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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the subject of community "high-crime" reputation. The site chosen as a case study is Olde Sandwich Towne, Windsor, Ontario, to which this label has been applied. A combination of field and literature research, interviews, and participant observation inform this thesis. In examining the characterization of Olde Sandwich Towne as a high-crime area, this study describes the basis for the label as demonstrated in how the label developed, problems created by the label, the process of community deterioration, and crimes which, according to police data, are typical of the community. This study also evaluates attempts by the community to overcome the reputation by relating how community members recognize it, and their reaction to it. The label's impact on community residents, on community esteem and viability, and on the social and physical structure of the neighborhood is appraised. An attempt is also made to ascertain whether criminal behavior of persons is the single cause that determines the community crime label.
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INTRODUCTION

While sociologists and criminologists are quite knowledgeable about behavioral concepts explaining criminal behavior of individuals, there is less awareness and investigation of high-crime reputations of communities. The most recognized community studies that "fill the gap between the urban and individual scales of analysis" are those of Shaw and McKay, states Herbert (1982, p. 103). Current research infrequently focuses on studies of "collective life", otherwise community ethnography. According to Reiss, Jr., and Tonry (1986, p. 27), such studies address "how people behave together, influence one another, and are organized to constitute a community". It is important, states Kennedy (1983, p. 114), that communities, as a "fourth level of government", exercise a share of social power, and "that citizens begin to plan...and not merely react to the plans of others".

Sociologists who are concerned about community crime and its causes, and the relationship of this phenomenon to the community's social and physical structures, have put forth varying theoretical propositions. Some have implicated social factors in neighborhood criminality, for example, the socioeconomic status of its residents. Others
suggest that the etiology of crime resides in the community's physical environment, for example, in structural density. While arguments continue, the reality exists for particular neighborhoods where crime has been determined to be excessive by some measure, that they become labelled as high-crime communities, and are left to struggle with the consequences of the stigma.

The purpose of this thesis is to address the topic of 'high-crime community' reputation. It is important to know how this identity is attributed to a particular urban area, and to understand why communities in trouble become so labelled. When an area is perceived as crime-ridden, do community crime rates become exaggerated? How is community life affected by the 'high-crime' label?

This study poses some poignant questions and probes existing research on the subject. Within a community to which a high-crime label is applied, is there a presence of excessive criminality? Is the volume of crime and the ascribed reputation authenticated and socially justified with validation from multi-source data? And, is behavior singly responsible for the high-crime label? Or does the reputation stem from long-held conceptions of the community; from a characteristic profile of residents and the area's physical structure?
The site chosen for this case study is Olde Sandwich Towne, a Windsor, Ontario neighborhood with a high-crime community reputation. In this site, these arguments will be investigated. This research explores urban processes, as well as how conflict is generated by differing and opposing value systems. In this respect, it examines the difference between members of the public and the "moral entrepreneurs", the latter being persons in authority who set community standards (Silverman and Teevan Jr. 1980, p. 148). This case study also addresses the impact of community labelling on its residents, on community esteem, and on its social and physical structure.

Chapter One illustrates the fundamental significance that various researchers have attached to the aggregation of people in units such as 'the community'. While stressing this importance, the section defines consequences that can detrimentally affect the most valuable property of a community, its reputation. The extent to which a label impacts the community is shown within an array of effects. Documented studies of other communities with similar reputations are illustrated.

In Chapter Two, suggestions are made regarding some origins of the high-crime reputation which has been attributed to Olde Sandwich Towne. An outline of various impacts of the community label on residents is given.
Significant as well, is the information contained in this chapter, which delineates 'other elements' of the high-crime reputation. These elements refer to the general inferences that may have been gleaned from the high-crime community designation, and which may in part, have perpetuated the reputation. These are outlined, and accompanied by supporting research.

Chapter Three reviews the literature that connects the components of this investigation, as well as discussion of criminological and sociological theories that are applicable and deemed appropriate to the theme of the thesis. The focus is on the forces in society which affect sociological inquiry and fuel the necessity for investigation. For example, how do urban policies and governance strategies affect communities? The purpose of reviewing such literature is to ask, 'how do we go about determining the validity of the hypothesis?'

The chapter also reviews media methods in reporting urban crime, and suggests the possibility that these practices create unnecessary fear amongst residents, and may be responsible for perpetuating the community high-crime label. It is possible that such 'vehicles' stereotype the community on the basis of characteristics of residents and the physical structures. Kennedy (1983, p. 76) refers to these images as "ecological fallacy". He explains that
these impressions are formed by "attaching the characteristics of people in an area to certain behavior such as crime".

As well, the chapter illustrates a comparison of traditional criminological and sociological views with current paradigms, and how high crime areas are defined when informal social control gives way to a formal structure. Research design is addressed by drawing on relevant literature that guides such design. The major focus in the conception of the design and its value is in adding new knowledge to this particular area of study. Research design is multi-faceted, and in this case, it will in part, help to determine whether the behavior of people in the Sandwich community is the single responsible factor of a high crime reputation, and as well, whether the community deserves the reputation. The case study investigation process will be outlined. Finally, some guiding hypothesis is developed.

Chapter Four reviews the methodology employed in gathering data, and the chronological account of this approach. When Kirby and McKenna (1989, p. 64) address research methodology, they speak of "researching from the margins". Their conception is that any explication of data requires of the researcher, a "political awareness of the need...and subsequent use of that information". They go on to say that,
We want...[to] enable people to identify and examine how living...affects their lives, their opportunities, the way they think and act...[that] we can begin to focus on the social relations which daily help to construct that experience.

Defining this process is as important to the research undertaking as it is to the ultimate result, the "production of knowledge" (Kirby and McKenna 1989, p. 65).

Chapter Five comprises the analysis of data, and 'what we have learned' concerning the high-crime reputation of Olde Sandwich Towne. Knowledge about the high-crime community reputation consists of diverse aspects and opinions that individuals have offered. From this variegated input, an attempt is made to locate common ground upon which experiences and knowledge of individuals come together to create a collective thought. Berger and Luckmann (1966, p. 15) once stated,

the sociology of knowledge must concern itself with what people 'know' as 'reality' in their everyday, non- or pre-theoretical lives...commonsense 'knowledge'...must be the central focus...[it] constitutes the fabric of meaning without which no society could exist.

The chapter will also attempt to 'balance' this account with other data concerning the community. Again, Kirby and McKenna (1989, p. 129) advise utilizing "intersubjectivity", otherwise hearing the "voices" within the dialogues of the accounts. In extrapolating information from various data, the researcher should be aware of "the social reality within
which people exist", and the effects of social structures on them. This awareness enhances the analysis of the data.

The development of knowledge is usually preceded by theorizing, or speculating about its components, and how these parts link. Again, according to Berger and Luckmann (1966, p. 173-174), "Identity is formed by social processes [and]...theorizing about identity....must occur within the framework of the theoretical interpretations within which it [is] located".

And in conclusion, Chapter Six will evaluate the hypothesis of this research, and discern whether the evidence presented supports or refutes the hypothesis.

Olde Sandwich Towne, Windsor, Ontario, is a Canadian community in southwestern Ontario which is negatively labelled as a high-crime area. In reflecting upon this type of characterization, and at the same time, on the historical foundation of Olde Sandwich Towne, there is sad irony and contradiction in the seeming incongruity between a 'high-crime' labelled neighborhood and a community with classic, ageless heritage. The community has been referred to as the 'birthplace' of Windsor. This legacy is confirmed by the numerous historical sites which still exist within the area. Much of its physical heritage has been revitalized through lengthy and arduous efforts of residents, merchants, community historians, urban administrators and government
officials, who have recognized the value of historical community identity.

The grandest legacy of this neighborhood is observed in the spectacle of its commemoration, with frequent festivities and celebration of 'community' through activities which are held several times throughout each year. People from inside and outside the Sandwich area enjoy these celebrations. Perhaps this legacy is especially significant for the neighborhood's schoolchildren and senior citizens. The general anticipation is that children, through active participation, will gain pride from sharing in the community's rich heritage, and that 'seniors' will accept commendations for creating a lasting endowment. Residents who enjoy, cherish, and support their neighborhood in this manner, appreciate the value of 'community'. The ironic contradiction between the attributed reputation and the apparent coherent community social character is especially perplexing for the community, in view of the consequences of the label.

In examining the process that characterized Olde Sandwich Towne as a high-crime area, the study will,
1. a) describe the basis for the label as demonstrated in,
   i) how the label developed,
   ii) problems created by the label,
   iii) the process of community deterioration,
iv) crimes which, according to police data, are
typical of the community.

2. a) describe and evaluate attempts by the community to
overcome the high-crime reputation by relating,
   i) how community members recognize the label,
   ii) residents' reaction to the label.
3) a) appraise the impact of such labelling on,
   i) community residents,
   ii) community esteem and viability,
   iii) the social and physical structure of the
       neighborhood,
   b) outline possibilities for changing/overcoming the
       high-crime community label.
4) a) attempt to ascertain whether,
   i) criminal behavior of persons is the single cause
      that determines the community crime label,
   ii) there may be ancillary elements and processes
       which become instrumental, and contribute to the
       label and the resulting stigma.

In this case study of Olde Sandwich Towne, arguments will be
investigated, and stages of the community's history will be
discussed. Based on these community accounts, and with
support from urban studies of characteristically similar
communities, the latter argument implicating the 'ancillary
elements' seems more probable in the case of Sandwich.
CHAPTER ONE

Community: its importance and meaning

The importance of "community" as a concept of human organization is defined in several ways that underline its significance. Poplin (1979, p. 9) refers to it as "consist[ing] of persons in social interaction within a geographic area and having one or more additional common ties". Wharf (1992, p. 16) sees community as "a network of individuals with common needs and issues". And particularly from the perspective of social consequence, Gallaher, Jr. and Padfield (1980, p. 1) portray 'community' as

refer[ring] to social organization common to, and characteristic of the human species...[it] is then, part of the very nature of man...[and] has existed as long as those qualities we have come to label human.

Human aggregation, with its inherent sense and need for cohesion, gives paramount testimony to the importance of 'community'. Such collectivism enhances the objective for maintaining human interconnectedness. Where this stability is strained, threatened, or absent, substantial consideration must be given to re-establishing it through some medium. In this regard, Gallaher, Jr. and Padfield (1980, p. 1-3) stress the importance of reaffirming 'community' by explaining that,
some form of community is necessary for human survival...all associational forms share...the most basic of all purposes -- the development of collective solutions to meet the needs of group survival...Both resources and the decision-making prerogatives for the allocation of those resources must be present.

Perhaps the biggest offender to human aggregation, for example, in the form of an urban community, is the lack of health and strength of its reputation. This is especially pertinent where it relates to, and concerns crime and behavior. Equally offensive though, is the probability which is likely to occur within public perception, that community reputation is determined singly by problems of behavior within it. Such perception may be faulty, and this is exemplified in what Becker, in his "interactionist theory of deviance", termed "reactivity". He refers to that aspect which labels behavior without consideration of other factors. Such judgements have negative potential, and may be detrimental for the community to which they are applied.

Impact of a high-crime reputation on the community

Whether a negative label attached to a community is realistic or not, the stigma invoked by it is 'problematic' for the area. This type of label has potential to create a reputation that is sustained by ensuing reactions to it, both within and outside the community. Labelling a community as a "high-crime" area is about more than stereotyping. It constitutes a system which contributes to
construction of tenets and structures of domination, and can create social stratification within an urban population.

Whatever the dominant forces which characterize an urban neighborhood as a 'high-crime' area or 'offensible space', they confer upon it an inferior classification that undermines, and destabilizes its very foundation. As a consequence, economic, social, and political resources may be inequitably distributed. Disparate power relationships may occur and generate undue conflict, and formal social control techniques may intensify. This type of labelling may compromise the community's strength to affect its own destiny, and ultimately distort informal community control and social justice.

