

The San Romanoway Community Revitalization Project:  
Executive Report, 2006

George S. Rigakos\*  
Associate Professor of Law, Criminology and Political Economy  
Department of Law  
Carleton University  
1125 Colonel By Drive  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1S 5B6

December 2007

**\*This report is for internal use only. Do not copy or distribute without written consent from the author.**

This report was financially supported by a grant from the Law Commission of Canada and the National Crime Prevention Centre. The authors would like to thank Stephen Bosanac, Francis Kwashie, David Sealy, and Alka Tandan Stephnie Payne, Adina James, Mirna Santizo, Rosa Guo, Shahzad Din, Tenician Ashley, Chaudra Varathrajan, and Kathy Likourezos for their hard work and research assistance.

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction and method:</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Findings:</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Demographic change: .....	2
Violent Crime:.....	4
Domestic Violence:.....	4
Property Crime: .....	5
Feelings of safety: .....	6
Community improvement:.....	7
Community Problems: .....	8
Community cohesion: .....	9
Police and security: .....	11
Programming:.....	12
<b>References:</b> .....	<b>18</b>

## **Introduction and method:**

This is an abridged report of a larger longitudinal analysis which is currently the subject of academic peer-review. Previous reports on the base-line 2002 (Rigakos, Sealy and Tandan 2002) and interim 2004 data collection years (Rigakos, Kwashie and Bosanac 2005) are available for public perusal. They also contain detailed information on methodology, sample rates and focus group data. This report is based on a scientific sample of residents at 5, 10 and 25 San Romanoway in 2002, 2004 and 2006. It employs a Quality of Neighbourhood Life Survey (QNLS) (DeKeseredy et al. 2003) which includes demographic, victimization, safety and perception questions about changes in neighbourhood life before and after a comprehensive crime prevention initiative in the community.

## **Findings:**

### ***Demographic change:***

In the 2002 QNLS, the most frequent country of origin response was for Jamaica making up 12.1% of the sample. Jamaican-born representation decreased by 4.9% in 2004 and continued to decrease for the 2006 sample year. The largest increase was from Chinese-born respondents, a 9.3% increase in 2004 only to see their representation drop to less than 1% in 2006. Residents born in Guyana increased their representation in the San Romanoway community in 2004 while seeing a decline to 2.8% in 2006. Sri Lankan born respondents remained the third most populous group in the San Romanoway community at 9.9%. In 2006, more respondents reported being born in Canada at 13.0% followed by Jamaica at 5.1%. Anecdotal information from site

employees verifies that these statistics correspond to successive waves of tenants moving into the community.

Table 1: Country of birth

Rank	Country (in %)	2002*	2004*	2006
2004		(n=76)	(n=39)	(n=228)
1	Guyana	8.0	15.7	2.8
2	China	3.4	12.7	0.8
3	Sri Lanka	10.5	10.5	4.0
4	Canada	11.7	9.9	13.0
5	Jamaica	12.1	7.2	5.1

\* These numbers should be read with caution given the low response rate to this question.

Most respondents self-identified as “Caribbean” in 2002 and remained the predominant group in 2006 making up 36.1% of the sample. In 2004, an apparent spike in representation from “Far Eastern” respondents dropped from 31.2% to 14.5% of respondents in 2006.

Table 2: Respondent group identification

Rank	Group (in %)*	2002 (n=306)	2004 (n=308)	2006 (n=310)
2004				
1	Far Eastern	28.0	31.2	14.5
2	Caribbean	34.3	26.0	36.1
3	North African	0.3	7.1	12.6
4	English Canadian	9.5	6.8	16.1
5	Central American	3.3	6.2	6.8

\*Does not add to 100% because only top five groups are listed.

### ***Violent Crime:***

There was an overall statistically significant decrease of 49.9% in violent crime victimization from 2002 to 2006. Assaults also decreased by 29.6%, robberies by 28.4% and sexual assaults were statistically significantly reduced by 60.5%.

