They are also an opportunity for sharing

costs in this time of decreasing resources.⁴ In addition, resources that were previously unobtainable by one group acting alone may become more accessible if that group is part of a team or partnership.⁵

Elements of the Partnership Environment

There are elements that are critical to creating a partnership environment and to the success of a partnership. The basis of a partnership is "fair exchange."⁶ A fair exchange happens when all partners are satisfied that a balance has been struck between "giving and getting." This balance need not only be in terms of funding resources invested in the partnership, but can be other benefits to the organization, individuals or recipients of the partnership venture. The following are important to a partnership environment:

- ! Know the philosophical viewpoint of partners.
- ! Identify the assumptions.
- ! Know your partners (sic) needs, limitations and hot buttons.
- ! Recognize your partners.
- ! Stroke the personalities.
- ! Select the appropriate person to represent you.
- ! Be prepared to give up control.
- ! Use a facilitator.
- ! View partnerships as an organism not a mechanical instrument.⁷

Another critical issue in partnership relationships is communication and the ability to balance tasks and processes. Be sure to resolve questions about expectations, roles, responsibilities, rules and issues of control and determine how messages about success or failure will be conveyed.⁸ Be aware of the possibility that the partnering process itself may begin to overshadow the original reason for the partnership-the needs of the community. While a partnership takes work to maintain, it is critical that this not become the main work of the alliance. Achieve a balance between the tasks and the process, and work to maintain this balance. The development of this Guide included a consultation with a variety of local CPSD-type

service agencies. One theme which emerged in the consultation was that partnerships worked based on the people involved, not based on the structure in which they worked. In every case, what was important was developing relationships with front-line staff and once this was in place, the structure became less relevant. Therefore, be aware of who will be working within the partnership; they need to be carefully selected not only for their skills but also for their willingness and ability to let the confines of organizational structure fade away for the good of the partnership.

Suggestions for Partnering

Most successful partnerships have evolved over time from a simple sharing of resources, into collaboration and then into a full partnership. You can begin with small joint ventures first, develop the relationship and the trust and then move into a more complex and long term partnership. The following suggestions for "teaming up" are offered by the Board Development Program, Alberta Community Development:

- ! Share office space, storage facilities, or equipment.
- ! Swap facility use for services.
- ! Share the expertise of both volunteers and paid staff. Use special skills within your organization to assist other groups, in return for assistance you require.
- ! Consider joint volunteer/staff training events with other organizations.
- ! Share information. Are you aware of statistics, research, or grant information that may help another party?
- ! Share purchasing power. Can you purchase supplies and services less expensively by buying volume?
- ! Work together on securing relevant information, understanding trends, and problem solving in your community.
- ! Collaborate on issues related to advocacy and lobbying. United voices and numbers speak volumes.⁹

Design Your Project

The first step in starting to design your project is to identify critical issues, concerns and needs. What need prompted you to begin this process? What need does your vision address and why did you seek out your partners?

Once you understand the focus of your project, set goals and objectives for the project. What are you trying to accomplish? Establish goals that are both short and long term. Then, within each goal, set out specific objectives with timelines that are reasonable. In some cases, you will anticipate outcomes that you might not want to state formally in your goals. This is often the case with CPSD-type programs; many organizations would not want to state crime prevention as a goal but would recognize it as an outcome. Identify strategies for reaching the goals and objectives. The strategies are the tasks themselves, the "how to." Strategies can include establishing a program, doing public education, engaging in lobbying or advocacy.

If you have decided to establish a program of some sort, as opposed to doing education or lobbying, then you have additional questions to consider. Will you establish a new organization or agency to operate the program? If so, what will the structure be; will there be a Board of Directors, committees? Who will be the participants in the program? Where will they be referred from? How many participants can you work with at once? How will they be screened or selected? Will you have paid staff and/or volunteers? How will you recruit and train them and what experience do they need to have? What will their duties be? How will you recognize them? Where will you locate or house the program?

You need to establish how the project will be resourced. A budget will need to be developed. Can the program or work be done with no money at all? Can the partners fund the project through pooling

or reallocating existing resources? Is there a need to seek new joint funding? Potential sources of funding will need to be identified and proposals written if that is the course that is selected. A useful step prior to making decisions on funding is to take inventory.