In this regard, the greatest risk to the community, and perhaps one most formidable, is to its viability, as the high-crime label erodes the community's social and physical structure. This situation furnishes potential for community decline, and on occasion, to the demise of entire neighborhoods according to literature in urban studies (Gallaher, Jr. and Padfield, 1980; Ericson, 1975; Reiss Jr., 1986; Schuerman and Kobrin, 1986; Sampson, 1986; Wharf, 1992; Nettler, 1984; Fishman and Benello, 1986). Eventually, informal social control practices are critically eroded by the process of decline, resulting in formal
systems of control being increasingly imposed on the community.

The objective of community then becomes transformed into deteriorating, distrustful, and alienated relationships. Kennedy (1983, p. 98) reflects on an Edmonton community study which found that where there was a high level of interaction and trust, an informal level of social control prevailed. Conversely, "formal intervention [was] greater in alienated areas".

Another Canadian example of subversion, and eventual demise of an otherwise "meaningful" and "traditional" community was that of Africville, in Halifax. As the area's population grew, "it became cluttered with railway tracks and industry city service depots", state Clairmont and Wilcox-Magill (1983, p. 320). The community was somewhat rural in nature, but industrial "encroachment" led to abuses of urban regulation standards, and land-use conflicts multiplied. According to Clairmont and Wilcox-Magill 1983, p. 325), while the majority of Africville's population was bound together by kinship...[and] family systems...Africville underwent profound changes...from a community of intelligent young people [where] much was expected of them...[to becoming] identified as a blot on the city of Halifax.

The population became heterogeneous and mobile, and the community was transformed into a 'deviance service centre' where "inadequate police protection" and disregarded
complaints from residents to urban officials metamorphosed into a "delivery system of social service [that] was obviously punitive", say Clairmont and Wilcox-Magill (1983, 326). Lack of enforcement of housing standards and other urban disregard led to persistent abuses, like moving the city dump "to the very doorstep of the community" (Clairmont and Wilcox-Magill 1983, p. 326). The area's urban research showed that the "crime rate over the past forty years was not particularly high", although the community was perceived otherwise. Eventually, with little attention given the remaining small population, the community of Africville was eradicated. As one resident stated, "The City didn't do anything to improve Africville. All the City did was to try and get it, and they did, in the end" (Clairmont and Wilcox-Magill 1983, p. 326).

Elements that shape the community 'high-crime' label

Community social control systems

The labelling of Olde Sandwich Towne as a high-crime community has had negative effects on the neighborhood and its residents. These harmful effects emerge less from the community's growth patterns and shifts in its population, than from actions of outside forces 1. Over time, activities of outside forces appear to have weakened the informal crime control system necessary to promote and
maintain social bonding within the Sandwich community. Steps taken to remediate criminal activity seem to have resulted in accelerated community deterioration.

Gillis and Hagan (1986, p. 144) addressed the subject of community deterioration while conducting their research in juvenile delinquency. They attempted to identify a "relationship" between physical environment and youth criminality. Examining a community's "built" structures in densely populated areas, they looked for differences in delinquent behavior within three types of community physical designs: a) building density design (number of dwelling units per structure); b) household density (persons per room in a household); and, c) areal density (persons per acre or square mile in a given area). Ultimately, they said that 'building density' was indicated as "the most salient" of these dimensions that showed a relationship between crime and delinquency.

However, Gillis and Hagan (1986, p. 144) found "incongruities" in other portions of the same research. Some of these studies indicated that in multiple living units and apartment highrises within geographic areas, such residency arrangements "prevent[ed] parents from closely controlling their children, [and] restrict[ed]...residents' feeling of territoriality and control over certain spaces". The logical indication, which was consistent within these
studies, according to them, is that "delinquent behavior is more, rather than less visible in high-density environments" (Gillis and Hagan 1986, p. 145), and this situation results in more complaints to police.

In continuing to examine other studies in order to substantiate their research pertaining to the relationship of building density and crime, Gillis and Hagan (1986, p. 145) found support in a 1978 study by Hagan, Gillis, and Chan. While other studies theorized that higher rates of youth delinquency were present in multiple-family residences (highrises), Hagan, Gillis, and Chan found only some relationship between delinquent behavior and delinquency victimization relative to building density. Instead, the investigation revealed, state Gillis and Hagan (1986, p. 145), that "police tend to view sectors of the city characterized by a high proportion of multiple-family housing as likely trouble spots". Ultimately, the findings led Gillis and Hagan (1986, p. 145) to conclude that "high-crime density areas may suffer from a surfeit of formal control rather than a shortage of informal social control".

In trying to understand more clearly how building density remained implicated in criminality, Gillis and Hagan (1986, p. 150) tested a variety of dependent variables and their relationship to delinquency. They say they examined studies by Tittle, and Elliott and Ageton who attempted to
draw a distinct association between socioeconomic status and delinquency. Retesting this theory, Gillis and Hagan declare that they found less evidence of this connection than had been detected between the "built environment" and delinquency.

Probing the investigation further, their study did locate what one may term a 'presumptive definition of crime' assumed by law enforcement organizations. On the basis of their findings, they altered their research results accordingly,

Building density is the single best predictor of police presence, which, in turn, is a significant predictor of police contact. This supports the idea that high-density housing attracts formal agents of control, independent of the apparent level of adolescent deviant behavior...police officers perceive areas with high housing density as potential trouble spots and deploy themselves accordingly (Gillis and Hagan 1986, p. 150).

Gillis and Hagan (1986, p. 150) concluded that the "housing environment" (built environment) remained a major factor in "the transition from informal to formal control on the macro level".

**Loss of community autonomy**

Gallaher, Jr. and Padfield (1980, p. 5-9) outline the 'community decline' concept as based primarily on two considerations, a) regional abandonment, and b) decision-making authority. 'Regional abandonment' in community
decline, the researchers explain, means that there are aspects which can be attributed to the "loss of local [community] autonomy...to external authority" and depletion of "local status", these particularly being "instrumental to social ends". The 'decision-making authority' element in community decline refers not so much to "the presence of decay...but the failure of repair and replacement to keep pace", they claim. This occurs more frequently "when [the local community's] base of authority dissolves". Local "systems of authority are crucial to the existence of the small community" (Gallaher, Jr. and Padfield 1980, p. 9).

As well, the researchers say, community decline may occur when ties that link a neighborhood to the larger society are disrupted. According to Clawson (1980, p. 76), only by recognizing such offensive elements which contribute to the decline of the community's economy can we begin to answer the questions "what start[ed] it, by what processes it spread,...and the social strategies for coping with it".

**Law enforcement and political influences**

Commonly, an urban centre's statistical crime data originate with the local police department. It is logical that a "high-crime community" label such as that attributed to Olde Sandwich Towne would originate from this source, and that criminal activity in this neighborhood would be higher
than "normal". Such a characterization of the community, along with a number of noticeable changes in its communal features, indicate a "problem area", or "community in decline".

As this perception builds, the neighborhood may experience further negative complications from political actions and reactions to the stigmatization, which hastens community decline. Herbert (1982, p. 95) shares this concern when he states,

the idea of stigmatization is important and is linked to the theory that reputations [of communities], once established, are perpetuated, perhaps undeserved, because the area is labelled as problematic.

A 1978 Sandwich study addressing some local concerns about the community, and about rejuvenating it, particularly as pertains capital investment in the area, McLean (1978, p. 79) outlines,

Sandwich has a poor image. It has been the subject of publicity regarding crime and pollution. The buildings appear shabby. Boarded-up government buildings and youths racing cars down the residential streets give the impression that municipal government does not care about the area. The probability of investment in the area has declined as the information regarding these things becomes more widely disseminated, and the perceived risk of a venture increases.

While public perception builds, other conditions of disadvantage may appear, and accompany the already-diminished community position, and may result in misdirected urban and social policies. The above-mentioned community study also addressed housing in the Sandwich community.
The last decade has seen considerable changes in housing patterns. The Official Plan of 1966 for the City of Windsor described Sandwich as a low density area comprised of 95% single family dwellings (McLean 1978, p. 105).

However, at the time of this study, the report stated that the community's housing density had become more intense, that "75% of the residential units :or dwellings...are apartment buildings". The report goes on:

Ten years ago, the average block in Sandwich would have contained twenty single family dwellings, two or three duplexes, and perhaps one apartment of six to eight units, totalling thirty-five housing units. Presently, the average block contains about seventy units, representing an increase in housing units of over 100% (McLean 1978, p. 105).

Evidence of this escalation in housing density was found again in a 1989 Sandwich Community Needs Survey. This study revealed that within a surveyed area measuring approximately five by eight miles, the dense housing situation of 1670.74 persons per square kilometer was unparalleled by any other local urban community. The City of Windsor population ratio was 294.9 persons per square kilometer at the same time.

Economic influences

Greenberg, according to Byrne and Sampson (1986, p. 56), in an extensive neighborhood crime study, revealed that while "single-family" residence was the "single most important positive effect" on a community, both housing and physical [community] deterioration were at the forefront of
"the perception of problems that are believed to reflect social disorder". Bursik, Jr. refers to research that purports "high crime rates may become symbolic of perceived neighborhood deterioration", state Byrne and Sampson (1986, p. 64).

Skogan (1986, p. 203-207) declares however, that community changes occur slowly,

unless 'triggering' events shift them from a position of relative stability into one of demographic and economic flux...[where] the critical role of these triggering events appears to be their effect on the number and mix of people moving into and out of the neighborhood.

He names three prominent factors which contribute to neighborhood change and fear of crime: disinvestment, demolition and construction, and demagoguery. 'Disinvestment' is that element within which little interest is given to the maintenance of buildings by landlords and owners, and where Skogan (1986, p. 206) says, "an important factor...is institutional decisions about the viability of particular neighborhoods". Regarding 'demolition and construction', Skogan (1986, p. 206) makes reference to the importance of "land-use patterns", where "planning and construction activities of government often create...'artificial neighborhoods' and upset the stability of city areas". As to 'demagoguery', Skogan (1986, p. 207) implicates "cagey real estate agents (panic peddlers)" as capable of "stirring concern about crime and racial change",
and where "an ambitious politician seeking to build a neighborhood political base can make somewhat different use [of the area]".

Physical environment: disarray in the neighborhood

Skogan and Maxfield (1981, p. 82) put forth several "dimensions" that convey public perception of criminality in an area. One of these is found within what they term as "signs of disorder" in the community. They refer to "abandoned buildings, vandalism", and other environmental clues indicating "disarray" in a neighborhood. "Untidiness", Skogan and Maxfield (1981, p. 91) state, fails to meet "people's expectations about fit and proper conditions..., [and] where these standards seem to be in a decline, people feel that they are watching disintegration of the rules that ought to govern public life". They say that "environmental cues...[are] dubbed 'the signs of crime'...[which] stimulat[e] the perception that crime is a major concern in the neighborhood" (1981, p. 92, 97). This type of 'reactivity' may apply both, to members of the community as well as those outside it, however it may be a stronger perception within the latter population.
Fear of crime

Regardless of the level of victimization or knowledge of actual criminal activity in a community, a perception of criminality is underscored by "official police accounts of neighborhood crime", and adds to the fear of crime, according to Skogan and Maxfield (1981, p. 115). However, they say, those people who "enjoy strong social and residential ties to their neighborhoods report being less afraid" (Skogan and Maxfield 1981, p. 122).