Table 3: Violent crime rate (incidents per 1,000 population)

CRIME TYPE	2002	2004	2006	% change 2002-06
Assault	54.0	65.0	38.0	-29.6
Robbery	60.9	43.3	43.6	-28.4
Sexual Assault	82.1	46.6	32.4	-60.5*
TOTAL VIOLENT CRIME†	201.5	155.3	100.9	-49.9*

\*p<.05

†Includes threats

### ***Domestic Violence:***

Over 26% of women in the San Romanoway community reported being physically victimized by their partner in 2006. This is on par with the Canadian average (Ellis and DeKeseredy 1995). However, 89.7% reported psychological abuse and 2% reported experiencing sexual coercion. Caution should be exercised with these findings as response rates are low and data collection methods affect response quality. One explanation of increased reporting of domestic violence victimization may reflect new community initiatives to counsel battered women.

Table 4: Partner violence victimization (in %)

Type of violence*	YEAR	RATE		% change 2002-06	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
Physical	2002	11.9	24.1		
	2004	13.0	20.2	+178.2	-10.3
	2006	33.1	26.6		
Psychological	2002	32.6	35.0		
	2004	27.4	48.5	+188.0	+156.3
	2006	93.9	89.7		
Sexual Coercion	2002	11.8	4.9		
	2004	16.0	4.9	-49.2	-57.1
	2006	6.0	2.1		

\* Based on Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (Straus et al., 1996) groupings. Physical consists 12 of 12 items, psychological 6 of 8 items, and sexual 3 of 7 items. Results should be read with caution given survey method and response rate.

### ***Property Crime:***

Total property crime decreased by 13.4% from 2002 to 2006. Break and enters declined by 16% and motor vehicle and parts theft decreased statistically significantly by 67.1%. There was a marked increase in property crime from 2004 to 2006 for break and enter (114.3%), and increases for household theft (79.6%) and personal theft (2.3%). Most property crime reductions took place between the 2002 and 2004 survey years. Despite increases in the past two years, these rates are still lower than 2002 levels.

Table 5: Household crime rate (incidents per 1,000 population)

CRIME TYPE	2002	2004	2006	% change 2002-06
Break and Enter	12.5	4.9	10.5	-16.0
Motor vehicle/parts theft	7.0	7.7	2.3	-67.1*
Theft of household property	18.8	10.8	19.4	+3.2
Personal theft	24.6	34.1	34.9	+41.9
<b>TOTAL PROPERTY CRIME</b>	<b>40.4</b>	<b>26.7</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>-13.4</b>

\*p<.05

### ***Feelings of safety:***

Across all perception categories, there was statistically significant increase in feelings of safety in the community from 2002 to 2006. Residents reporting they felt safe “walking alone in their neighbourhood after dark” increased from 34.6% in 2002 to 70.8% in 2006. Similar changes were found in all safety categories, including “alone at home” for which 85.9% of respondents reported feeling safe in 2006 compared to 58.7% in 2002 (see Table 6). Satisfaction with neighbourhood life also statistically significantly increased from 2002 to 2006. The number of respondents reporting that they were “very satisfied” with living in their neighbourhood increased by almost 200 per cent from 2002 to 2006. Similarly, residents reporting that they were very dissatisfied with their neighbourhood decreased from 15.9% to 1.8% (see Table 7).

Table 6: Feelings of safety in the San Romanoway community (in %)

TYPE OF ACTIVITY AFTER DARK	SAFE†			UNSAFE‡		
	2002	2004	2006	2002	2004	2006
Walking alone***	34.6	39.2	70.8	47.4	40.7	20.3
Riding bus alone***	42.6	46.8	73.7	39.2	36	17.9
Riding bike alone***	29.7	33.2	64.4	46.9	46.3	25.8
Walking alone in car lot***	33.5	37.9	66.8	47.9	40.6	24.0
Waiting alone for public transportation***	37.9	39.8	67.2	46.0	39.4	23.4
Waiting for someone to drive you home***	40.6	46.1	70.2	40.9	31.0	21.2
Walking past unknown people***	34.0	36.9	67.4	48.9	40.9	23.5
Alone at home***	58.7	70.6	85.9	25.8	19.1	8.8

†Includes “somewhat” and “very” safe

‡Includes “somewhat” and “very” unsafe

Note: Percentages do not add to 100 because neutral response “feel neither safe nor unsafe” not listed in table.