Take Inventory

This part of the process of implementing CPSD initiatives involves assessing what is required for the initiative and what you can offer to it. All of the partners in the strategy or initiative will bring expertise and strengths to the effort. These strengths may be in the areas of program delivery, advocacy, research, networking, fundraising or administration. The unique skills and knowledge of all partners must be recognized as resources; resources are not limited to funding or equipment. What skills, knowledge and expertise are required for the initiative? What skills, knowledge and expertise are present in the partnership and what is missing and will have to be sought out to successfully implement the task?

One of the key messages during the agency consultation phase of this project was found in the answer to the question "what do you see as your most important resource?" Everyone interviewed said that their greatest resource was people - the staff, clients, volunteers and community members who are involved in the programs. Not one person said that their most important resource was money or material things. This is a critical message for those wishing to implement CPSD-type programs. People bring the concept of CPSD to life and lead to program success. It is essential in taking inventory to acknowledge the staff who are committed to their work and to their clients, the volunteers who give their time to help others and the clients who are looking to improve their quality of life.

Beyond the technical skills of the persons involved, other non-monetary resources include networks, people skills, community support and credibility, volunteers and library/database information.

Monetary resources include funding support, staff time and office space, supplies and equipment. Again, this step involves assessing what resources are required for the task, what resources are already present and what still needs to be obtained.

Implement Your Project

Once all of the above tasks have been completed, the time has come for the implementation stage. The partners are all committed, the group has a vision, they have selected a focus for action and they know what resources are required and what resources they have at hand. Now is the time for doing. It is critical at this stage to remember to build the process of evaluation into the project from the very start. The stages and requirements of the evaluation should be articulated from the beginning so that material and information can be collected throughout the project. This is particularly important if there has been a decision to conduct pre- and post-tests on program participants.

Edmonton Safer Cities Initiatives

Edmonton serves as an excellent example of the implementation of CPSD initiatives. Edmonton's experience will be highlighted here to illustrate the process by which a municipality can begin to implement CPSD.

The European and North American Conference was held in Montreal in 1989. This conference resulted in a specific program of action for the prevention of crime and to decrease feelings of insecurity in cities. This conference inspired a group of over 50 people from Edmonton to meet to discuss crime prevention through social development. Subsequent meetings led to a proposal for the Edmonton Mayor's Task Force on Safer Cities, which was subsequently approved by City Council in June, 1990.¹⁰ The Task Force was comprised of 15 appointed citizens, with the Mayor acting as chair. The members of the Task

Force formed committees which worked intensively to identify key areas of concern and devised action plans to address them.

The work of the Mayor's Task Force on Safer Cities culminated in the production of 4 individual reports: Family Violence: Breaking the Cycle; Safe Housing; Young Adult Employment - Investing in our Future, and; Children and Youth are Today. The Final Report of the Mayor's Task Force was approved by Edmonton City Council in September, 1992.¹¹ One of the recommendations in the Final Report was for the establishment of a Safer Cities Initiatives Advisory Committee to govern the implementation of the recommendations contained in the Final Report. Appointments to the Advisory Committee were subsequently approved by City Council, along with the creation of a Safer Cities Initiatives Office and the terms of reference for the Advisory Committee.

The work of the Advisory Committee includes advising City Council on matters relating to the implementation of the Task Force recommendations, advising staff of the Safer Cities Initiatives Office on the implementation of the recommendations and on how to encourage community participation, providing quarterly reports to Council and assisting in public relations efforts.¹² Many of the Safer Cities initiatives are listed in the accompanying document entitled "The Canadian Experience With CPSD." Results of the Mayor's Task Force and Safer Cities Initiatives include: new programs to meet local needs, such as an inner city school lunch program; training and education for teachers in the areas of family violence, sexual assault and dating violence; locating facilities for self help groups to meet; preparing submissions to government consultations such as the National Crime Prevention Council; preparing a listing of free and low cost recreation opportunities in Edmonton; setting aside city owned land for sale under market value to be used for low cost housing, and; planning a program and facility which will address the educational needs

of students with behaviour and violence issues.¹³ For further details on the structure, process and results of the Mayor's Task Force on Safer Cities, please see their final report entitled Toward a Safer Edmonton for All.

