



# Measuring Neighbourhood Watch

## Views of Effectiveness

V1.02



## 1. Introduction

This Review was undertaken at the request of Chief Constable Frank Whiteley, the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) lead for Neighbourhood and Home Watch and other Watch Schemes in England and Wales, following lengthy debate at the National Strategy Group For Watch Issues (NSGWI) around the question of “Is Neighbourhood Watch effective in reducing crime?”

The review considers the published work on the effectiveness of Neighbourhood Watch (NHW) schemes in reducing crime and summarises the experiences of researchers to date. It draws mainly on the 14 publications listed in the Bibliography, which are amongst those most frequently referenced in papers on the subject. These documents were themselves selected from a database created for this review containing 443 NHW related titles, 280 of them Research Papers.

Whilst the primary focus of the review is on evidence of crime reduction the paper also uses data from the publications reviewed to consider the categories against which measurements might in future be made.

## 2. Executive Summary

Since the inception of Neighbourhood Watch in the UK over 25 years ago researchers have sought to understand it’s effectiveness, initially and still most frequently expressed as a reduction in crime. Individual examples of the impact of NHW have shown crime to reduce in specific situations and yet numerous studies have shown that when attempts have been made to measure the overall effectiveness using crime reduction alone the results have been ambiguous. A recent study<sup>1</sup> now finds that NHW is reported as reducing crime in 79% of cases in the UK and 56% of cases in the total study group. Although this report has some caveats it uses very rigorous methodology and is seen as the most comprehensive to date. In terms of at least the UK it makes a significant case for a link.

Whatever the impact, if crime reduction was the only measure that people valued then you might think that the worldwide attitude to NHW would be ambivalent but this is not the case. Studies consistently show that NHW is valued by the community at large, frequently for the reassurance that it provides. These values are largely recognised by NHW in the UK and articulated in the watch objectives.

This review suggests that for all practical purposes, the case for the effectiveness of NHW in reducing crime should now be considered proven and that further measures of effectiveness might now be improved by shifting the focus from an understanding of “If” it is effective in reducing crime to a two pronged approach that:

---

<sup>1</sup> Bennett, T.H., Holloway, K. and Farrington, D.P. (2006) “Does Neighbourhood Watch reduce crime? A systematic review and meta-analysis”. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*. Vol.2, No.4, pp.437-458. and Bennett, T.H. and Holloway, K. (2008) “A review of the effectiveness of Neighbourhood Watch” *Security Journal*. Advanced access publication August 2008.



- Understands specifically “How” NHW is effective in specific instances of reducing crime. (A Best Practice Study) and
- Considers alternative metrics for effectiveness based on those aspects of Neighbourhood Watch that stakeholders most value.



### 3. Contents

1. Introduction .....	2
2. Executive Summary .....	2
3. Contents.....	4
4. Statistically supported findings of the effectiveness of NHW against crime .....	5
5. Measures of Effectiveness .....	7
6. Neighbourhood Watch Objectives.....	8
6.1. United Kingdom.....	8
6.2. New Zealand .....	9
6.3. Australia .....	9
6.3.1. Victoria.....	9
6.3.2. New South Wales (The Northbridge area of Sydney).....	9
6.3.3. Australian Capital Territory (ACT) Canberra.....	10
6.4. United States of America .....	10
6.4.1. National Sheriffs Association (USA On Watch) .....	10
7. What People Value .....	11
8. Conclusions.....	13
Appendix A - NHW Objectives .....	14
Table 1 - Comparison of NHW Objectives .....	14
Table 2 - Objectives not covered by the UK.....	17
Appendix B - Laycock and Tilley, Strategic Implementation of NHW by Crime Category .....	18
Appendix C - Studies of the Effectiveness of Neighbourhood Support .....	20
Appendix D - Bibliography .....	21



## 4. Statistically supported findings of the effectiveness of NHW against crime

Neighbourhood Watch has been in existence for over 25 years and is now operating in various forms in many countries of the World. Whilst objectives and implementations may vary the primary focus has always been on the reduction of crime and from the earliest times studies have sought to establish the impact of NHW on crime rates.

A mid 90s review by the Home Office (Laycock and Tilley, 1995) noted that NHW "...can and sometimes has produced reductions in crime, notably burglary" but also highlighted the variability of NHW implementations, the widely differing contexts and the lack of understanding about how reductions in crime had been achieved. The study drew on the results of several other reviewers (Bennett 1990, Husain 1990 and Rosenbaum, 1987/88) who had all noted similar difficulties in methodology and variation of results. Despite significant improvements in approach (Benett 1990 is quoted) results were again inconsistent.