\*\*\* $df=8$ ,  $p<.001$

Table 7: Satisfaction with neighbourhood life (in %)

Overall, how satisfied are you with living in your neighbourhood?	2002 (n=302)	2004 (n=325)	2006 (n=341)	% change 2002-06***
Very satisfied	12.6	16.3	37.5	+197.6
Somewhat satisfied	46.4	60.6	52.2	+12.5
Somewhat dissatisfied	25.2	17.2	8.5	-66.3
Very dissatisfied	15.9	5.8	1.8	-88.7

\*\*\* $\chi^2=129.9$ ,  $df=6$ ,  $p<.001$

Satisfaction also statistically significantly varied by building for each of 2002 ( $\chi^2=26.12$ ,  $df=6$ ,  $p<.001$ ), 2004 ( $\chi^2=18.59$ ,  $df=6$ ,  $p<.01$ ), and 2006 ( $\chi^2=27.78$ ,  $df=6$ ,  $p<.001$ )

### **Community improvement:**

There was a statistically significant (173.4%) increase in the number of respondents reporting that they felt the community was getting “better” since they first moved in. Only 8.8% of respondents felt the community was getting worse in 2006 compared to 40% in 2002.

Table 8: Sense of community improvement (in %)

Since you moved to your neighbourhood, would you say it has become [ ] as it was when you first moved here?†	2002 (n=285)	2004 (n=278)	2006 (n=328)	% change 2002-06***
Worse	40.0	16.9	8.8	-78.0
About the same	44.6	55.8	49.1	+11.4
Better	15.4	27.3	42.1	+173.4

\*\*\*  $\chi^2=114.44$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p<.001$

†Includes valid responses only: “missing” and “not stated/don’t know” omitted from analysis.

Sense of community improvement also statistically significantly varied by building for each of 2002 ( $\chi^2=17.68$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p<.001$ ), 2004 ( $\chi^2=10.70$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p<.05$ ), and 2006 ( $\chi^2=12.98$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p<.01$ )

### **Community Problems:**

From 2002 to 2006 residents reported statistically significant improvements on all items relating to a wide range of community problems. Table 9 aggregates responses “not a problem” and “less of a problem” for neighbourhood antisocial behaviours. Statistically significant increases in such responses were evident for 2006 over 2002 for: vandalism (166 per cent), people drinking alcohol and doing drugs (303.4 per cent), teens loitering (276 per cent), youth gangs (273 per cent), graffiti (189 per cent), garbage on the streets (264 per cent), noise, drug dealing, armed robbery, burglary, violent assault, family violence, and theft (see Table 9). In fact, drug dealing saw the largest increase in perceptions that this antisocial behaviour was becoming less of a problem (337 per cent) in the community.

Table 9: Community perceptions about order (in %)

Please tell us if you think that the following things are ... since you first moved here.	“Not a problem” + “Less of a problem”†			% change 2002-06
	2002	2004	2006	
Vandalism***	24.5	35.8	65.2	+166.1
People drinking alcohol and using drugs (e.g., marijuana, cocaine, crack, heroin) in public places***	17.9	33.8	72.2	+303.4
Groups of teenagers hanging around public places***	19.2	42.0	72.1	+275.5
Youth gangs***	21.0	36.9	78.4	+273.3
Graffiti (people writing on walls)***	26.1	47.2	75.4	+188.8
Garbage on the streets and sidewalks***	16.8	32.7	61.2	+264.3
Noise***	23.5	42.5	62.7	+166.8
Drug dealing***	17.7	40.7	77.3	+336.7
Armed robbery***	25.6	49.5	83.3	+225.4
Burglary***	28.0	49.3	83.9	+199.6
Violent assault***	23.6	47.2	83.1	+252.1
Sexual assault***	33.7	47.4	83.7	+148.4
Family violence (e.g., wife beating and child abuse)***	31.8	48.7	82.6	+159.7
Theft***	25.5	47.2	82.1	+221.9

\*\*\*  $df=3$   $p<.001$

†Includes valid responses only: “about the same” and “more of a problem” are omitted from table but are part of the Chi-square cross-tabulations for significance.