"Neighborhood integration", another 'dimension' conveying public perception of criminality, state Skogan and Maxfield (1981, p. 98-99), is one other "causal antecedent of social pathologies". They affirm that where community members have more awareness about their neighborhoods, the "less affected [they are] when they encounter...the signs of crime" (Skogan and Maxfield 1981, p. 99). Particularly, where there are social ties and personal investments in the community, these factors join others as "powerful predictors of a host of attitudes" regarding community criminality (Skogan and Maxfield 1981, p. 100). Clearly, better knowledge and understanding about communities seems to adjust the direction of perceptions about community criminality in more positive directions.
The media is often blamed for sensationalizing crime, and devotes a good portion of coverage, particularly to violence. Skogan and Maxfield (1981, p. 142-143) assert that "while the frequency of actual victimization and the relative proportions of violent and property crime do not match people's concerns, the media are more suspect". In this regard, they say, the media imports "vicarious victimization" upon people, due to the fact that it is a powerful "source of impressions about crime which are remote from actual events". In examining the relationship between victimization and fear, Skogan and Maxfield (1981, p. 258) state that "[actual personal] experience with crime is infrequent enough to break the mathematical requirements of most statistics". Therefore, the real basis for fear of crime tends to be of some curiosity to researchers. Skogan and Maxfield (1981, p. 260-261) affirm that where attention to crime through the media was similar in areas experiencing various levels of crime, there was more fear of crime in "low-risk strata", while "people who are more attuned to local conditions are less fearful."

Each of these discussion segments comprise conditions and possess ingredients which equate with the Sandwich situation in regard to the attribution of a high-crime community label. The labelling of Sandwich is most likely more prevalent among law enforcement agents; and 'outsiders'
who maintain perceptions of the community, possibly supporting their views with "environmental cues". There is also indication that the media, to some extent, and urban administrators who failed in maintaining this community, view it negatively. These suggestions are supported by comments of interview respondents, the majority of whom tend to discount the label of Sandwich as a high-crime area.
CHAPTER TWO

Suggested origins of the Sandwich community high-crime reputation

General reference to Olde Sandwich Towne as a high-crime community has been common over the years. The label has become somewhat of a generic character of the community. The frequency of this type of neighborhood characterization has been so prevalent that few people, especially residents, who are most affected, have questioned it. But some who have taken exception to this label are senior citizens, especially those who are aware of the early history of the Sandwich community. They are both resentful of, and confused by this stigma. Many know the community, especially through area biographies, one of which in part, refers to the Sandwich area of earlier times,

[the] town of Sandwich and judicial seat of the County of Essex is beautifully situated in the midst of a fine and well settled agricultural country on the Detroit River. There are many beautiful private residences and well kept lawns, the long rows of magnificent shade trees lining the principal streets. It being an historical town, many people visit the place each year from all parts of the American continent (Neal, 1909, p. 27).

As well, 'seniors' understand how the family and church were firmly established centres of community interaction,
and writings which state that Sandwich "subscribe[d] to social norms" overall. It seems that as long as the area was able to exercise informal control over its population, it was able to manage its affairs. Gervais (1992, p. 11) comments, in his tribute to early local law and order titled The Border Police, that "there seemed more of a respect for authority, [of] institutions, even police constables...there was little trouble enforcing the law".

It is difficult to precisely ascertain the origin of the high-crime label, although there is indication that amalgamation of Sandwich, Windsor, Walkerville, and East Windsor led to community socioeconomic changes, and a time when waves of criminal activity swept through the area. At that time, prohibition had taken a toll on the community, with dealers utilizing the waterway for rum-running and transport of contraband whiskey. A bootlegging and gambling subculture was establishing itself in Sandwich (Gervais 1992, p. 70). The community was being changed by the most adverse consequences of these illegal acts. Sandwich changed from an historical, stately, and family-oriented community to one infected and divided by conflict which tormented its residents.

At that time, promises of a "cleanup" of these "thriving" negative influences were proclaimed by the "new" police force, with its police chiefs originating from the
employ of Hiram Walker and Ford City, and bringing policing experience with them. The local newspaper touted that a "unified force would be...an effective arm against crime" according to Gervais (1992, p. 76).

But, it seems that policing of Sandwich occupied a lesser importance in the scheme of urban social order, and Gervais (1992, p. 77) states, "[policing] was so haphazard that often the turnkey at the county jail was assigned to handle criminal matters". Until total amalgamation was achieved, Windsor boasted 57 constables, while only two served the Sandwich community.

Within the foregoing perspective, it is possible that early symptoms of social stratification were occurring in the Sandwich community. In Duane Alwin's (1990, p. 58) "Reviews" [on] "Social Hierarchies", he comments on the topic of social structures. He states that "social stratification" refer[s] to "the hierarchy of power, privilege, and prestige...[and these] measure social stratificational position". The Sandwich case may be an example of how a hierarchical urban power structure is created. While social and political situations usurp neighborhood viability and wrest the community's informal social control traditions, conditions are created within it which are conducive to criminality, or to implications of deviant behavior.
Another possible influence on the reputation of Olde Sandwich Towne may have come with the introduction of public housing to the area. With it came criminal activity, if police and resident rhetoric can be considered a validating source for the high-crime label. This community was the first local urban area to experience such a housing style. It is possible that construction of this immensely dense living accommodation at that time, may have precluded sufficient scrutiny on the part of urban and housing officials about its potential effects on tenants.

The question arises: "does public-housing cause crime?". Local police officers do emphasize that a large segment of police calls are directed toward public housing areas. Phillips and Andrews (1982, p. 31) offer an explanation. They state,

While explanations for the generally high incidence of vandalism, burglaries, fights and gang formation often found in public housing projects vary, most evidence links these problems to the high concentration of low-income single parent families in such projects. While the exact nature of this relationship remains unclear, most research points to the following: that the poor, and particularly the poor of racial minorities, are unable to demand much in the way of police protection; that single parents have more difficulty in controlling their teenage children; that mother led single parent households are more vulnerable to criminal attack; and that high concentrations of low income single parent families have a 'critical mass' effect that multiplies the negative impacts of poverty, creating entire housing environments dominated by the conditions of poverty.
Although English research preceded Canadian studies on the effects of crowding and density in urban housing, Kennedy (1983, p. 126-127) says that such information had long been available for consultation. In 1968, a Canadian "Federal Task Force on Housing and Urban Development" studied "residential crowding" such as public housing. Kennedy (1983, p. 126-127) elaborates on some of the Task Force findings,

Crowding generates great dissatisfaction [among tenants]...studies have linked overcrowding to juvenile delinquency and family breakdown...site crowding (i.e. neighborhood density) plays a bigger role in increasing personal discontent.

The recommendations by the Task Force is that "more research [is required] on the effects of housing on urban residents...[as well as on] more innovative design of housing" (Kennedy 1983, p. 128).

Kennedy (1983, p. 128) makes references also, to extensive studies by researchers such as Mitchel, and Michelson and Garland, into dense housing problems in Saskatoon and Toronto. As well, he evaluates similar studies of Dennis and Fish "in their analysis of social (public) housing policy in Canada", and he states,

[they] observed that despite the concerns about crowding and privacy, the form of dwelling unit is mainly determined by the economics of building, rather than by user needs...Economics dictate that physical space and not social issues is the prime concern (Kennedy 1983, p. 128).
Such misdirected concerns of social systems, and organizations responsible for human welfare, to some extent fail to serve "human interests". Instead, these bureaucracies tend to dominate individuals, making them "feel powerless and inconsequential...and isolate individuals from one another", according to Fishman and Benello (1986, p. 125). Such situations create "power systems" which reify "social reality", removing subjective thought from objective goals.

In 1979, when a neighborhood activist urged urban officials to provide more recreational activity for youth within the Sandwich community's public housing projects, it was revealed that 550 children under 16 years of age resided here, within a space comprising approximately a four block area. In 1989, a Sandwich Community Health Centre Needs Survey revealed that this same area contained "two spatially-crowded 'row-type' housing projects [which] accommodate 386 family housing units", according to Catton and Hutchinson (1989, p. 26).

Increased housing density and overcrowding inevitably produce an environment that contributes to stress and delinquency. Public housing policies draw much criticism in relation to these stresses, claims Reiss, Jr. (1986, p. 20). When public housing 'ghettos' are permitted by the housing authorities, this creates a situation where "crime becomes
endemic among young persons...[and] affects the crime careers of communities". Public housing areas draw tenants from all areas of the urban centre, and, much as Kennedy (1983, p. 94) points out, those "who have few resources to move into the private market...the single-parent families, the very poor, and the elderly".

Earlier evaluative appraisals and assessments by Windsor housing officials, of effects of public housing, may have lessened the adverse impact of this density in this case study area. Had action been taken then, it may have led to changes similar to those currently being undertaken by local administrators. Recently, a few housing units have been 'subtracted' from one project, giving "breathing space to its residents", as well as allowing for the creation of some small children's playgrounds (Catton and Hutchinson 1989, p. 26). While this public housing adjustment was made recently, requests of this nature were first posed to local housing officials approximately fifteen years ago by concerned local citizens, both inside and outside public housing complexes.

Perhaps even more progress as regards almost three decades of public concerns about dense public housing ought yet to be achieved. This may be accomplished by acting on the latter part of the above-mentioned Task Force
recommendations, the need for 'more innovative design of housing'.

In underscoring the failure of housing officials to address such needs of urban citizens, Kennedy (1983, p. 128) may be precise in pointing out reasons for such scarce attention. He borrows a quote from the 1972 research of Dennis and Fish, who state: "The user is fit into what can be built". According to Kennedy (1983, p. 128), the problem in this area is that "[governments] have had tremendous difficulty balancing the issues of need, common good, and merit...[they]... have acted as developers, as landlords, and as bankers". Kennedy (1983, p. 96) demonstrates, in the following diagram titled "Views of the Neighborhood", what may be referred to as the complexities of some communities.
Elements contributing to a 'high-crime' community label

In the Sandwich community at the present time, there exist three large grade schools, one high school within the boundaried area, and one other, along with the University of Windsor campus, skirting another boundary. The community accommodates the Windsor Jail, an alcohol detoxification centre, a large home for the aged, a Community Policing Unit, an adolescent behavior modification centre, two huge construction-aggregate compounds, several large above-ground commercial fuel storage tanks, busy riverfront ship-docking and unloading areas, several pubs and taverns, and a nearby abandoned dump site.

Also within the community, heavy truck traffic complicates other vehicular traffic on two major highways, one running directly through the community, and the other immediately alongside. In addition, there is a heavily-travelled entry/exit international border-crossing site. Both, traffic routes and the amount of vehicular usage of them, continue to increase. Local industry sites which are sprinkled throughout the community, and in most cases located very close to residences, have historically posed environmental problems to residents. This situation continues, and frequently results in area land-use conflicts. Of the numbers of problems that these conditions
create, there is affirmation of them from urban officials and regulators, but often scarce major attempts at resolutions.

Clairmont and Wilcox-Magill (1983, p. 325) elaborate on how a conception of powerlessness develops and adversely affects populations to the point that community situations become self-fulfilling prophecies. Consequently, they [residents] learn that in their community they can expect only poor and inferior services and protection from such institutions as the police, the courts, the schools, sanitation department, the landlords, and the merchants.

Skogan (1986, p. 212-213) attributes these types of situations to neglect in enforcement of local urban administrative standards. He notes also, that the presence of "highly visible signs [such as] junk, trash, vacant lot, and boarded-up buildings...are associated in the minds of many with... crime". It has been my experience to have observed buildings, streets, and landscapes which have become blighted by neglect, where industries invaded vacant areas, as transportation routes increased. New investment was thwarted by negative financial predictions.

Community conditions such as these impact the area to the extent that conflict and frustration prevail. A negative 'political' attitude toward the area is preserved by these conditions. Ultimately, cynical judgements are made by police, legal and social service departments, and
other essential allies, and counteractive reactions to neighborhood demands occur. Skogan (1986, p. 215) confirms that any territory experiencing such problems is rife with residents' feelings of impotency, and vulnerability. This condition induces "helplessness", which itself commits an impression to public perception, that the community is indifferent to behaviors within it. Demographies of declining communities show that with the onset of area decay, the population becomes socially and psychologically transformed. Fear often infects otherwise socially stable families, as emotional and physical isolation inhibits social interaction.

Consequences do occur within a labelled community when its unique and collective needs are not identified and appropriately addressed, or worst, disregarded. Berger and Luckmann, in their reference to 'social construction', while addressing the perspective of "objectivation" in human organization, reflected on how, and why such consequences occur. They cautioned against perils when social situations translate into "social constructs".