Other Examples

The Edmonton experience with the Safer Cities Initiatives provides an example of how a municipal government can get involved in implementing CPSD. This section will describe the implementation of and features of two smaller projects, along with the keys to success that they have identified. Please see the accompanying document entitled "The Canadian Experience With CPSD."

Boyle-McCauley Community Action Project

The neighbourhoods of Boyle and McCauley in Edmonton are close to downtown and are considered to be disadvantaged, inner city neighbourhoods. In 1992, after a coalition of agencies convinced City Council to fund a community planner to assist the two neighbourhoods in redrawing the city's official land use plan for the area, the Boyle-McCauley Community Action Project was born.¹⁴ It was based upon a belief in community empowerment and the understanding that simply responding to community problems such as prostitution and drug addiction would not bring about long term change. Project leaders established a managing committee that included business people, city planners, builders, police, landlords, members of agencies and residents. Thousands of people who live and work in the area were consulted by workers, volunteers and the planner who was employed for the project.¹⁵ The Community Action Plan organizers were given final say over the contents of the land use plan, which included 144 recommendations. The plan was approved by City Council and is now being implemented.

Project organizers indicate that the process was not easy. There was difficulty convincing community members that they would benefit from contributing. Those who were involved often had to compromise to resolve differences and city planning staff members were reluctant to relinquish control and "were sceptical of the community's ability to solve its own problems."¹⁶ Several key factors to success were identified. First, the planner worked for the community, even though her salary was funded by the city. Second, many agencies, individuals and interests were heard through many different methods. For example, some were personally interviewed, some were polled, essay contests were held, and feasts and picnics were held which attracted members of various ethnocultural communities. Even though city funding for the project ended in 1994, four private funders have agreed to support the continued efforts of the project.¹⁷

Children and Families Initiative

The Edmonton Children and Families Initiative (CFI) is a collaborative project established to funnel human and financial resources toward the elimination of the damaging effects of poverty.¹⁸ The Initiative is a joint effort of key human service funders in Edmonton, educators, health providers, police and representatives from business and labour. The first task undertaken by the CFI was to call a meeting of stakeholders to identify issues and prioritize actions related to the reduction of the harmful effects of poverty. Participants at the meeting were divided into groups on the following topic areas: family support, family violence, health, housing, income security, mental health, education and youth.¹⁹ These groups were then asked to identify three critical issues and actions related to their topics. A Steering Committee was then established to work with the information obtained at the Stakeholders' meeting and to decide on three specific initiatives.

The Steering Committee established three priorities. First, to develop a new model of income support that would guarantee support to those who are unable to work and to provide work and training opportunities to those able to work.²⁰ Action taken in this area included significant involvement in the federal Social Security Review.²¹ The second priority was to support the development of school nutrition programs, Head Start, Partners for Youth and Health for Two. Action on this initiative included three workshops on a program called "Success by 6." Success by 6 focuses on conquering barriers to adequate early childhood development.²² CFI was officially dissolved at the end of 1994 and has evolved into "Success by 6." The third priority was to become pro-actively involved in the changes to child welfare services in the City of Edmonton.²³ Work on this priority included preparing a submission to the consultation on changes to the Young Offenders Act and involvement in the consultation's changes to the delivery of services to children and families in Alberta.²⁴

Conclusion

Crime prevention through social development is a concept whose time has come. We are becoming increasingly frustrated with the limitations of our traditional responses to crime, as we are now beginning to see the need to address the factors associated with crime rather than merely reacting to it. There is already an incredible amount of social development programming going on in Canada. Every city and town has agencies, community groups and government departments providing services to those in need. However, the social development that is happening now is not necessarily targeted, coordinated, integrated and is not based on a long-term vision of a safer community. We still have communities and citizens who believe that the answer to crime prevention is more cops, more courts and more corrections.

The impact of CPSD will not be seen in the near future. It is very long term in focus. Only when the concept becomes more widely known, more fully understood and the types of suggestions made in this Guide broadly implemented will we see changes in our quality of life. It is our hope that this Guide and the accompanying Literature Review will provide some basis for dialogue and some suggestions for change.