### **Community cohesion:**

One measure of community cohesion is frequency of contact between neighbours.

There was a statistically significant difference in reported frequency rates of neighbourhood interaction from 2002 to 2006. The frequency of daily and weekly interactions decreased but monthly interactions increased.

Table 10: Frequency of contact with neighbours (in %)\*\*

How often do you or people you live with get together (either in the neighbour's or your own home)?	2002 (n=298)	2004 (n=325)	2006 (n=328)	% change 2002-06
Every day	9.4	15.4	5.5	-41.5
A few times a week	13.4	14.2	4.9	-8.5
Once a week	9.4	5.8	5.2	-44.6
A few times a month	9.7	15.4	17.1	+76.3
Once a month	4.7	5.2	4.9	+4.2
A few times a year	8.7	14.8	31.7	+264.4
Once a year	4.7	2.8	2.7	-42.5
Hardly ever	39.9	26.5	28.0	-11.9

\*\*\* $\chi^2=104.416$ ,  $df=14$ ,  $p<.001$

Frequency of contact did not statistically significantly vary by building for each of 2002, 2004 and 2006.

### Drug Availability:

Decreases in perceived drug availability between 2002 and 2006 were dramatic for a wide range of drugs including heroin, LSD, speed, and others (see Table 11).

Table 11: Perceptions of drug availability (in %)

Would it be very hard, hard, easy, or very easy for anyone to buy the following drugs in your neighbourhood?	"Easy" + "Very Easy"†			% change 2002-06
	2002	2004	2006	
Marijuana	37.1	21.3	28.5	-23.2
Cocaine	26.5	9.9	8.1	-69.4
Crack	28.0	12.3	6.9	-75.4
Heroin	25.3	6.5	4.6	-81.8
LSD	22.0	5.3	3.4	-84.6
Hash	25.2	6.5	5.2	-78.4
Ecstasy	24.9	7.4	8.0	-67.9
Speed	22.9	4.1	4.6	-79.9
Other illegal drugs	23.9	5.8	5.2	+78.2

†Includes all responses. Respondents answering "Don't know" or missing data (from 2002-06) in lieu of available options varied from 67.7% for marijuana to 86.3% for LSD.

Caution should be exercised with these results as the lion's share of respondents reported no knowledge of drug availability in their community.

**Police and security:**

Residents' overall satisfaction with both police and private security climbed across most evaluation items from 2002 to 2006. Satisfaction with private security climbed more than for police across all items, including especially "enforcing building rules" (20 per cent), providing information "on reducing crime" (28 per cent) and "preventing crime" (19 per cent).

Table 12: Satisfaction with police and security (in %)

For each of the following situations, please tell us if you think that your [local security company (Intelligarde) / local police service] does a good job, an average job, or a poor job.		Satisfaction = "good job" + "average job"†			
		2002	2004	2006	% change 2002-06
Enforcing the rules of the building [security] / laws [police]	Police	83.3	85.4	84.5	+1.4
	Security	74.0	83.6	89.0	+20.3
Quickly responding to calls	Police	79.8	81.7	77.8	-2.5
	Security	77.5	79.9	83.3	+7.5
Easy to talk to	Police	81.5	82.5	80.8	-0.8
	Security	81.4	82.3	85.4	+4.9
Giving information to the public on reducing crime	Police	77.0	79.2	80.4	+4.4
	Security	65.0	77.3	83.0	+27.7
Preventing crime	Police	72.3	76.3	79.6	+11.0
	Security	71.2	79.4	84.7	+19.0

†Other response options were "poor job" and "don't know".

Despite marked improvements in satisfaction with policing, respondents are still less likely to report the police are doing a “good job” compared to fellow Torontonians and Canadians (see Table 13).