Once created, [social constructs] take on a reality of their own...their origin as human constructs is easily forgotten...[they] become replicated as a result of the 'survival value'...and proceed to develop into an organizational system...[which] becomes institutionalized through law, custom, [and] surrounding institutions that support the major system...[thus] creating the organizational RNA that assures that the structural features...are replicated
and remain the same (Fishman and Benello 1986, p. 122).

In the absence of strong urban administrative strategies, an urgency exists for socially troubled communities to persist in their efforts to survive and regenerate, and to refrain from becoming urban wastelands. Schwartz (1980, p. viii) articulated his concerns about troubled communities, and spoke of Gallaher's examination of "the impact of external authority on the little community". In an admonishing tone, he asserted that a community in decline demands "a thoughtful understanding and deep empathy for the inhabitants, a result rarely attained in an analytical work of social science" (Schwartz 1980, p. ix).

Social and economic base of the Sandwich community

"Social context can have a pernicious effect in neighborhoods...that are bereft of resources", states Weiher (1991, p. 193). He goes on to say, "Those who live in these areas bear the cost of social pathologies...that are concentrated and magnified". The Sandwich community can be described as having been somewhat 'bereft' of many resources over the years, primarily due to poor urban and social community planning. It is a small, but densely populated community (5.5% of Windsor's population), one in which the population ranges between two extremes, youths (over a quarter of Windsor's population) and seniors (over a third
of Windsor's population) (Catton and Hutchinson 1989, p. 12). Of the youth (under 25 years old) population, it is possible that many are university students. Seniors are "people who are retired, many of them widowed". There are more women in this community, many of them single parents, although these numbers (of both sectors) have dropped off in the last five years. Because most single parents do not work full-time, their incomes tend to be low, although their level of education is higher than that of males in the community. Almost a fifth of the Sandwich population are immigrants. Community residents tend to be employed mainly in blue-collar jobs, with incomes ranging from $20,000 to $30,000. Over two-thirds of community residents own their homes (Eureka Management Consultants 1994 p. 9). A variety of businesses and industries are situated in this area, from retail and convenience stores to manufacturing plants and other industry.

A health care facility has been established in the community within the last few years, and there is a significant increase in the state of total well-being of community members. Most noteworthy about the Sandwich Community Health Centre (situated in a local high school), is that, although it manages a large clinical area, it possesses a vast educational component. Instead of totally directing itself to disease treatment, it addresses disease
prevention, thus operating in a proactive style as a 'total health care facility'. Parents, especially those who are very young, can learn or improve parenting skills, and are able to complete high-school (with the Centre assisting in child-care); children can learn about healthier lifestyles like proper eating, sleeping and study habits. The Centre provides teenagers with valuable resources, like a dietician who educates on appropriate diet, nurses who direct sex education and family planning, and health programmers who teach about the hazards of alcohol and drugs. Social workers counsel community members on family and other social problems. The Centre's gerontology section provides senior citizens with a variety of services. 'Seniors' can avail themselves of advice which addresses their diets, exercise targeting proper weight maintenance, smoking cessation clinics and instruction on disease risk reduction, recreational activities which include walking, swimming, and dancing, various counselling, and, legal advice on financial and property matters. Addressing environmental pollution is also part of the Health Centre's program. Community development initiatives are partnered with community service agencies and businesses. The Centre works with children and adult groups on community projects, as well as with the Sandwich Community Police Unit. All programs at the Centre are community-directed and community-oriented. Therefore,
the concluding comments in the 1989 Needs Survey: "The overall goal of the Centre is to improve the quality of life for the residents of the community", and those of the updated 1994 Needs Survey: "Sandwich Community Health Centre's mandate and mission imply a continuous need to assess and understand the needs of the community it serves", are very appropriate.

Basically, the area is presently fairly self-sufficient in most services to its population. Recreational activities have increased with the presence of a community centre, more usage of school buildings, and a larger number of green spaces. Most social needs of the community seem to be fairly well maintained.

The economic base of the Sandwich community suffers because there is a shortage of land area for new investment and development. Land-use conflicts prevail due to incompatible land utilization. While a fair number of community residents own their homes, when some of these become available to the realty market, they are often purchased for conversion to multiple residence and student housing. More recent community development in Sandwich has been directed mainly toward improvement in the social arena, and on rejuvenating the community's physical environment. These initiatives have been launched almost entirely by citizens, community leaders, and business owners. Financial
support for these has been solicited mainly from various provincial grant systems, by the various community groups. Some financial aid has come from the local government. According to Sandwich community members, area improvement initiatives are community defined (as seen in a number of community Needs Surveys), creating a direction that is consistent with what Roberts (1979, p. 175-176) details in his "definitions of community development". He outlines Canada's definition as

a) an educational-motivation process designed to create conditions favourable to economic and social change...on the initiative of the community...[or] to secure the fullest participation of the community, b) facilitation in solving problems as identified by the community itself, c) define [community's] area for action.

While movements in the economic sphere tend to be limited for Sandwich, community leaders have chosen to turn their attention mainly inward, and to regenerate internally, addressing social needs, and quality of life of the neighborhood. Perhaps this community direction may be criticized by economists, and other "devotees of free market[s]". "Economists...frequently do not consider markets in the context of the other types of systems with which they interact", says Weiher (1991, p. 171). Instead, they isolate their systems "from other social phenomena" and ignore "outcomes [such as] social stratification". In his
view, "The conversion is complete when concepts like status
and social distance are assigned values".

The Sandwich community is annoyed by such consequences,
and has chosen to rebel against the "conversion". There is
a new sense of excitement in the neighborhood, where
community members refuse to be isolated any longer.
Undoubtedly, in this community, neighborhood stereotyping
and characterization in social stratification has become a
dated system.

**Halting community impairment**

There are potential points of intervention as communities approach decline. With genuine and sufficient
heed paid to warning signals and transformations of
community characteristics, the decline of communities could
be halted by urban managers and officials. However, in the
absence of such heed, the community must draw on its own
strengths and resources to wrench itself from demise. It
may ensure its own existence by collectively appraising its
dilemma, and mutually responding to its own predicament.

More recently, the preservation of communities has been
recognized as a prudent social and economic necessity by the
local, provincial and federal governments, resulting in some
funding being provided for urban renewal. Still, the pace
of the initiative has been slow and inadequate for prevention of urban decay.

Significant indication is presented thus far that overall, poor urban planning and ineffectual administrative practices precipitate potential for community decline. Municipal officials and administrators set much of the primary political tone within their urban directives, decisions, and actions, and are liable for the viability of communities. Therefore, it is their responsibility to detect and prevent a weakening of community structure, and the consequences that surely follow, the most formidable being community decline and the creation of a high-crime community reputation. Failure to accept this responsibility demonstrates administrative indifference to a community's fate.

Skogan (1986, p. 221) affirms that "decline is not the inevitable fate of urban neighborhoods, ...[it] can go 'up'...through 'incumbent upgrading'". Vidich (1980, p. 119), in typical agreement, offers an additional observation.

It is possible that some communities that might otherwise have been destroyed will be saved. If they are saved it will be as a result...of the efforts of individuals and groups who have chosen to save them.

Such an effort has taken place over a number of years within the Sandwich community. The rejuvenation of the neighborhood has involved much of its population, and has
been an ongoing process for over a decade. It is demonstrated in the latter part of this thesis.

**STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESIS**

Olde Sandwich Towne had undergone a process of noticeable change as pertains to its communal characteristics. This development, in conjunction with the community's statistical crime data indicating higher than 'normal' criminal activity, resulted in the attribution of a "high-crime community" label. Once the community was formally labelled as a high-crime or problem area, ensuing political actions toward it hastened its decline, if not ensuring it.

This negative identification of Sandwich has its major origin in poor urban planning and ineffectual administrative practices. An indifference to a community's fate by urban officials poses a risk to its viability, as the high-crime label undermines and weakens the area's social and physical structure. This process precipitates potential for community decay. If municipal administrators are responsible for the viability of communities, the responsibility for the symptoms of decline, as well as the decline itself, rests with their actions and decisions.

Within such a community, various conditions of disadvantage become central properties that facilitate and
hasten decline. Conditions such as housing density and overcrowding provide an environment that is conducive to stress and delinquency. This environment involves a lack of social cohesion and initiates high rates of population mobility, with ensuing physical deterioration of the community (Herbert 1982, p. 35-37). Consequentially, any effects upon an area are exacerbated by neglectful and misdirected urban initiatives and policies, as well as by the inertia of other agencies who reflect indifference to an ailing community. The decline of Olde Sandwich Towne is illustrated in typical consequences of reactions by social agencies, business investors, as well as other urban communities. A focus is also directed at police and legal strategies, in order to evaluate formal control strategies and community policing practices.

Positive outside perceptions are critical to the stability of a community's social environment, and often may diminish the consequences of criminal activity, or its supposition, for the community. This is commonly shared social knowledge. Therefore, most residents are angered, confused, and distressed by the 'high-crime' label, although they may ultimately accommodate it.
CHAPTER THREE

LITERATURE REVIEW

Urban communities are affected by the types of planning strategies, programs, services, and ultimately social policies chosen to apply to them. Although some policies do create the "concept of positive discrimination", and propose funding for short-term "local ameliorative solutions" for certain communities, according to Herbert (1982, p. 107), they offer illusory predictions and little initiative for abating underlying problems. The powers of communities to control their individual destinies are rarely respected or permitted by their local and regional governments.

Gallaher, Jr. (1980, p. 108) states that a community deserves the utmost of consideration for its well-being, and that it "ought to provide its members with the full opportunity to grow socially and to gain individual satisfaction". But the community is part of a centralized urban system of governance that administers essential resources, and oversees the process of decision-making for all communities. Therefore, the kind of image of individual communities, held by administrators of the larger urban
center, and others responsible for the welfare of neighborhoods, is crucial. This impression plays an important part in the regulation of measures, quality, and types of inducements and ministrations that are appropriated to particular urban areas.

Kennedy (1983, p. 123) expresses such concerns, and identifies urban studies that point to the importance of "service equity" among urban communities. But he indicates that inequalities of services do occur, and it is often difficult to establish the basis for such developments. Where such inequities prevail, he claims that "distribution of opportunities to influence service delivery...[are] consequences of differential access to the decision-making process".

Community identity and criminality status

It is recognized that required community services differ between neighborhoods because of geographic and population variance and divergent area attributes. Characteristically, communities evolve to form and shape their own identities and needs. But evolution is a lengthy and mystifying process, and the outcome cannot be predicted. Research shows that it is often easier to create or change a community then to observe and monitor its growth (Lewis, Grant, and Rosenbaum 1988, p. 138). Meantime, there is a
propensity for governing bodies to "institutionalize" customary 'benchmarks' which constitute 'normal' communities. This is usually achieved by providing urban resources and services which are seen by administrators as equal. However, Kennedy (1983, p. 122) refers to the research of Rich, and states that such services "are offered to people in unequal circumstances [thus]...in fact [services] are not equitable".

Communities may evolve in unpredictable and unplanned patterns. Conflicts begin to occur when urban area features are seen as atypical by those who service community needs; and this may be perceived by urban administrators as symptomatic of ills. A negative status may be assigned to the community, problematically stereotyping and labelling it. This may be particularly harmful to the community's social complexion, especially as regards human behavior, which may also be seen as atypical.

Behaviors though, are colored by many factors, for example, by the physical environment of the neighborhood, and how it effects residents. Urban research is often performed by ecologists who determine the "ecology of crime" in a community, by employing certain methods and measurements. According to Bottoms (1976, p. 37), census data is the most likely source utilized for this research. However, much of census data entails "social
characteristics" of a community from which an "ecological correlation" is secured. For this reason, Bottoms takes issue with this methodology because, according to him, it falsely implicates the nature of the area as the source of criminal activity.