By 2007 there was a wider pool of published data although the inconsistencies continued. In their review of the New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey 2007<sup>1</sup>, Mayhew and Reilly devoted a chapter to Neighbourhood Watch (Neighbourhood Support in New Zealand) and again considered the published works, including a table (Appendix C below) listing 11 studies, of which three (Sherman, (1992), Sherman and Eck, (2002)<sup>2</sup> and Bennett, Holloway and Farrington (2006.<sup>3</sup>) conducted systematic reviews of previous literature. These reviews received high assessments for research quality, with Bennett seen as the most rigorous to date, but still showed no consistent link between NHW and crime reduction although Bennett did show an overall positive benefit, significantly in the UK.

The Bennett survey illustrates the difficulties of making any assessment of links between the NHW movement and crime reduction.

To produce reliable findings the authors paid particular attention to methodology, using a rigorous, statistically based approach and limiting their research to the most comparable, quality based work they could find. This reduced an original list of over 1,500 publications to just 30.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mayhew, J. and Reilly, P. - Findings from the New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey 2006: NZ Ministry of Justice

<sup>2</sup> Sherman LW and Eck JE 2002. Policing for crime prevention. In LW Sherman, DP Farrington, BC Welsh and DL MacKenzie (eds) Evidence-based crime prevention. London: Routledge.

<sup>3</sup> Bennett, T.H., Holloway, K. and Farrington, D.P. (2006) "Does Neighbourhood Watch reduce crime? A systematic review and meta-analysis". Journal of Experimental Criminology. Vol.2, No.4, pp.437-458. and Bennett, T.H. and Holloway, K. (2008) "A review of the effectiveness of Neighbourhood Watch" Security Journal. Advanced access publication August 2008.



The results showed that within the overall study group, 56% reported positive findings but with some significant variations within the categories evaluated. As examples, positive results for the UK were 79%, whilst for outside the UK they were 41%. For published work the figure was 40% positive whilst for unpublished work it was 91%.

Whilst these results were inconsistent across the categories considered they are still entirely valid in their own context and are quoted as potentially the most reliable yet produced. Rather than being seen as inconsistent, these variations highlight the impact of the many variables involved although "...the factors that influence which schemes are effective..." are still obscure.

With the publication of Bennett et al. 2006 it is difficult to see how future general reviews of the impact of the NHW movement in reducing crime might improve. Although more valid in terms of data and methodology, the summary still seems to reflect earlier findings, that although NHW can and sometimes does produce reductions in crime, general studies vary considerably with circumstance.

The inclination now is to accept Bennett et al. as the best general assessment that is likely to be produced and focus instead on two fronts:

- The factors that make NHW successful (The Operational level) and
- What measures of effectiveness might be adopted that address published NHW objectives or how NHW is most valued by stakeholders.



## 5. Measures of Effectiveness

When considering measures of effectiveness in any walk of life it is reasonable to ask “Effective against what?” and two perhaps obvious answers to this question are against existing NHW objectives or aspects of NHW that people value.

In the case of the UK there seems to be a close fit between these two elements. In contrast to some countries the UK NHW objectives do not restrict themselves to Crime Reduction but instead include such aspects as Reassurance, Neighbourliness and Quality of Life and in recent publications these are the factors that emerge in comments on what stakeholders value.

The issue of what to measure was covered in a paper by Fleming<sup>4</sup> in 2005 and the ideas provide an interesting alternate view. In her paper, Jenny Fleming recognises the historic difficulty of assessing NHW in terms of impact on crime and proposes a new approach to assessment based on viewing NHW within the context of Reassurance Policing. Fleming suggests that a better way to assess the efficacy of NW is to view it as “...a vehicle to enhance partnerships between police, other agencies and the community and that these partnerships can effectively improve police/community relations, improve perceptions of safety and security and enhance community involvement in wider crime prevention initiatives.”

Three possible criteria are proposed:

- The capacity to enhance the relationship between police and the community;
- The ability to improve feelings of safety and security; and
- The ability to expand community involvement in wider safety and crime prevention initiatives.