References

Introduction

1. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (1993). Trends in police personnel and expenditures, 1962-1992. Notice of Release--Police Expenditures in Canada, 1992, (Nov.). Statistics Canada, p. 2.
2. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (1994). Canadian crime statistics, 1992. Juristat, 14(3), p. 2.
3. Ibid.
4. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (1994). Canadian crime statistics, 1993. Juristat, 14(14), p. 1. Statistics Canada.
5. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (1992). Correctional expenditures and personnel in Canada 1991-92. Juristat, 12(22), p. 5. Statistics Canada.
6. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (1993), p. 3.
7. Canadian Council on Social Development. (1990). Safer communities: An emerging Canadian experience. (Draft). p. 1.
8. Ibid., pp. 1-3.
9. Ibid., p. 3.

Chapter 1

1. Canadian Criminal Justice Association. (1989). Safer communities: A social strategy for crime prevention in Canada. Ottawa: Author, p. 1.
2. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (1994). 14(14), p. 3.
3. Ibid., p. 3.
4. Ibid., p. 8.
5. Ibid., p. 21.
6. Ibid., p. 8.
7. Ibid., p. 3.
8. Task Force on Crime Prevention. (1993). Partners in crime prevention: For a safer Quebec. Report of the Task Force on Crime Prevention 1993. Quebec City: Minister of Public Security, Government of Quebec, pp. 27-29.
9. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (1994). 14(3), p. 3.
10. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (1994). 14(14), p. 9.
11. Ibid., p. 10.
12. Ibid., p. 14.
13. Correctional Service of Canada. (1995). Forum on Corrections Research, (7)(1), p. 6.
14. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (1994). 14(3), p. 15.

15. Task Force on Crime Prevention. (1993), p. 82.
16. Ibid., p. 82.
17. Ibid., pp. 82-83.
18. Ibid., pp. 83-84.
19. Ibid.
20. Waller, I. (1991, November). Introductory report on urban safety, drugs and crime prevention: Implications of current trends. Report presented to the Second International Conference on Urban Safety, Drugs and Crime Prevention, Paris, France, p. 15.
21. Task Force on Crime Prevention. (1993), pp. 84-85.
22. Leblanc, M., Vallieres, E., and McDuff, P. (1993). The prediction of males' adolescent and adult offending from school experience. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 35(4), pp. 459-478.
23. Ibid., p. 84.
24. Waller, I. (1991, November), p. 16.
25. Task Force on Crime Prevention. (1993), pp. 84-85.
26. Waller, I. (1991, November), p. 17.
27. Ibid., pp. 17-18.
28. Ibid., p. 18.
29. Ibid., pp. 18-19.
30. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (1995). Risk of personal and household victimization: Canada, 1993. Juristat, 15(2), p. 8. Statistics Canada.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid., p. 21.
34. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (1994). Trends in criminal victimization: 1988-1993. Juristat, 14(13), p. 1. Statistics Canada.
35. Ibid., p. 19.
36. Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General. (1993). Crime prevention in Canada: Toward a national strategy. Twelfth report of the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General, Issue 87. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, p. 6.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid., pp. 5-8.
39. Roberts, J. (1992). Public opinion, crime and criminal justice. In M. Tonry (Ed.), Crime and justice: A review of research, 16, 99-180. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 110-111.

Chapter 2

1. John Howard Society of Ontario. (1993). Now is not the time to panic. Preventing crime by confronting the fear of crime: A guide for the concerned. Toronto: John Howard Society of Ontario, pp. 4-5.