Table 13: Satisfaction with police (in %): Comparison to Toronto (CMA) and Canada

Location	N	Year	Respondents answering “Good job”†				
			Enforcing laws	Responding to calls	Easy to talk to	Public info.	Prevention
Canada	24,260	1999	60	49	66	54	62
Toronto	3,721	1999	61	44	61	47	58
San Romanoway	252	2002	50	52	58	46	40
Canada	25,906	2004	59	52	65	51	61
Toronto	4,218	2004	60	53	63	47	61
San Romanoway	260	2004	37	38	32	33	32
San Romanoway	258	2006	54	43	47	46	45

† Other response options were “average job”, “poor job” and “don’t know” for both GSS and QNLS.

### ***Programming:***

Generally speaking, programs that were most known to community residents in 2004 and 2006 were those that had the highest enrolment and were situated on-site. Overall satisfaction rates with community programming were very high. In fact, none of the programs scored lower than 85% approval. A consistent relative complaint by respondents about programming was space and facilities for 2004 but this was greatly diminished in 2006, coinciding with the construction of a new centre.

Table 14: Program participation and awareness by residents (in %, including missing), 2004 and 2006

PROGRAM	Awareness (total)		Took part		Volunteer		Child took part		Know youth enrolled		Know parents of youth enrolled		Only know about the program		Haven't heard of program	
	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006
Youth Against Violence	<b>34.6</b>	<b>45.2</b>	0.9	2.8	0.6	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.6	12.7	3.9	10.2	22.6	13.6	44.6	21.2
Breakfast and After-School Homework	<b>50.5</b>	<b>42.0</b>	2.4	1.1	0.9	2.0	6.3	4.0	7.8	9.9	6.6	10.8	26.5	14.2	32.8	19.3
March Break Camp	<b>39.1</b>	<b>41.6</b>	0.3	1.4	0	2.3	3.9	3.1	4.8	9.9	4.5	11.0	25.6	13.9	35.2	20.4
Summer Camp	<b>45.4</b>	<b>41.4</b>	0.6	2.0	0.3	2.0	4.2	4.2	5.1	9.9	4.5	10.8	30.7	12.5	30.1	16.7
Youth Internship	<b>18.4</b>	<b>24.3</b>	0.3	0.8	0.3	0.8	0.9	0.6	1.2	8.2	0.9	5.4	14.8	8.5	47.9	21.5

Table 14a: Youth against violence program: community perceptions (in %), 2004 and 2006

FACTORS	Satisfaction Rate*		Poor		Below average		Fair		Good		Excellent	
	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006
Drug education	<b>86.0</b>	<b>85.3</b>	7.0	11.8	7.0	2.9	20.9	11.8	34.9	29.4	30.2	44.1
Anti-violence training	<b>85.1</b>	<b>91.7</b>	10.6	5.6	4.3	2.8	17.0	5.6	40.4	41.7	27.7	44.4
Facilities	<b>72.8</b>	<b>97.5</b>	6.8	0	20.5	2.6	18.2	15.4	20.5	23.1	34.1	59.0
Space	<b>78.7</b>	<b>92.3</b>	6.4	5.1	14.9	2.6	34.0	17.9	21.3	30.8	23.4	43.6
Role of facilitator	<b>78.6</b>	<b>91.9</b>	9.5	2.7	11.9	5.4	21.4	5.4	31.0	35.1	26.2	51.4
Violence reduction	<b>84.5</b>	<b>97.0</b>	4.4	0	11.1	3.0	8.9	12.1	40.0	39.4	35.6	45.5
Better community life	<b>78.7</b>	<b>93.9</b>	4.3	3.0	17.0	3.0	6.4	12.1	38.3	30.3	34.0	51.5
<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>82.3</b>	<b>91.9</b>	7.8	5.4	9.8	2.7	7.8	5.4	41.2	27.0	33.3	59.5

\* Sum of valid percentage reporting fair, good and excellent.  
Table does not include "don't know"

Table 14b: Breakfast and after-school program: community perceptions (in %), 2004 and 2006