The proposals are seen as consistent with “... the emergence of Reassurance Policing that targets street crime and disorder and has been a key component of recent reforms in the UK police force.” The paper “... challenges practitioners, policy makers and communities involved with NW schemes to rethink the outcomes they are seeking to achieve and provides a rationale for community police partnerships that have the potential to improve feelings of safety and security in local communities.”

---

<sup>4</sup> Fleming, J. - Neighbourhood Watch, reassurance policing and the potential of partnerships: Australian Institute of Criminology.



## 6. Neighbourhood Watch Objectives

In considering what different groups value about Neighbourhood Watch it would be instructive to look at the published aims and objectives of organisations around the world and then compare them with what people actually do. People do not tend to undertake voluntary work that they do not value and understanding what attracts volunteers and comparing it with how they are actually spending their time would be reasonable pointers both to what people value and how NHW might evolve. An investigation of what people do in their watch schemes is outside the scope of this review. However, whilst it is not always easy to find a clear statement of NHW objectives for any one Country or State, a superficial comparison is possible.

Appendix A, Table 1 provides a simple comparison of the various attitudes and approaches, from national to local level, gleaned from the web sites and published reviews of the countries concerned. These extracts do not directly compare like with like and represent different levels of authority but, if read with that understanding, do give a flavour of the differing approaches and emphases in the communities served. Table 2 shows additional activities of other nations not traditionally covered by the UK objectives.

Appendix B shows the variations in aim and approach that might be adopted with differing crime levels in the UK, proposed by Laycock and Tilley in 1995.

### 6.1. United Kingdom

The objectives of UK Neighbourhood & Home Watch are contained in the “Neighbourhood & Home Watch National Statement of Purpose” agreed Jan 2009 and published on the UK Neighbourhood & Home Watch web site. ([www.mynhw.co.uk](http://www.mynhw.co.uk)) They are listed below. Objectives highlight crime reduction but also include reassurance and community elements that reflect many of the aspects seen as valuable from the publications reviewed. In that respect they seem to provide a good basis for alternative measures of effectiveness although framing suitable measurement criteria might prove a challenge.

The Objectives are:

- Prevent crime, and the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour
- Reassure local residents, and reduce the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour
- Reduce the incidence of domestic fires and environmental damage to residential property
- Encourage neighbourliness and community cohesion
- Improve the quality of life for local residents and tenants





## 6.2. New Zealand<sup>5</sup>

The New Zealand approach to NHW (taken from “Findings from the New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey 2006”) is broadly similar to that of the UK, although placing more emphasis on the concept of empowering communities to help themselves. Whilst focusing activity on the primary UK objective of “Cutting crime, opportunities for crime and antisocial behaviour” the specific activities are formally expressed in more tactical terms as: “Burglary and car crime in the local area,” and “Reducing graffiti, vandalism, violence and disorder.” Focus is also given to the wider objective of “Educating and Empowering neighbours to take responsibility for their own safety” and the practical task of “Knowing how and when to contact Police, other emergency services and support agencies.” The UK Objectives around “Reassurance, Neighbourliness and Quality of Life” are all covered but the NZ approach stresses self reliance, suggesting that NHW might “..Decide on ways to handle any civil emergencies that may occur” and “Identify the strengths and skills of neighbours to contribute to solving local problems.” The support of Victims of Crime is also stated as a potential role.

## 6.3. Australia

Australian NHW is owned funded and run by the Territorial or State Police, although there have recently been moves to organise at a National and International level. Australia and New Zealand have also (2005) created a joint organisation, “Australasian Neighbourhood Watch” that is still developing. (Last Conference Nov 2008.)

Comments on examples from the individual States give a general flavour:

### 6.3.1. Victoria<sup>6</sup>

The primary focus in the stated objectives (from a Victoria NHW Board review in 2007) is on crime deterrence, prevention and detection, on neighbourhood safety and the desire to reduce the fear of crime, although the overall Aim of NHW includes: “To foster and enhance the partnership between police and the community and thereby improve the safety, security and quality of life for all Victorians.”

### 6.3.2. New South Wales<sup>7</sup> (The Northbridge area of Sydney)

Northbridge NHW objectives are stated as: Improving the level of personal and household security, Minimising the incidence of preventable crime, Increasing the incidence of crime reporting to the Police, Encouraging people to engrave / photograph their property for ease of identification if stolen and Improving the relationship between

---

<sup>5</sup> Mayhew, J. and Reilley, P. - Findings from the New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey 2006

<sup>6</sup> Victoria (Australia) NHW Board - Review of Neighbourhood Watch — (2007) final report and recommendations for consideration.