Kennedy (1983, p. 77-78) takes an even stronger exception to such research practices, explaining that the methods distort crime statistics because, "They treat [the physical environment] as a medium rather than a variable with its own effects on social behavior". His thoughts seem to coincide with Bottom's assertion, and he says that this type of research

relies on information about social aggregates mainly derived from census counts...[and that] communities are real only as they are defined by census groupings used in the analysis of data (Kennedy 1983, p. 78).

Raising several questions in this regard, Kennedy (1983, p. 78) asks, "How are the concerns about the fair access to decent housing, safety, and community support ensured in environments where competition means the survival of the fittest?".

The physical environment, Kennedy (1983, p. 76) states, has to be of concern in urban crime studies. He outlines an example of public perceptions of urban areas that can be created from "drawing a relationship between geographical incidence of crime and individual characteristics", and refers to an article in a Toronto paper, reviewing the
city's crime statistics. As the city's media addressed crime rates for a particular urban community, an implied relationship between the criminal reputation of this specific area of Toronto and the characteristics of its residents was being obviously drawn. The article read,

It's home to students in cooperative housing...many members of the city's drug subculture and those people 'just passing through' living in the area's many rooming houses. And it's the transients who make life most difficult for police and law-abiding citizens, police say (Kennedy 1983, p. 76).

Responding to this type of stigmatization, Kennedy (1983, p. 76) affirms that, "The labelling of the area...implies that the majority of people living there are criminal".

The primary concern is that stigmatized areas become labelled by negative impressions of the community. With lack of intervention in this undermining process, it is difficult to prevent the label's destructive effects on the community.

Stereotyping communities

Walter Lippmann, as cited in Nettler (1984, p. 269), discussed the idea of "stereotype", that our responses were often based on "pictures in our heads" of others.

These pictures are alleged to be partly true, partly false, and always exaggerated...the perfect stereotype precedes the use of reason...it stamps the data of our senses before the data reach the intelligence.
Nettler (1984, p. 270) supported this explanation, and elaborated on the inaccuracies and consequences of stereotyping. He drew attention to the images that first come to our minds when references are made to "occupations", "social classes", "personalities", and "ethnic groups". Unfortunately, these images have become socially acceptable, and are often sanctioned by referential terms such as 'group consensus' and 'it is general experience'. Kennedy (1983, p. 76) recognized that in a community, these are social pitfalls created by "ecological fallacy", otherwise "attaching the characteristics of people in an area to certain behavior such as crime", and he calls this "a hazardous practice".

According to Theodorson (1982, p. 249), Downs suggests that assumptions are feeble explanations of urban situations.

Underpinning an understanding of the processes of urban governance and administration are assumptions about human behavior...To the extent that governing processes seem unable to resolve an increasing number of urban problems, assumptions are explicitly questioned.

Stereotyping individuals, groups, communities, and societies assigns a "'master status state'", a label to which Nettler (1984, p. 284) refers as "is-ness". He outlines several "defects" of the label, 1) [it] infers what we are from what we do, which is all that can be observed, 2) it ignores degrees of activity, and 3) it produces an
inflexible categorization congenial to dogmatism and deaf to information. Labelling, he states, "is more political than scientific, and...carries a price". For some communities, the "price" may come in the form of ecological fallacy.

Weiher (1991, p. 25) calls attention to Dye, as well as Skogan, who evaluate how urban areas take on certain identifications, and how "lines of cleavage[s]" between communities form. They explain that these types of demarcations are almost exclusively created by "political boundaries", and contribute to "urban fragmentation". The significance of this system is not only that political boundaries "are characterized by surprising invisibility...we know that they are there but we don't see them", but that they become "sorting mechanisms" within urban populations, states Weiher (1991, p. 28). Such 'sorting' does pose some advantages to urban function, for example, formally denoting industrial zones for economic purposes. But particular urban areas may subtly take on determinist definitions when "culture, demography, and life style begin to interact with geography, [and] the information that is structured and conveyed by political boundaries tends to perpetuate that identity", says Weiher, (1991, p. 55). To some extent, this process of "segregation...intensifies social pathologies... [and] those
who are isolated...may be denied opportunities" (1991, p. 58).

Redlining of communities

Communities labelled high-crime and in decline presume a variety of causal elements and effects, says Miller (1981, p. 114), but one of these often has the most devastating effect. It is the practice of "redlining", he states, which "is now illegal". Such an exercise aims at determining land values within an area, and presumably serves to protect investors. Relining is a powerful and destructive force that undermines the economic and social health of certain communities in various ways. While it may be illegal, it is possible that its exercise prevails and continues to be subtly inferred. Miller (1981, p. 112) states, "Value is not intrinsic to any form of property". Property value is largely determined by appraisals drawn by realtors and financial institutions, and most often relies on "neighborhood analysis",

lending institutions consider it important to gauge the direction of neighborhood change...perceptions of...deterioration [are] based on high crime rates, the kind of people moving [in], vacant structures, and the prevalence of undermaintained buildings.

Although Miller (1981, p. 114-118) implicates mainly realty and financial institutions as responsible for redlining, it is conceivable that other social partners of
community viability are privy to such information which may then be weaved into decision-making processes. Brantingham and Brantingham (1981, p. 26) point to the studies of Bottoms and Xanthos, and Miller, to show "how a neighborhood's reputation as crime-ridden develops, and how that reputation builds a deviance amplification spiral which locks the neighborhood into a grim future as a criminal area".

Harries (1980, p. 101)) states that redlining is applied variously, but particularly within the area of "property values". In the community within which this practice may occur, "neighborhood analysis in which the criminological attributes of an area may be taken into account [by real estate agents]", buyers may offer, and sellers may accept "a lower price than might otherwise be the case". This practice causes a "downward spiral" where "fear of crime is related to a price decline".

Levin (1980, p. 269) lays some of the blame of community decay on situations

where bank credit from 'risky' areas is a pervasive policy...[followed by] ruination financed by shadow world money, and then selection of the area by the Planning Commission as a candidate for cataclysmic use of government money to finance renewal clearance.

As well, "the criminal justice system seems to swing between two extremes", either disregarding community problems, or "being extremely repressive", says Levin (1980, p. 269).
In 1993, the Detroit Free Press wrote that "The Clinton administration" will investigate allegations of practices that discriminate against particular communities relative to area demography. Evidence has been presented that particular neighborhoods "are disproportionately exposed to air pollution, hazardous wastes, pesticides and the like". "I don't think that there is any doubt that low income and minority communities have borne the brunt of our industrial lifestyle" stated Carol Browner, agency administrator of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. "The cases that have been filed demonstrate the real frustrations that these communities feel", said Browner (Cushman, Jr. 1993).

West Windsor has been identified recently by the Windsor Air Quality Study (Windsor Air Quality Committee 1994, p. 7) as one of two "hotspots" in the City, for the highest presence of particular hazardous air pollutants. The Study, in presenting its three-year research findings, details the efforts of the Sandwich population in battling for cleaner air. It states, "In the 1980's, determined citizens in Windsor's west-end began a local initiative. They believed the pollutants in their air were affecting their health, spoiling their quality of life, and undermining the livelihood of storekeepers, restaurateurs, and other retailers (Windsor Air Quality Committee 1994, p. 1). Although Sandwich community leaders, health service
providers, and many residents and business owners continue efforts to improve air quality in the area, and have achieved some success, air quality still remains a problem.

Much like some of the Detroit cases, Sandwich has "disproportionately" borne the weight of poor urban planning and ineffectual regulatory enforcement. In 1987, many Olde Sandwich Towne residents, business owners, teachers, and especially senior citizens and parents of small children decided they had endured the nuisance of heavy truck traffic for too long. They decided to curb the damaging effects of this type of transportation on their health and that of their community. Among them, a pastor pleaded, "We're more than a little tired of having to bury our dead with the roar of trucks passing by". People organized, took up petitions, lobbied urban administrators for support, and took their concerns to Windsor City Council. The Windsor Star gave this initiative much attention with lengthy and well-written articles titled, "Truck route war looms in Sandwich", and, "Sandwich truck ban may end up in court" (Windsor Star, 1987). Industry and truckers fought back, bringing a local lawyer to argue for them before Windsor City Council. The 'weight' of this influential group: the Windsor Harbor Commission, Windsor-Essex County Development Commission, Ontario Trucking Association, and spokesmen for the bridge and tunnel, was intimidating. However, Sandwich people
remained undaunted. City Council eventually decided to ban heavy truck traffic from a number of streets in the Sandwich area.

Inasmuch as community members were exuberant, and somewhat amazed at their victory, there is perhaps little comfort in the message that went out to the general public within the comments of heavy-industry representatives: "[the] big rigs now account for nearly half of [the Ambassador Bridge's] eight million vehicles a year" (Windsor Star 1987). Bridge traffic enters and exits in the Sandwich area, and it can probably be presumed that the Sandwich area will continue to be inundated with industry-related traffic. This fact may deal a blow to property values and to the recruitment efforts by the community for new residents and community ventures. And further, it could send a disquieting message to financial institutions and new investors.

Miller (1981, 113) states that

Although crime is, indeed, a source of adverse effects on property values, the direct impact is not from crime but from the perceptions of crime, from fear, from opinions, which may...be totally unsubstantiated.

Redlining does not have to be 'couched' in financial and economic issues. Its properties may be equally damaging when 'buried' in well-meaning, almost altruist deeds. On October 4, 1991, "the John Howard Society, the Windsor Society for Criminology Club, and the University of Windsor"
hosted an 'community information' presentation to "120 people" at the University campus. The guest presenters included Staff Sgt. Bill Stephens of the Sandwich Towne Community Patrol, and Detroit Police Sgt. Charles Barbieri, both speaking to "community-based policing". The Windsor Star 'covered' this event, titling it "Police marshall people power in their crime-prevention fight", and the article outlined "the key to crime prevention". Staff Sgt. Barbieri elaborated on this topic, and spoke of closing down "crack houses", and that "you have to take charge of the neighborhoods". He gave credit to citizens who help the police. "The same idea is behind Windsor's Sandwich patrol", said Stephens in the following sentence. With "24 officers" staffing this policing unit, Stephens spoke of "divid[ing] the west end [Windsor] into 18 small zones - one for each constable". Staff Sgt. Barbieri, the article states, "helps supervise some of the 57 storefront mini-stations throughout Detroit. Each is staffed by one officer". Both officers emphasized, "Meet us before you need us" (Windsor Star, 1991).

Perhaps the first thought in the minds of those who attended this event, and newspaper readers, may be to recognize the ratio of officers involved, where the west-end community policing station employs almost half the number of officers as that of Detroit. Although the ultimate
intention of the officers is praiseworthy, the way the article was presented is damaging to the Sandwich community. Such information is meant to inform and educate the public. Undoubtedly, this initiative unjustifiably instills fearful public impressions of at least one Windsor community.

Despite such examples which reflect the properties of redlining, this illegal practice is difficult to isolate and prove because of its ubiquitous nature. However, in interviewing Sandwich community members, some good examples of discriminatory practices that had existed in the community for many years came from asking a three-part question: whether there had been indications of community change in the past history of Olde Sandwich Towne, if changes indicated community decline, and could any changes have been averted by early intervention. Ninety percent of respondents observed detrimental changes, and that these changes indicated community decline. Eighty nine percent of respondents thought that these changes should not have occurred, and could have been averted by more efficient urban administrative practices, and possibly stringent legal intervention. Changes are summed up in the following way.

Public housing brought problems that were unaddressed; increased vehicular traffic until area became "overloaded with traffic routes"; saturation ("packed effect") of area with apartment buildings, low-priced lands attracted uncanny development; Sandwich possessed "little to no power for input [and became] victim of whims of industry"; "initial community was beautiful, then came decline"; "property values
dropped severely, houses were bought up cheaply by absentee landlords [who] capitalized on student housing" (responses to Question #13 in Interview questionnaire).