2. Canadian Criminal Justice Association. (1989). Safer communities: A social strategy for crime prevention in Canada. Ottawa: Author, p. 2.
3. Loeber, R. (1991). Risk factors and the development of disruptive and antisocial behaviour in children. Forum on Corrections Research, 3, p.22.
4. Kolberg, W.H. (1987). Employment, the private sector, and at-risk youth. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 494, 94-100, pp. 96-97.
5. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (1994). Canadian crime statistics 1992. Juristat, 14(3), pp. 12-13. Statistics Canada.
6. Ibid., p. 13.
7. Ibid., p. 15.
8. Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General. (1993). Crime prevention in Canada: Toward a national strategy. Twelfth report of the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General, Issue 87. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, p. 8.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., p. 10.
11. Canadian Council on Social Development. (1984). Crime prevention through social development: A discussion paper for social policy makers and practitioners. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development, p. 16.
12. Simourd, L., and Andrews, D.A. (1994). Correlates of delinquency: A look at gender differences. Forum on Corrections Research, 6(1), pp. 26-31.
13. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. (1992). Female young offenders, 1990-91. Juristat, 12(11), p. 1.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.
16. Donnison, D. (1982), cited in Ryerse, C. (1990). Thursday's child. Child poverty in Canada: A review of the effects of poverty on children. Ottawa: National Youth Care Network, pp. 3-4.
17. Ryerse, C. (1990). Thursday's child. Child poverty in Canada: A review of the effects of poverty on children. Ottawa: National Youth Care Network, p. 3.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid., pp. 3-4.
23. Lempriere, T. (1992). A new look at poverty. Perception, 16, 18-21, p. 18.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid., pp. 18-19.
26. Ibid., p. 19.
27. Ibid., pp. 19-20.
28. Ibid., p. 20.
29. Ibid., p. 21.

30. Hartnagel, T.F., and Lee, G.W. (1990). Urban crime in Canada. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 32(4), 591-606, p. 594.
31. Ryerse, C. (1990), p. 62.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid., p. 63.
35. National Council of Welfare. (1994). Poverty Profile 1992. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, p. 30.
36. Evans, R.S., and Prevost, M. (1993). Young families and rising poverty. Perception, 17, 23-24, p. 23.
37. National Council of Welfare. (1994). p. 8.
38. Evans R.S., and Prevost, M. (1993), p. 24.
39. Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General. (1993). p. 11.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid. p. 10.
42. Ibid.
43. Ryerse, C. (1990), p. 52.
44. Goetting, A. (1992, November). Parenthood factors in delinquency and crime: A review of research. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, New Orleans, LA, p. 4.
45. Ibid., p. 20-21.
46. Ibid., p. 19.
47. Ibid., p. 20.
48. Simons, L., Wu, C., and Conger, R. (1992). Differences in the impact of parenting and peer group upon delinquency for early versus late starters. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, New Orleans, LA, p. 1.
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid., p. 2.
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid., p. 3.
53. Ibid., pp. 3-4.
54. Ibid., p. 4.

Chapter 3

1. Canadian Criminal Justice Association. (1989). Safer communities: A social strategy for crime prevention in Canada. Ottawa: Editor, p. 5.
2. European and North-American Conference on Urban Safety and Crime Prevention. (1989). Final Declaration of the European and North-American Conference on Urban Safety and Crime Prevention, Montreal, Quebec.

3. Waller, Irvin (1991 November). Introductory report on urban safety, drugs and crime prevention: Implications of current trends. Presented at the II International Conference on Urban Safety, Drugs and Crime Prevention, Paris, France, p. 3.
4. Ibid.
5. Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General. (1993, February). Committee recommends a national strategy to prevent crime [News release]. Ottawa: House of Commons, p. 1.
6. Ibid, p. 1.
7. Government of Canada. (1994). National Crime Prevention Council created [News Release].
8. Task Force on Crime Prevention. (1993). Partners in crime prevention: For a safer Quebec. Report of the Task Force on Crime Prevention 1993. Quebec City: Minister of Public Security, Government of Quebec.
9. Canadian Criminal Justice Association. (1989), p. 21.
10. Canadian Criminal Justice Association. (1989), p. 23.

Chapter 4

1. European and North-American Conference on Urban Safety and Crime Prevention. (1989). Final Declaration of the European and North-American Conference on Urban Safety and Crime Prevention, Montreal, Quebec. p. 18.
2. Task Force on Crime Prevention. (1993). Partners in crime prevention: For a safer Quebec. Report of the Task Force on Crime Prevention. Quebec City: Minister of Public Security, Government of Quebec. p. 180.
3. John Howard Society of Ontario. (1993). Now is not the time to panic: Preventing crime by confronting the fear of crime. Toronto: John Howard Society of Ontario. p. 6.
4. Ibid., pp. 5-7.
5. European and North-American Conference on Urban Safety and Crime Prevention. (1989), p. 17.
6. Ibid., p. 17.
7. Ibid., p. 18.
8. Berger, R., and Berger, C. (1985). Community organization approaches to the prevention of juvenile delinquency. Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 12, 129-153., p. 146
9. European and North-American Conference on Urban Safety and Crime Prevention. (1989), p. 17.
10. Cooper, T.L. (1980). Citizen participation: From political response to administrative initiative. The Bureaucrat, Winter 1979-80, 40-49. p. 41.
11. Ibid., p. 41.
12. Round Tables on the Environment and Economy in Canada (1993). Building consensus for a sustainable future: Guiding principles. Ottawa: Enviro Print. p. 5
13. Ibid., p. 6.