<sup>7</sup> No State level Objectives found. The above from: Northbridge Progress Association (2009) NHW Northbridge, Sydney, Australia Web Site



local Police and the community. Watches are expected to have four meetings a year and to organise four newsletters.

### **6.3.3. Australian Capital Territory (ACT) Canberra<sup>8</sup>**

Objectives around prevention and detection of crime are prioritised although the importance of community spirit and neighbourliness is stressed. The two way communication with Police is seen as an important element.

Specific initiatives include the identification and marking of personal property, the creation and distribution of newsletters and the encouraging of reporting of crime and suspicious activities to the Police.

## **6.4. United States of America**

### **6.4.1. National Sheriffs Association (USA On Watch)<sup>9</sup>**

In the USA Neighborhood Watch is operated through USAOnWatch ([www.usaonwatch.org](http://www.usaonwatch.org)) on behalf of the National Sheriffs' Association. Watches are supported centrally in terms of literature, guidance, marketing information etc. and are self organising and funding. The single Aim is defined on the "USAonWatch" web site as to: "... unite law enforcement agencies, private organizations, and individual citizens in a massive effort to reduce residential crime." Watches are expected to define local problems, establish objectives and work with local Police. Activities are generally crime prevention, detection and reporting of suspicious activity. Tasks can include patrols of neighbourhoods.

---

<sup>8</sup> Australian Federal Police - (2009) ACT (Australian Capital Territories) Neighbourhood Watch web site.

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.sheriffs.org> and <http://www.usaonwatch.org>



## 7. What People Value

If measures of NHW should reflect those aspects that people value, then it might be helpful to monitor the values that people most appreciate and compare them against the formal objectives.

In the Urbecon survey of UK Neighbourhood Watch undertaken in 2004<sup>10</sup> the authors offered a guide based on the answers to postal surveys and interviews. They found that respondents “...overwhelmingly chose ‘reassurance’ as the most important role (100% of police, 98% of CDRP [Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership] respondents). ‘Improving police/community relations’ came a very close second. A clear majority of both groups believed that ‘detering criminals’ was also a primary role. Opinions varied about ‘intelligence gathering’, which was more favoured by police respondents (88%) than among CDRP respondents (75%) while more CDRP respondents (55%) than police respondents (47%) saw a surveillance role as primary.” Although not a primary goal of the report, the findings were considered useful and included on that basis.

Other indicators come from papers reporting instances where NHW effectiveness was measured not so much against tangible factors such as crime levels but against peoples perceptions of how NHW had worked. NHW was first accredited in Northern Ireland in 2004 and reviewed in 2007.<sup>11</sup> As a part of the Review, stakeholders were asked their perceptions of the effectiveness of NHW against nine key metrics. Of these nine, “Reducing the level of Crime” came 8<sup>th</sup> and “Reducing the level of Antisocial Behaviour”, 9<sup>th</sup>, with the top five places going to factors concerning the building of Police and community relationships and the development of community empowerment. Northern Ireland may be seen as a special case in terms of both recent history and the maturity of NHW but the potential for NHW assisting in community improvement is clear. In New Zealand<sup>12</sup> a 2007 study showed that whilst there was no clear evidence of Crime Reduction, Reduction of Concern about Crime, Improved Social Cohesion or Flow of Information to the Police, measurements of popularity of NHW (Neighbourhood Support in NZ) were very positive, with eight out of ten people not covered by schemes saying they would join if one became available. This figure is echoed in the UK where a 2006 Home Office report<sup>13</sup> shows that three quarters of those not covered by a scheme would join if asked. The implication is that whilst studies struggle to measure the more tangible factors such as

---

<sup>10</sup> Gresham P, Grainger E, Stockdale J, Woodhead D C, and Shermer D: Keeping Watch. A report by For the Home Office, Crime Strategy and Resources Unit, on the Neighbourhood Watch Development Project. (2004) : Urbecon Ltd.

<sup>11</sup> SMR with SRC and The ICR - Research into the views and experience of people involved in Neighbourhood Watch Schemes in Northern Ireland. (2007) : Northern Ireland Policing Board, Community Safety Unit of the Northern Ireland Office and the Police Service of Northern Ireland.