FACTORS	Satisfaction Rate*		Poor		Below average		Fair		Good		Excellent	
	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006
Education	<b>93.8</b>	<b>95.0</b>	1.6	2.5	4.7	2.5	17.2	5.0	37.5	42.5	39.1	47.5
Nutrition of meals	<b>95.3</b>	<b>97.6</b>	3.2	2.4	1.6	0	4.8	7.1	34.9	40.5	55.6	50.0
Recreational activities	<b>93.5</b>	<b>97.6</b>	3.3	0	3.3	2.4	11.5	17.1	45.9	31.7	36.1	48.8
Facilities	<b>65.6</b>	<b>92.8</b>	14.8	4.8	19.7	2.4	19.7	11.9	29.5	35.7	16.4	45.2
Space	<b>60.3</b>	<b>92.5</b>	17.5	7.5	22.2	0	23.8	17.5	22.2	35.0	14.3	40.0
Role of tutors	<b>93.5</b>	<b>97.5</b>	1.6	2.6	4.8	0	11.3	10.3	53.2	38.5	29.0	48.7
Role of outreach workers	<b>100.0</b>	<b>95.7</b>	0	4.3	0	4.3	8.0	8.7	52.0	43.5	40.0	43.5
Violence reduction	<b>95.0</b>	<b>94.5</b>	1.7	2.7	3.4	2.7	6.8	8.1	49.2	43.2	39.0	43.2
Better community life	<b>95.0</b>	<b>94.8</b>	0	2.6	4.9	2.6	8.2	7.9	47.5	39.5	39.3	47.4
<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>95.3</b>	<b>95.1</b>	3.1	2.4	1.6	2.4	6.3	12.2	53.1	39.0	35.9	43.9

\* Sum of valid percentage reporting fair, good and excellent.  
Table does not include "don't know"

Table 14c: March break camp: community perceptions (in %), 2004 and 2006

FACTORS	Satisfaction Rate*		Poor		Below average		Fair		Good		Excellent	
	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006
Education	<b>95.9</b>	<b>97.1</b>	0	2.9	4.2	0	4.2	5.7	54.2	57.1	37.5	34.3
Nutrition of meals	<b>91.8</b>	<b>97.2</b>	4.1	2.9	4.1	0	2.0	5.7	36.7	48.6	53.1	42.9
Recreational activities	<b>94.0</b>	<b>97.2</b>	0	2.9	6.0	0	6.0	8.6	52.0	48.6	36.0	40.0
Facilities	<b>60.8</b>	<b>94.3</b>	11.8	2.9	27.5	2.9	11.8	14.3	31.4	42.9	17.6	37.1
Space	<b>56.0</b>	<b>94.3</b>	12.0	2.9	32.0	2.9	14.0	22.9	24.0	31.4	18.0	40.0
Role of tutors	<b>95.9</b>	<b>97.1</b>	0	2.9	4.1	0	4.1	14.7	61.2	47.1	30.6	35.3
Role of outreach workers	<b>100.0</b>	<b>93.8</b>	0	6.3	0	0	4.7	12.5	53.5	37.5	41.9	43.8
Violence reduction	<b>92.0</b>	<b>97.1</b>	4.0	2.9	4.0	0	8.0	8.8	44.0	47.1	40.0	41.2
Better community life	<b>96.1</b>	<b>97.2</b>	0	2.9	3.9	0	5.9	2.9	47.1	51.4	43.1	42.9
<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>98.0</b>	<b>96.9</b>	0	3.1	1.9	0	7.5	3.1	54.7	50.0	35.8	43.8

\* Sum of valid percentage reporting fair, good and excellent.  
Table does not include "don't know"