Redlining in the Sandwich community may consist of the sum of prejudicial mechanisms, and the perniciousness of such activity over time. The foregoing examples demonstrate overpowering discrimination against particular communities, and the consequences.

The Moral Dilemma of Social Scientists: Labelling, conflict, and social control

Urban criminological research by social scientists in the 1960's viewed urban communities as composed of social groups, and inquiries on these and related topics were environmentally-focussed, borrowing on the biotic processes of natural science. Typical of this ecological concept was the Chicago School which weaved zonal ecology into the pattern of criminality, as the studies of Shaw and McKay have shown. Delinquency for instance, was considered group behavior, with prime causes linked to the "social, cultural and economic factors" within particular urban zones, according to Herbert (1982, p. 36).

However, Herbert (1982, p. 36) explains, "[Shaw] did not submit evidence to show that delinquency rates represented an ecological adaptation to different areas". As well, delinquency studies of the time focussed more on offenders and their urban location than on the larger,
intrinsic nature of various offence environs. The 'sins of ecological fallacy' pervaded urban studies well into the 1970's. Communities with characteristics which were unlike those perceived as the 'norm' were often perceptually associated by researchers, with deviance and criminality. This type of analysis entrenched social views about criminality as being a most likely feature of particular urban areas. "Spatial analysis [possessed] positivistic qualities...[and] behavioural processes were couched in positivistic terms", says Herbert (1982, p. 25). Community labelling, and theorists' attitudes about behavior gained support from such traditional practices.

Herbert (1982, p. 42), in demonstrating an example of ecological fallacy, extracts delinquency as one of several behaviors perceived as present within a labelled 'high-crime' area. The occurrence of this behavior in such a community, he explains, is an easy and objective way to view its establishment. But, he emphasizes, this behavior does not have a "surrogate" relationship with a particular urban area. Instead delinquent behavior comes at the end of a long chain which links the allocation of power in society, through distribution of resources to its members, to the fact of unequal access to those resources in geographical space...[to] the socio-legal system. This broader perspective is essential...to understand the differential response at individual and neighborhood level to macro-conditions of disadvantage.
Therefore, taking into account that 'socio-political' situations are very common to urban circumstances and may play significantly in behaviors, and inequitable procedures and "class conflicts" may result, labelling and conflict issues in urban sociology should be more judiciously addressed. Understanding "the way space is managed and how urban environments of particular quality emerge", advises Herbert (1982, p. 44), can serve the purpose of detailing conditions for certain behaviors. "It is from the 'roots' of the system... that any manifestations of space originate", states Herbert (1982, p. 26).

In most cases, behaviors "modify over time except where [the community] is adversely labelled" asserts Herbert (1982, p. 79). By employing qualitative methods, utilizing the subjective interpretations of community residents, and by examining "situational contexts" of behaviors, those are ways that the "root causes of crime" may be determined (Herbert 1982, p. 44), or the perceptions of community crime reputations more precisely discerned.

Herbert (1982, p. 81) borrows on support for his view from other sociologists, among them Michelson, who claims that "the most relevant indicators [of deviant behavior] are "social". To the extent that the "built environment" may be implicated is particularly relevant to some factors, one being "overcrowding" (Herbert 1982, 82). Mainly, suggested
factors in 'criminality' are "disadvantages of poor environment (housing density), [inadequate] social and economic opportunities, [and] climate of opinion affect[ing] the life chances of the individual". Out of these, some of the conditions that emerge are "low occupational skills and poor education", says Herbert (1982, p. 81). Community residents may feel locked into "housing market[s] [that] place households in less advantageous tenure conditions". Being unable to achieve "favorable moral influences and opportunities compound[s] the difficulties" (Herbert 1982, p. 86). Within such areal framework, helplessness perpetuates hopelessness.

Cumulatively, as the following outline shows, the social scenario is demonstrated by what Herbert (1982, p. 88) titles "theory of competitive markets (access to scarce resources)", in Figure 1.
Figure 1
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Any community system which reflects this profile, should be able to demonstrate a link of community conditions with the "local conditions via bureaucratic control and 'gatekeepers' to their structural origins" (Herbert 1982, p. 88). Herbert cautions though, that each factor in Figure 1 is not "mechanistic", and should be seen in relative fashion. Secondly, factors which draw their "inference" purely from statistical sources should be utilized with circumspect due to limitations, particularly of quantitative data, and necessitate other substantive evidence. Altogether though, the scenario should provide indications how serious inattention, if not indifference by urban 'gatekeepers' to community decline, could pose consequential results.

Herbert (1982, p. 95) adds another variable to reasons why the structure of particular urban areas is undermined. He refers to the "dumping theory". The "Sheffield study" showed that the practice of 'dumping' did exist. In these cases, shoddy urban planning strategies translate into consequences, for example in public housing, when large numbers of "tenants preselected because of [their] adverse qualities [are] gathered together", says Herbert (1982, p. 95). Most often, some of the qualities that are judged
'adverse' can be such commonplace features as low income and single parenthood (Herbert 1982, p. 35).

But, sizeable tenant congregations such as these often precipitate local resentment. Most often, many public housing tenants originate from other more politically influential urban areas. The community within which public housing is installed, is stigmatized. Meantime, other forms of 'dumping' may occur, and if the practices remains unabated, the area becomes saturated with incompatible and contentious operations. The initial stigmatizing agent (faulty housing policy) becomes the genesis of a depreciating reputation that eventually envelopes the entire host community. Herbert (1982, p. 35) cautions,

The idea of stigmatization is important and is linked to the theory that reputations, once established, are perpetuated, perhaps undeservedly, because the area is labelled as problematic.

Damer, as cited by Herbert (1982, p. 95), portrays such housing policy consequences in his Glasgow study of Wine Alley, an area in which he resided for some time, for study purposes as participant observer. While he "found it to be a fairly ordinary Glasgow manual workers community",

Municipal officials stereotyped Wine Alley...by its physical identity...[it] was primarily a product of labelling on the grounds of past perceptions rather than modern realities of its occupants behavior.

In other similar situations, as in Gill's study of Luke Street and in the Ely housing estates of Cardiff in England,
these revealed additional problems which were attributed to urban "inadequacies of design and provision", Herbert (1982, p. 95) states. Negative consequences become realistically entrenched in communities where intervention that could serve to avoid them is lacking. Herbert (1982, p. 96), demonstrates this in the following diagram, "Problem Estates", in Figure 2.
Figure 2

ORIGINS
- early problem families
- distinctive tenants
- dumping policy

LABELLING
- local population
- housing officials
- police, welfare services

CHARACTERISTICS
- low status
- large families
- few facilities
- low maintenance

CONTINUITY
- self selection
- turnover
- transfers

PROBLEM ESTATES
- establish reputation
- stigmatize
- reinforce label
- perpetuate character
Associating the creation of problem estates with "the roles of urban managers or 'gatekeepers' and their place in the system", Herbert (1982, p. 28) places this responsibility on those who possess the power to foresee, prevent, or modify detrimental urban conditions. Space, by itself does not produce such negative consequences, "[it has] to be contextual in its social meanings", says Herbert (1982, p. 100).

There is no geometry of space which has a meaning independent of the socio-political forces, or indeed of the morphological and land-use contexts of which it is a part (Herbert 1982, p. 103).

Canadian researchers Frank and Mustard (1993, p. 1-15), in recent works titled "The Determinants of Health from a Historical Perspective", focus on how the definition of 'health' has been defined, by aiming at "treating the sick". They remind that theories about 'determinants of health' regard "the definition of health -- necessarily affect[ing] how illness is defined". But if a state of health is predefined by standards for well-being, then a disjuncture occurs between this and the causes of ill-health. Therefore, 'health' is probably unachievable. This example seems to correlate with the definition of deviancy.

Herbert (1982, p. 7) draws attention to the views of Kitsuse and Cicourel, and outlines their concerns about "misrepresentation" of deviant behavior, that being the
"differenc[e] between social conduct which produces a unit of behaviour and the organizational activity which labels this behavior as deviant". Kitsuse and Cicourel question how deviant activity is defined, if the "intensity of social control" determines, or is determined "by the recorded offence rate", says Herbert (1982, p. 7). A definition of criminality, similar to the example of health, must be achieved by more precise methods that determine causes. If not, then might the dilemma of social scientists still remain in the rudimentary principle of "blame the victim"? If so, then changes must occur.

There appears to be inadequate examination, and evaluation, thus responsibility for particular urban areas, especially as it relates to labelling the behavior of community members. This type of inattention has the potential of causing human disadvantage to residents of those areas. The more logical approach to abating social problems, as Herbert (1982, p. 108) maintains, is to address,

the roots of inequality in society whether this is a political ethic or a cumbersome and prejudiced bureaucracy...[and to ask] whom the law serves (or does not serve), [what] is the definition of criminal behavior, and of the use of discretionary powers...

Social science can supplement the creation of urban social policy, Kennedy (1983, p. 133) asserts, despite hesitancy in this regard. "Does the social scientist's role
involve advocacy of a particular policy [and] does it include an advisory position which works to guide policy-makers based on insights gained from research?" Or is this information to be provided to policy-makers only in a 'cartographic' context?" he asks, and adds,

There is a strong argument for the social scientist's responsibility in guiding the policymaker...by assessing the implications of statistical findings which translate into political reality...[by] showing the policymaker that while [for example] police expenditures have been high and include money for crime prevention, their success can be demonstrated through changes in public attitudes...Many people believe that behavior is the only true measure of social change. They deny the importance of attitudes in affecting this. Guiding the policymakers in understanding the motives behind behavior is a major task of the urban researcher (Kennedy 1983, p. 133-134).

Perhaps the fault lines that may still exist in sociology and criminology can be traced back to the objectives of traditional social science. Ericson (1975, p. 46) states that sociologists had taken "objective facts as given, ignored their subjects' definitions, and proceeded to offer data that suggest a solution". May one not question this attitude as a form of social engineering and determinism, and is it socially responsible to recycle such unacceptable and outdated concepts? Ericson (1975, p. 19) suggests that "demystifying" some sociological ideologies which permit sociologists to select objectives in analyzing behavior, should occur, and may serve to promote theories
that allow more subjective realistic context into the field of inquiry.

Sociological crime control strategies may be the result of traditional sociology which supports theories of social control to solve problems. This approach perpetuates "social classification" (Ericson 1975, p. 22) and social stratification, practices which have potential to undermine the principles of 'community'. As well, such traditional thinking eludes the principles of social justice. Ryan, Piven and Cloward, and Harp and Hofley have concentrated some of their studies on social justice philosophies of both United States and Canada, say Couse, Geller, Harding, Havemann, Matonovich, and Schriml (1986, p. 49). Their examinations question what position social scientists occupy.

Justice is a preoccupation of moral philosophy and the distribution of burdens and benefits is the subject matter of the philosophy of justice (Couse et al 1986, p. 48).

As regards social science, are the elements of fairness and social justice seen within the "context" of the human condition, or as a "panacea" within the realm of social control? If justice lies with the former, then the work of social science, according to Couse et al (1986, p. 38) addresses "the much wider intellectual and political movement which rejects positivistic social engineering". Affirming this, they cite Gouldner, who outlines,
criminology [then becomes] intellectually serious as distinct from professionally respectable...[its study] is the critical understanding of the larger society and of the broadest social theories (Couse et al 1986, p. 35).

But if the sociological definition of justice sides with social control, then a vital part of social science has become a relic. According to Couse et al (1986, p. 38), social science is then "an issue for the 'sociology of knowledge' and those concerned with statist ideology and control". In this regard, they say, it contributes to coercion, i.e. crime control, rather than legitimation to absorb dissent and the repercussions of social dislocation flowing from economic underdevelopment...power and wealth (Couse et al 1986, p. 48-49).