<sup>12</sup> Mayhew, J. and Reilley, P. - Findings from the New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey 2006: NZ Ministry of Justice.(2007)

<sup>13</sup> Worry about crime in England and Wales: findings from the 2003/04 and 2004/05 British Crime Survey: Home Office Online Report 15/06



impact on crime, the general public perceives a value in NHW which is more to do with community spirit, communication and reassurance, factors which whilst difficult to measure may be every bit as valuable.



## 8. Conclusions

This document is not an original work of research and as such does not present new findings. In contrast it uses published literature to attempt to understand the ambiguities reported by so many researchers into the Effectiveness of NHW in reducing crime and considers what alternative approaches might be of value.

The observations are:

1. After more than 25 years of evaluation we now have available what may be the most carefully researched and presented work possible in assessing the general effectiveness of NHW in reducing crime. These results show that NHW was effective in reducing crime in 79% of cases but highlight that significant variations are produced in differing circumstances. They also highlight that little is known about the factors that influence which schemes are effective.
2. From other sources we have an emerging recognition that there may be benefits of moving to alternate methods of measuring effectiveness based more on factors that stakeholders value. These are likely to involve reassurance, neighbourliness and better integration between the community, agencies and Police.
3. From numerous surveys we have evidence that if we cannot always link effectiveness to crime reduction there are individual cases where NHW has been of specific assistance, although we do not necessarily understand what factors impacted that success. We also know that there is wide popular support for NHW. If we are not measuring the reasons for public perceptions of effectiveness then the public is telling us clearly that they are there.
4. This report suggests that we should now shift the focus of measuring the effectiveness of Neighbourhood Watch from an understanding of "If" it is effective in reducing crime to a two pronged approach that:
  - a. Understands specifically "How" it is effective in specific instances of reducing crime. (A Best Practice Study) and
  - b. Considers alternative metrics for effectiveness based on the aspects of Neighbourhood Watch that stakeholders most value.



## Appendix A - NHW Objectives

**Table 1 - Comparison of NHW Objectives**

<u>UK NSGWI</u>	<u>NZ (National)</u>	<u>Australia (Victoria)</u>	<u>Australia (NSW Govt)</u>	<u>Australia (NSW - Sydney Northbridge)</u>	<u>Australia ACT (Australian Capital Territory)</u>	<u>USA National Sheriffs Association</u>
<p><b>Prevent crime, and the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour</b></p>	<p>Minimise burglaries and car crime in the local area.</p> <p>reduce graffiti, vandalism, violence and disorder.</p> <p>Know when and how to contact Police, other emergency services or support agencies.</p> <p>Educate and empower neighbours to take responsibility for their own safety.</p>	<p>To minimise the incidence of preventable crime.</p> <p>To deter criminal activity by increasing the probability of apprehension.</p> <p>To increase the reporting of crime and suspicious activity.</p> <p>To improve the degree of personal and household security through education programmes</p>	<p>Increasing community awareness of crime risk, and prevention strategies.</p> <p>Co-ordinating multi faceted crime prevention efforts.</p>	<p>Encouraging people to engrave / photograph their property for ease of identification if stolen.</p>	<p>Provides a voice for the community regarding crime prevention</p> <p>Improves communication between police, the community and you.</p> <p>Distributes crime prevention messages and community education about safety, security and well being, through regular newsletters delivered to as many residences as can be covered by volunteers</p> <p>Encourages reporting of crime and suspicious activity to police</p>	<p>"... unite law enforcement agencies, private organizations, and individual citizens in a massive effort to reduce residential crime."</p>



<u>UK NSGWI</u>	<u>NZ (National)</u>	<u>Australia (Victoria)</u>	<u>Australia (NSW Govt)</u>	<u>Australia (NSW - Sydney Northbridge)</u>	<u>Australia ACT (Australian Capital Territory)</u>	<u>USA National Sheriffs Association</u>
		To expand time programme's involvement in wider community safety and crime—prevention initiatives.			Seeks to improve the quality of information provided to police  Encourages people to correctly and comprehensively identify and record all personal and household items of value	
<b>Reassure local residents, and reduce the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour</b>	Share information that will help reduce the risk and fear of crime  Enhance the safety features and appearance of the neighbourhood..	To reduce the fear of crime.				
<b>Reduce the incidence of domestic fires and environmental damage to residential property</b>						