Table 14d: Summer program: community perceptions (in %), 2004 and 2006

FACTORS	Satisfaction Rate*		Poor		Below average		Fair		Good		Excellent	
	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006
Education	<b>91.0</b>	<b>97.2</b>	2.3	2.8	6.8	0	9.1	2.8	45.5	47.2	36.4	47.2
Nutrition of meals	<b>90.7</b>	<b>97.2</b>	2.3	2.8	7.0	0	9.3	8.3	41.9	22.2	39.5	66.7
Recreational activities	<b>93.5</b>	<b>97.2</b>	2.2	2.8	4.3	0	10.9	5.6	39.1	33.3	43.5	58.3
Facilities	<b>69.5</b>	<b>97.4</b>	4.3	2.6	26.1	0	15.2	13.2	30.4	39.5	23.9	44.7
Space	<b>67.4</b>	<b>97.3</b>	4.3	2.6	28.3	0	19.6	28.9	26.1	26.3	21.7	42.1
Role of tutors	<b>93.1</b>	<b>97.2</b>	2.3	2.7	4.7	0	4.7	16.2	53.5	37.8	34.9	43.2
Role of outreach workers	<b>97.0</b>	<b>94.1</b>	0	5.9	2.9	0	2.9	5.9	50.0	35.3	44.1	52.9
Violence reduction	<b>95.4</b>	<b>97.0</b>	0	2.9	4.7	0	7.0	0	46.5	52.9	41.9	44.1
Better community life	<b>95.8</b>	<b>97.2</b>	0	2.8	4.3	0	8.5	0	42.6	44.4	44.7	52.8
<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>96.0</b>	<b>97.1</b>	0	2.9	4.0	0	4.0	0	52.0	40.0	40.	57.1

\* Sum of valid percentage reporting fair, good and excellent.  
Table does not include "don't know"

Table 14e: Internship program: community perceptions (in %), 2004 and 2006

FACTORS	Satisfaction Rate*		Poor		Below average		Fair		Good		Excellent	
	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006	2004	2006
Education	<b>95.8</b>	<b>90.0</b>	0	0	4.2	0	12.5	5.3	45.8	47.9	37.5	36.8
Job training	<b>95.6</b>	<b>100.0</b>	0	0	4.3	0	21.7	20.0	39.1	40.0	34.8	40.0
Development of life skills	<b>91.2</b>	<b>100.0</b>	0	0	8.7	0	13.0	5.0	39.1	55.0	39.1	40.0
Cultural instruction	<b>91.3</b>	<b>100.0</b>	4.3	0	4.3	0	17.4	21.1	39.1	21.1	34.8	57.9
Recreational facilities	<b>95.7</b>	<b>94.7</b>	0	0	4.3	5.3	17.4	10.5	52.2	26.3	26.1	57.9
Facilities	<b>83.3</b>	<b>100</b>	4.2	0	12.5	0	20.8	15.8	45.8	26.3	16.7	57.9
Space	<b>83.4</b>	<b>100.0</b>	4.2	0	12.5	0	25.0	26.3	41.7	36.8	16.7	36.8
Role of tutors	<b>91.3</b>	<b>94.4</b>	4.3	0	4.3	5.6	13.0	16.7	52.2	33.3	26.1	44.4
Role of outreach workers	<b>91.2</b>	<b>94.2</b>	4.3	5.9	4.3	0	13.0	5.9	47.8	47.1	30.4	41.2
Violence reduction	<b>91.6</b>	<b>94.2</b>	4.2	5.9	4.2	0	20.8	5.9	37.5	47.1	33.3	41.2
Better community life	<b>92.0</b>	<b>94.5</b>	4.0	5.6	4.0	0	20.0	5.6	40.0	55.6	32.0	33.3
<b>Overall assessment</b>	<b>92.0</b>	<b>94.5</b>	4.0	5.6	4.0	0	16.0	5.6	44.0	50.0	32.0	38.9

\* Sum of valid percentage reporting fair, good and excellent.  
Table does not include "don't know"

## References:

- DeKeseredy, Walter, Shaid Alvi, Martin D. Schwartz, and Andreas Tomaszewski. 2003. *Under Siege: Poverty and Crime in a Public Housing Community*. Lanham MD: Lexington Books.
- Ellis, Desmond, and Walter DeKeseredy. 1995. "Marital status and woman abuse: The DAD model." Pp. 25-44 in *Woman and her Environmeny*, edited by Man Singh Das and Vijay Kumar Gupta. New Delhi: MD Publications.
- Rigakos, George S., Francis Kwashie, and Stephen Bosanac. 2005. *The San Romanoway Community Revitalization Project: Interim Report*. Ottawa: National Crime Prevention Centre.
- Rigakos, George, David Sealy, and Alka Tandan. 2002. *The San Romanoway Community Crime Survey: Base-line Data*. Ottawa: Law Commission of Canada.