An obligation of social science is to dismantle forms of domination which make criminality a focal point of analysis, instead of a "secondary indicator/symptom" that creates unequal opportunity and condition, say Couse et al (1986, p. 51). Sociological examination courts risks when "criminal statistics [are used] in unexamined ways; the ways in which they are defined, and their partialness should be exposed", according to Herbert (1982, p. 106). Again, Couse et al (1986, p. 58) cite Gouldner, who states,

If academe is to be useful...it must look at global relations, spiritual relationships, and environmental systems. This requires the reformation of the relationship between disciplines, between physical and social sciences, as well as between art and science.
Such rethinking and redirection of sociological focus has been implemented in curriculum at the University of Regina at the School of Human Justice, state Couse et al (1986, p. 63). Classes, they say, address Justice and the Planning Process, and some social science educators have directed their instruction to the control, management and allocation of physical space...[and]...analysis of the impact of underdevelopment on the metropole, the politics of urban and rural planning, land banking, speculation, and the political economy of housing (Couse et al 1986, p. 63).

Academic redirection of this type is to move from "social research" to "social relevance", and to see human problems as "socially defined" rather than "sociologically defined". It is to see interaction as a "process" that leads us away from "theories that are true only when men hold still", states Ericson (1975, p. 37).

Determining a high-crime community: is it possible?

Types and numbers of crimes are traditionally deduced by designated institutions utilizing formal measurements to detect criminal activity. It can be assumed that the basic, and most logical source of a community high-crime characterization has its origin with law enforcement in its community crime statistics; and that the label originates from comparative analysis of criminal offenses between urban communities. While the primary mandate of policing is the
protection of the public, and necessitates crime measurement and analysis for many aspects of police department functions, one may wonder what other purposes are served by comparisons of criminality amongst neighborhoods.

However, if differences in community criminality must be determined, one may question the basic social fairness to all communities, where correlations of behaviors are made without consideration of other pertinent factors. How does, what seems like an inadequate prognosis, affect a community, for example its social health, its viability, and its sense of 'community'; and at what cost does such prophecy present itself to the area's social and economic structure?

Brantingham and Brantingham (1984, p. 41) offer an interesting view regarding the subject of crime documentation. They wonder what objectives are served by answers to the perennial question of, "how much crime is there"? Stating that there is "a certain morbid fascination for most of us [with the topic of crime]", they go on to say,

Counting crime seems to satisfy some fundamental urge to know the dimensions of our misery, as if knowing by itself makes things better. People want...to compare their problems with... other people. More important, enumeration of crime gives us a measure of political success... [and] practical significance. Political campaigns, [budgets], and public behavior can all be shaped by changes in the crime count. The counting of crime seems to be an important precondition of the analysis of the causes of criminal behavior.
But counting crime does not determine its cause. Lewis (1981, p. 13) offers a wider perspective of behavior, it is not only who we are but where and how we live that shape crime-related behaviors...how citizens perceive the crime problem and what they do in response are colored both by the activities of state agencies and by the structure of opportunity available to them.

Skogan (1981, 20), in sharing similar concerns, and while questioning the validity of behavior definition and crime perception, outlines how perceptions of criminal behavior may become exaggerated by members of the public themselves, including the media. He suggests that "[people] develop beliefs about things with which they have no real experience". Further, says Skogan (1981, p. 21), "Research indicates that people tend to overestimate the amount of crime around them". According to him, "Several studies indicate the media, but not personal experience, or vulnerability, shape beliefs about the volume of crime" (Skogan 1981, p. 23).

Gordon and Heath (1981, p. 231) seem to agree with Skogan's indictment of the media. They attest to the ease of obtaining crime statistics from police, and claim,

News [and]...basic facts about crime events are conveniently obtainable from police...[police] are generally accepted by reporters and editors as authorities about crime events...Other sources are frequently regarded as unnecessary.

As well, Gordon and Heath (1981, p. 244) establish that newspapers which devote the largest reporting space to
violent crime evoke most fear among their readers, especially when the media message is that "crime is the most important neighborhood problem". And opinion polls don't help in assessing fear of crime, suggests Skogan (1981, p. 26), because the techniques they use to measure it "in fact measure many things...emotionalism of the issue clouds responses [and creates]...an irrational attitude unrelated to the reality of crime".

In continued assessment of public impressions about crime, Skogan (1981, p. 24) claims that "Perceptions of the risk of personal crime are particularly strongly linked to police figures on the incidence of crime in each area". When the "geography of crime focus[es] firmly on the local environment", Herbert (1982, p. 111) expresses concern with this range of "distribution", that crime statistics may be utilized in attributing criminal activity to "space". When that occurs he says, several consequential effects may follow,

i) More policing leads to higher crime rates because as police 'burrow' into the dark area, more offences become known,

ii) Police are especially active in known problem areas. Does this have the effect of ensuring that crime rates there remain high?

iii) Police hold discretionary powers: are these equitably applied over time and space?

( Herbert 1982, p. 111)
Perhaps most bothersome as it relates to criminality, is what Gordon and Heath (1981, p. 247) found, that "crime is easy news", and that "police function as gatekeepers to [crime] information". The social "costs" incurred to the public by such situations, they describe as, (i) inappropriate ranking of crime, and, (ii) unwarranted levels of fear of crime (Gordon and Heath 1981, p. 244). The major problem seems to be that when criminality is defined ostentatiously, it becomes easier to attribute it singly to behavior. Such a strategy assuredly evokes public fear. Investigation and reporting of crime is concerned less with definitions which are more socially and sociologically contexted because that does not provoke public excitement. Within this unbridled frame of reference of crime, perhaps a consequential 'cost' may result, and could be added; that which ultimately determines community stature and reputation.

The clearest indication thus far has been that the principles surrounding the definition, location, and extent of crime lack appropriate evaluation, and thus are less credible when particular aspects are omitted. An important component of urban centres, that being the 'little' community and its reputation, can be most adversely affected by imprecise appraisals of criminality. Underestimating these 'costs' is tantamount to invoking 'ecological
fallacy', or reframing this deception in Comte-philosophy 'positivism'.

Formal social control: how it is enhanced by concepts of crime causation

Some sociologists and criminologists, amongst them Schuerman and Kobrin (1986), Reiss, Jr. and Tonzy (1986), and Nettler (1984), have expressed concern regarding "traditional" methods of prognosticating on community criminality, where behavior was the sole factor under consideration. There is consensus amongst these researchers that in early urban studies, the interpretation of 'high-crime' neighborhoods, or "crime zones" as they were frequently called, emerged principally from comparative analyses of spatial urban areas; and necessity for changes to this system is urged. There is evidence, these researchers say, that this change is slowly occurring in contemporary society.

Where 'dated' approaches prevail, the research regarding community criminality is distorted and open to debate. A most vociferous exception to the traditional paradigm is taken by Herbert (1982, 21), as he states,

To take crime out of its social context and to try and explain it as the product of a minority of unfortunate individuals apparently outside the bounds of conventional society has been a cardinal sin of traditional criminology.
Still in many cases, outdated models prevail, linking crime causation with characteristics of individuals, groups, or particular communities.

Ratner (1985, p. 18) refers to his "frustration", and that experienced by his colleagues Hackler, Fattah, and Szabo, who believe "that the 'problem of crime' cannot be studied in isolation from other social factors". But where it is, Snider and West (1985, p. 139) confirm that mediums of social control and labelling prevail, and cause social conflict. Entrenchment of these crime causation concepts in Canadian society is almost a prerequisite of social order, and serves this purpose well. Snider and West stress that "there has been an overwhelmingly correctionalist focus to Canadian studies of crime...[on] the traditional agents of control, the police and custodial officers". All this implies that a more appropriate formula for defining crime has, for too long, been void of social and sociological context. Such procedures have aroused other controversies among urban researchers, especially social area analysts.

Evaluating criminality of communities

Byrne and Sampson (1986, p. 5) argue against geographically-confined evaluations of crime which are almost exclusively defined by, and related to the characteristics of a particular community and its residents.
It is their position that current and more accurate evaluations of community criminality should include, along with spatial crime data, various other components. In particular, such evaluations should implicate the "social structure...[where] consequences for crime...transcend geographical space". They state that

contemporary ecological inquiry [is] predominantly macrosocial in perspective...social systems exist as entities 'sui generis' and exhibit structural properties that can be examined apart from the personal characteristics of their individual members (Byrne and Sampson 1986, p. vi).

Reiss, Jr. (1986, p. 24-25) similarly criticizes the process utilized to reflect the behavioral and criminal profiles of particular communities. He states that

societal intelligence, including that of social science research, is organized to know much more about individual behavior than about collective life, and that what we know about collective life is largely gained by aggregating information about individuals...the intelligence that a society gathers about crime and its causes, structures and limits its capacity to understand and to control crime...society's policies and programs will be shaped by the concepts and measures of information that is collected.

Beecher, Lineberry, and Rich (1981, p. 186), in addressing the subject of Community Power and Policing, a thirty-year study of ten American cities and communities, demonstrate the differences in urban policing responses. They state that the "behavior and activities of urban police departments seem to be related to variations in the local political cultures of cities...[and] urban politics",
otherwise to the urban power structure. They suggest four particular facets within which this power is located, and identify, "political elitism", "business elitism", "bureaucratic", and "pluralism" (politics of groups). Their research indicates that these compelling segments have a decidedly influential effect on the definition and treatment of criminality, that

the level and content of urban police policies is not a simple function of changes in the crime rate alone. Instead...urban policing responds also to variations in the configurations of urban power (Beecher et al 1981, p. 187-200).

In sum, Beecher et al (1981, p. 196-199) suggest that much research on the geography of crime has not been addressed appropriately, that it does not reflect sociologically-determined properties. Research results do not implicate effects of the larger social structure, those elements which lie well beyond the urban spatial boundaries. Instead, policing policies for example, are influenced by the "urban power" structure, thus law enforcement policies may be dominated by political and economic ideologies. In this regard, a conclusive evaluation of areal criminality cannot be discerned. Communities are, after all, social "nodes" of the larger body, and respond to the elaborate "web" of society, according to Poplin (1979, p. 280).
CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY

Researchers in community studies resort to a variety of research models in analyzing various-sized populations. One focus is the utilization of the "ethnographic" approach. Studies such as Lynd's *Middletown*, Wirth's *The Ghetto*, Whyte's *Street Corner Society*, and Liebow's *Tally's Corner* have involved this type of "sub-area" investigation. The significance to social science, of this type of research, emphasizes the importance of "the little community", and "why sociologists can and should bring their research skills to bear on the solution of community problems", states Poplin (1979, p. 271). This issue, he says, has been "controversial" among sociologists because of those "who feel that would be unprofessional for them to get involved in the nitty-gritty of community problem solving" (Poplin 1979, 271-272). However, Poplin (1979, p. 272) asserts that in

using community as a sample approach...sociologists can make a meaningful contribution...[in] explor[ing] the larger implications of community problems and to see them in all their complexity.
Another popular research approach is to "investigat[e] patterns of social stratification", Poplin (1979, p. 278-279) suggests, and how "local stratificational systems", by stratifying communities within an urban centre, imposes rank and status on particular sub-areas. Adverse long-term consequences may result in some neighborhoods, depending on this status ranking. Poplin (1979, p. 280) addresses this situation by recounting Vidich's and Bensman's study of Springdale, a community "profoundly influenced by decisions made at the societal level, and that local residents are in no way the 'masters' of their own fate". Gallaher, Jr. and Padfield (1980, p. 7) also, speak to allocation of lesser significance to certain urban areas, which results in "regional abandonment" by the larger urban government. They declare that "[there is] the threat to the small community posed by the political order surrounding it". As they elaborate on "loss of local autonomy, sometimes violent, sometimes subtle, to external authority", they address the issue of dependency that develops when communities are then forced to rely totally on services outside their control. This process, they say, which is often instrumental to social ends...makes it clear that ends do not simply emerge, dealt by an invisible hand, but that they are determined by specific political and economic bodies" (Gallaher, Jr. and Padfield 1980, p. 8).
More popular sociological investigations aim at evaluating "community structure and process". Here, the focus is on urban administrative techniques, and the allotment of "community power", "leadership", and "decision-making" to the smaller community, according to Poplin (1979, p. 286). Such studies, he says, provoke research on "the spatial distribution of specific social or economic phenomena".