<u>UK NSGWI</u>	<u>NZ (National)</u>	<u>Australia (Victoria)</u>	<u>Australia (NSW Govt)</u>	<u>Australia (NSW - Sydney Northbridge)</u>	<u>Australia ACT (Australian Capital Territory)</u>	<u>USA National Sheriffs Association</u>
<b>Encourage neighbourliness and community cohesion</b>	Encourage neighbours to talk to each other.  Liaise and cooperate with other community groups.		Utilising local police services regarding early intervention programs to young children.	Improving the relationship between local Police and the community.	Cares about what happens in our neighbourhoods and is visibly active in developing community spirit	
	Help foster a sense of community spirit, where everyone is respected and valued.  Identify the needs of neighbours and ways to assist each other.					
<b>Improve the quality of life for local residents and tenants</b>	Enhance the safety features and appearance of the neighbourhood.	To foster and enhance the partnership between police and the community and thereby improve the safety, security and the quality of life for all Victorians.				





**Table 2 - Objectives not covered by the UK**

<u>Category</u>	<u>NZ (National)</u>	<u>Australia (Victoria)</u>	<u>Australia (NSW Govt)</u>	<u>Australia (NSW - Sydney Northbridge)</u>	<u>Australia ACT (Australian Capital Territory)</u>	<u>USA On Watch (USA National)</u>	<u>USA National Sheriffs Association</u>
Civil Emergency Planning	Decide on ways to handle any civil emergencies that may occur.						
Neighbourhood Self Help	Identify the strengths and skills of neighbours to contribute to solving local problems.		Encouraging community involvement in local community safety.  Identifying real and potential community safety problems.  Co-ordinating multi faceted crime prevention efforts.				Watches are expected to define local problems, establish objectives and work with local Police who will provide a link.
Victim Support	Support victims of crime.						



## Appendix B - Laycock and Tilley, Strategic Implementation of NHW by Crime Category<sup>1</sup>

In their 1995 paper Laycock and Tilley looked at the various ways in which NHW might be adapted when addressing areas with differing levels of crime. Rather than present a single implementation model for NHW the review recognised that NHW might need differing approaches in differing areas and presented Four (Three with on subdivision) different approaches.

The models were:

<u>Crime Category</u>	<u>Aims</u>	<u>Characteristics of the NHW Scheme</u>	<u>Level of Police Involvement</u>
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Keep crime rate low</li> <li>- Maintain public confidence</li> <li>- Guard against vigilantes</li> <li>- Maintain good police/public relations</li> <li>- Reduce fear of crime</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Run by community volunteers</li> <li>- Capable of self funding</li> <li>- Respond rapidly should need arise</li> <li>- Emphasis on partnership with the police</li> <li>- Minimal involvement from other agencies</li> <li>- NHW signs displayed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support by request</li> <li>- Encourage volunteers</li> <li>- 'Standard pack' NHW</li> <li>- Provide basic crime data</li> <li>- Request help from community when need arises</li> </ul>
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce crime rate</li> <li>- Maintain and extend crime free value system</li> <li>- Increase informal social control</li> <li>- Monitor and respond to minor nuisance and incivilities</li> <li>- Improve police/public relations</li> <li>- Reduce fear of crime</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reinforce characteristics of low crime areas</li> <li>- Fund-raising events and modest subscription</li> <li>- Other agencies involved, eg. work with local authority</li> <li>- High profile activities with tenants' associations and community groups</li> <li>- Able to deal promptly with incivilities/vandalism</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Engage other agencies</li> <li>- Provide crime data</li> <li>- Active encouragement for schemes on 'at risk' estates</li> <li>- Respond promptly to emerging crime problems</li> <li>- Active CPO contribution</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Laycock, G. & Tilley, N. - (1995) Policing and Neighbourhood Watch Strategic Issues: Home Office



<u>Crime Category</u>	<u>Aims</u>	<u>Characteristics of the NHW Scheme</u>	<u>Level of Police Involvement</u>
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>a) Local authority housing</i></li> <li>- Reduce crime</li> <li>- Increase community control</li> <li>- Decrease tolerance of crime/ incivilities</li> <li>- Widen and deepen public confidence in policing</li> <li>- Reduce fear of crime</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Multi-agency support, eg BT phones, local authority involvement, probation service input</li> <li>- Strong community coordinators with local support groups in place</li> <li>- Small schemes</li> <li>- Active support for victims/witnesses</li> <li>- Active involvement of young people in crime control</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Active encouragement of schemes/innovation</li> <li>- 'Tailor-made' schemes to reflect local circumstances</li> <li>- Immediate feedback of successes</li> <li>- Engage other agencies</li> <li>- Rapid response policy on intimidation</li> <li>- ALO work with local authority</li> <li>- Provide detailed crime data</li> </ul>
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>b) Gentrified areas</i></li> <li>- Reduce crime</li> <li>- Increase public confidence</li> <li>- Maintain attractiveness of inner city to higher income groups</li> <li>- Reduce fear of crime</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Self-financing</li> <li>- Small schemes</li> <li>- NW signs displayed</li> <li>- Good police/public communications – rapid response</li> <li>- Encourage residents to help each other to reduce risks</li> <li>- Encourage installation of burglar alarms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Active encouragement of schemes</li> <li>- Domestic security surveys offered</li> <li>- Provide detailed crime data</li> </ul>