14. Goldman, H., and Intritigator, B. (1990). Factors that enhance collaboration among education, health and social service agencies. Paper presented at the 1990 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. p. 9.
15. Ibid., p. 9.
16. Wolfe, R. (1994). Evaluating your campaign: A framework for measuring success. Speaking notes from workshop facilitated by Ruth Wolfe, evaluation consultant with Wolfe-Gordon Consulting. Workshop presented at conference entitled, Tools for Change: Social Marketing in Your Community, March 17-18, 1994, Edmonton. p 3.
17. Deutscher, I. (1976). Toward avoiding the goal-trap in evaluation research. In C.C. Abt (Ed.), The Evaluation of Social Programs, pp. 249-268. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications. p. 259.
18. Wolfe, R. (1994), p. 4.
19. Deutscher, I. (1976), p. 261.
20. Wolfe, R. (1994), p. 4.
21. Ibid., pp. 4-5.

Chapter 5

1. Nielsen, A. (1990). Visions for our future: A crime prevention guide for native communities. Edmonton: Native Counselling Services of Alberta and Alberta Solicitor General. pp. 2-3.
2. Success by 6. (1994). Vision, mission and belief statements. Edmonton: Success by 6.
3. Ibid., p. 1.
4. Servos, P. (1994). Partnership. Workshop presented at Vitalize '94 Conference, Grande Prairie, Alberta, June 7-9, 1994.
5. Audet, B.A., and Rostami, J. (1993). Partnership strategies for community investment: Findings of national consultations. Ottawa: Conference Board of Canada.
6. Board Development Unit, Alberta Community Development. (1994, April). Board Development: Serving Alberta's non-profit boards. Edmonton: Board Development Unit, Grant MacEwan Community College and The Muttart Foundation.
7. Servos, P. (1994), p. 5.
8. Audet, B.A., and Rostami, J. (1993), p. 30.
9. Board Development Unit, Alberta Community Development. (1994, April), pp. 4-5.
10. Safer Cities Initiatives, City of Edmonton. (1994). The Mayor's Task Force on Safer Cities and Safer Cities Initiatives (Folder of information). Edmonton: City of Edmonton.
11. Ibid.
12. Safer Cities Initiatives, City of Edmonton. (1994). The Safer Cities Initiatives Advisory Committee. (Folder of information). Edmonton: City of Edmonton.
13. Safer Cities Initiatives, City of Edmonton. (1994). Safer Cities Initiatives: Progress Report for the Quarter January 1 - March 31, 1994. (Folder of information). Edmonton: City of Edmonton.
14. Elash, A. (1995). By the community, for the community. Front and Centre, v. 2, no. 1, January, 1995. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Philanthropy., p. 1.

15. Ibid., p. 2.
16. Ibid., p. 2
17. Ibid., p.2.
18. Children and Families Initiative. (1994). Submission of the Edmonton Children and Families Initiative to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Human Resources Development. p. 1.
19. Children and Families Initiative. (1994). Stakeholders' Meeting, November 24, 1993, Summary Report. p. 2.
20. Children and Families Initiative. (1994). Steering Committee Priorities, February 12, 1994. p. 1.
21. Children and Families Initiative. (1994). Children and Families Initiative - Stakeholders' Update. December 31, 1994.
22. Children and Families Initiative. (1994). Steering Committee Priorities, February 12, 1994. p. 1.
23. Children and Families Initiative. (1994). Steering Committee Priorities, February 12, 1994. p. 1.
24. Children and Families Initiative. (1994). Children and Families Initiative - Stakeholders' Update. December 31, 1994.