## Appendix C - Studies of the Effectiveness of Neighbourhood Support<sup>2</sup>

The most effective studies investigating the Effectiveness of NHW in Reducing Crime. From Mayhew and Reilly (2007.)

<u>Where:</u>	<u>Study</u>	<u>Effect on crime</u>	<u>Effect on concern about crime</u>	<u>Research Quality</u>
Seattle, WA, USA	Lindsay & McGillis, 1986	Some short-term reduction	Small increase	✓
Chicago	Rosenbaum et al., 1986	No consistent effect	Increase in three of four areas	✓ ✓
Rochdale, UK	Forrester et al., 1988	Reduction in burglary	Not assessed	✓ ✓
England and Wales (BCS)	Mayhew et al., 1989	Inconclusive	Possible small increase	✓
London	Bennett, 1990	None	Decrease in one of two areas	✓ ✓
Chicago	Skogan, 1990	Inconclusive	Increase	✓ ✓
UK	Husain, 1990	None	Not assessed	✓
Madison, WI, USA	Wycoff and Skogan, 1993	None	Not assessed	✓ ✓
UK (BCS)	Sims, 2001	Not measured	No effect	✓
Systematic review	Sherman, 1997; Sherman & Eck, 2002	None	Increase or no effect	✓ ✓ ✓
Meta-analysis	Bennett et al., 2006	Modest reduction' - with caveats	Not assessed	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓

<sup>2</sup> Mayhew, J. and Reilly, P. (2007) - Findings from the New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey 2006



## Appendix D - Bibliography

- Bennett, T.H., Holloway, K. and Farrington, D.P. (2006) "Does Neighbourhood Watch reduce crime? A systematic review and meta-analysis". *Journal of Experimental Criminology*. Vol.2, No.4, pp.437-458. and Bennett, T.H. and Holloway, K. (2008) "A review of the effectiveness of Neighbourhood Watch" *Security Journal*. Advanced access publication August 2008.
- Casey, L. - Casey Report - Engaging Communities in Fighting Crime - Full Report (2008)
- Flemming, J. - Neighbourhood Watch, reassurance policing and the potential of partnerships. (2005)
- Gresham, P. Grainger, E. Stockdale, J. Woodhead, D.C. Shermer, D. (2004) "Urbecon" Report to the Home Office, Crime Strategy and Resources Unit, on the Neighbourhood Watch Development Project. - Urbecon Ltd (2004)
- Holloway, Katy Bennett, Trevor and Farrington, David P. Does Neighborhood Watch Reduce Crime? Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, (2008)
- Huck, S. & Kosfeld, M. - The Dynamics of Neighbourhood Watch and Norm Enforcement' (2004)
- Laycock, G. & Tilley, N. - Policing and Neighbourhood Watch Strategic Issues (1995)
- Marshall, B. & Johnson, S. - Crime in Rural Areas: A Review of the Literature for the Rural Evidence Research Centre (2005)
- Mayhew, J. and Reilly, P. - Findings from the New Zealand Crime and Safety Survey 2006 (2007)
- Rasphone, A. - The analysis of Neighbourhood Watch Structure Using Geographic Information System (GIS) (2004)
- Sherman, L. W., Gottfredson, D., MacKenzie, D., Eck, J., Reuter, P., & Bushway, S. (1997). Preventing crime: What works, what doesn't, what's promising. (1997)
- Sims, L. - NW Findings from the 2000 BCS (2001)
- SMR with SRC and The ICR - Research into Neighbourhood Watch Schemes in Northern Ireland (2007)
- Victorian Police. Review of Neighbourhood Watch: Final report and recommendations for consideration. Australian Policy Online. (2007)

Richard Slatter BSc. MIET  
Hertfordshire Constabulary  
May 2009