This thesis reflects portions of these research approaches, and exemplifies them in the concept of "social area analysis". In Poplin's view, the main point of reference of this concept is an evaluation of "patterns of differentiation and stratification as they are manifested in urban areas" (1979, p. 113). Factors which influence such patterns are perhaps closest to Shevky's and Bell's indices of "social rank" (socioeconomic status of population under study, i.e. occupation and education); "urbanization" (type of family structure and single/multiple dwellings); and "segregation" (population composition i.e. ethnicity, age, etc.) (Poplin 1979, p. 113). Social analysis seeks to locate and evaluate the quality of such experiences through interpreting the "intersubjective" meanings, and the reality of the "native" world that lies "behind the symbols and beliefs", and the "social context" of them, according to Gubrium (1988, p. 6).
Although social area research often relies on census tract information about the description of the community, it is the choice of this researcher to utilize instead, a detailed and comprehensive document outlining the demography of the Sandwich community. Although the document, in many respects, resembles census information, the choice is made for several additional reasons. First, the document is formally identified as a "Needs Survey", and therefore defines more finite characteristics of the population of Sandwich. Secondly, the survey not only reflects the profile of the Sandwich population, but solicits subjective input from residents, and more knowledgeable evaluations of their community. And thirdly, the residents of this area are able to appraise the quality of their community with input that has potential for changes to the community's social environment. In this way, evaluations of urban administration policies and services, satisfactions, or suggestions for improvements, and a sense of personal significance and community ownership can be exercised by community residents.

Among tasks undertaken to show support for the arguments proposed by this thesis is a critical review of the judiciousness of urban policies, how they are applied to, and have affected the case study community, and social interaction within it. This information is derived from
personal interviews with community members from various sectors of the Sandwich area. Their appraisal of the objective of an urban administration system, as the system relates to, and appreciates the unique characteristics of their community, is examined and analyzed.

This assessment will not only serve as a public evaluation of community management practices applied, over the last decade, to their neighborhood. It will also weigh the extent of social justice present in these procedures, and whether the practices strengthened or weakened community structure, and enhanced or restricted harmony within its population.

Interviews with key informants

To establish the reasons for a community's high-crime reputation, and the outcomes of such labelling, both historical and current perceptions of crime and social policies relating to these areas are addressed. This objective was carried out in personal interviews with twenty-three community members responding to fifty questions, within a questionnaire which I utilized as a survey guide. The intention was to gather subjective input from the interviewees. The interview format was devised in such a way as to determine how these members perceive their community, and their level of satisfaction with the urban
administration of their community. I heeded any related advice and direction in my research.

Brantingham and Brantingham (1981, p. 21) state that a meso analysis within the study of criminology pertains to "subunits" of an urban area which may be a census tract, police precinct, or smaller areas comprising of a number of city blocks; that the analysis relates crime distribution with other factors and,

examines...routine daily activities such as work, school, shopping and recreation location; of criminal justice system or security functionaries; of traffic channels; and of zoned land uses (Brantingham and Brantingham 1981, p. 21).

As pertains to community crime, interview subjects in the Sandwich study were asked to confirm its presence (for example, how criminality is recognized), what is responsible for it (delinquency, violence), how interviewees learn of its presence (victimization), the extent of its presence (real or perceived), and the degree of their fear of it (feared enough to leave the area). And they were encouraged to speak to other issues relative to the community, such as:

i) neighborhood change. What changed? In which direction has change occurred? And how has this change occurred? Such issues may address neighborhood characteristics, a few of which are housing, population mobility, physical deterioration, and population density,

ii) How effective is community policing, and what effect
iii) The housing policy: how has the situation of housing density in public housing areas affected tenants and others, and how well has the community accepted multiple-family dwelling units?

iv) Are there improvements in the community, and, what types of programs and services have brought about these developments?

As one explores how the world is perceived, it is possible to achieve this view through 'geographic and sociological imagination' by examining the "social backcloth" of a community. By looking for "patterns in groups of events, or things, or persons having similar sets of identifying properties", in sociological imagination particularly, state Brantingham and Brantingham (1981, p. 20), is how we find answers to "questions of social structures, of social changes, and social stratifications". This achievement is among the desired goals of this research.

Participant observation

As well in this thesis, I, as participant observer, utilized various observations and knowledge gained over thirty years as a resident, parent, and property owner in the area. Participant observation, as field research, was
pioneered before the 1900's, and continued to be utilized by Park, Thomas, Small, and Palmer. Perhaps the method's most steadfast supporter was Everett Hughes, who wrote extensively on its virtues. According to Starr (1986, p. 193), Hughes states that the practice was set aside for a while because "many sociologists [wished] to achieve scientific respectability for their discipline", and [needed] funding from "public and private foundations for research activities".

Government [was] less interested in subsidizing critical research than the computer hardware industry...[and it was] much easier to get money for machines to count than for human beings to observe and think (Starr 1986, p. p. 193).

Hughes continued, says Starr (1986, p. 195), to stress the importance of employing participant observation because its objective...is to observe people in situ, 'finding them' where they are, staying with them in some role which, while acceptable to them, will allow both intimate observation of certain parts of their behavior, and reporting it in ways useful to social science but not harmful to those observed.

It allows "direct observation, interviewing, listening, securing life-history accounts [and] consulting public records". Participant observation is far superior to other methods in...[examining] emerging structures in a society or institution undergoing change...especially when placed within the "interactionist theoretical framework (Starr 1986, p. 195-196)."
Analysis of Data

The formal method of analysis could be described as Denzin's "analytic induction" strategy, which gives the researcher the advantage of such methodological properties as "time order", "participant observation", and "life histories". In detailing the usefulness of these three methods, Denzin (1989, p. 24-25) states, "each method reveals different aspects of empirical reality". He recommends utilizing "triangulation". 3

Analytic induction is especially helpful for studying community and its interactionist nature because it does not allow the researcher to control "rival" factors. Instead, this method "leads to universal-interactive propositions [and] most severely tests the theory" (Denzin 1989, p. 24-25). According to Reynolds (1990, p. 223), Glaser and Strauss stress that because interactionism is "processual", social phenomena are not fixed, stable, or static entities; rather, they are dynamic, with a constant potentiality for change. Thus the fundamental interactionist postulate of process in social life need not be abandoned; for interactionist purposes, structure [human relationships] can fruitfully be conceptualized in processual terms.

While examining the processes that led Windsor's Olde Sandwich Towne to its present state, it is important to locate 'points of intervention' in the community's history. Early interceding measures may have limited the 'high-crime'
reputation, encouraging measures and types of community rejuvenation and enhancement. Responses relevant to this issue were solicited of the interviewed group, by the researcher. Results of this community case study were critically examined in light of predictions derived from labelling and conflict theory.

This multi-faceted research approach gives importance to qualitative analysis. Bulmer and Burgess (1986, p. 251) indicate that the qualitative approach to data gathering assists in the formations of concepts and theories. In one particular way, the 'analytic induction' method devised by Florian Znaniecki may be utilized in "abstracting and generalizing...empirical data...from a relatively small number of cases". The "plasticity" of this method is appreciated because, as Bulmer and Burgess (1986, p. 251) state,

No definition of a class or category of data precedes the selection of data to be studied of that class. The data analysis begins before any general formulations are proposed...It abstracts from a given concrete case the features that are essential, and generalizes them.

Reynolds (1990, p. 124-125) as well, supports the qualitative approach, and states it is most appropriate in research because,

1. empirical research tends to use observations from a selected portion of 'everyday life',

2. human behavior and social life are continually in flux...Social life is assumed to be 'in process' never
'in equilibrium',

3. social objects of study (behaviors, influences, and the like) are interpreted by the individual and have social meaning...they are seen as 'definitions of the situation'.

Why get involved?

Kirby and McKenna (1989 p. 164-170) advise that researchers should declare the genesis of their interest and inquiry. Guided by this instruction, and by the implicit purpose of social research, in my view, it is essential for researchers to probe various situations, especially those which are disconcerting, and may pose potential for dilemmas. This is especially true of areas where seeming social inequities appear.

In Olde Sandwich Towne where I have lived and interacted with the community for over three decades, I became increasingly aware of community conditions that were unacceptable and worrisome to my family and myself. Over time, in expressing concerns about particular matters, I often found my complaints variously disregarded, or dismissed by urban regulators and officials, sometimes with indifferent attitudes. As problems in my community's sociological and socioeconomic life persisted, they became more evident within deteriorating social and physical community conditions.
Through continued interaction with community members, I became increasingly sensitized to situations which seemed socially inequitable, as within the treatment of residents' concerns and their personal situations, especially of those in low-income conditions, children, and the elderly. Evidence of lax regulatory standards and bylaw enforcement seemed to affect community infrastructure. Politicians appeared unresponsive to the most obvious of adverse conditions, and the community was becoming a receptacle for unpleasant and inappropriate social, commercial, and industrial entities. Heavy traffic volumes, especially commercial transport which polluted the area, presented dangers to children and senior citizens. Other concerns were with sanitation, sewer, and housing conditions; a serious lack of parks, children playgrounds, and a library; the installation of unsightly, and possibly dangerous fuel storage tanks within yards of peoples' homes; and, the subtly-imposed inaccessibility to the waterfront for community residents, the latter being an affront to traditionally-exercised forms of recreation.

These apparent problems provided reasons to probe community circumstances. Also of concern was the irony that the community was held responsible for its arrangement, despite the fact that residents lacked a voice. The sum of
these community conditions initiated my reasons for research in the form of this thesis.
CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEW DATA

A brief recapitulation of the study 'problem'

The main argument of this thesis concerns the high-crime label applied to Olde Sandwich Towne, and the consequent impact of the high-crime reputation on the community. Questions related to labelling are asked. Why and how was this identity attributed to the community? What is the impact of such labelling on residents; on community esteem and viability; and on the social and physical structure of the neighborhood?

The investigation seeks to ascertain as well, if criminal behavior of persons within the community is the only reason that the community has a high-crime label, and whether the area deserves the high-crime reputation. Or are there ancillary elements and processes which are instrumental, and contribute to the label and the resulting stigma? Amongst these elements, is there an impression which stems from a long-held negative image of this neighborhood, and which is continually perpetuated by numerous 'remnants' of an imprudently managed community, vestiges that associate the community with high-crime?
Olde Sandwich Towne had undergone a process of noticeable change in community characteristics. This development, in conjunction with statistical crime data, indicates higher than 'normal' criminal activity, resulting in a "high-crime community" label being attributed to the area. Such an identification indicates a community in the process of decline. Ensuing political actions toward the community are affected; and these effects sustain the process of community decline, and may help to assure it.

Recounting the hypothesis

The analysis of data should support the hypothesis: that there is such a high-crime label applied to the community, and that this negative identification has its major origin in poor urban planning and ineffectual administrative practices of urban governance. Such a development is indicative of indifference on the part of urban officials to a community's fate. Further repercussions pose risks to the community's viability, as the high-crime label undermines and weakens its social and physical structure. This is a detrimental process that precipitates potential for community decay, and may be responsible for community decline.
"It's about time someone asked us..."

What was learned?

Twenty-three people who had sufficient association and knowledge of the Sandwich community were approached. The approach was made either individually, or directed to groups. The sample was purposive, in that efforts were made to reach a broad spectrum of knowledgeable participants. My lengthy participation in the community made it possible to approach persons from many sectors of the area, thus insuring a cross-section of opinions, responses, and reactions.

Responses to requests for interviews were positive, even enthusiastic. As one survey respondent stated: "it's about time someone asked us 'how we feel about our community'".

Interviewees needed to have a fair amount of knowledge about the Sandwich community, especially the high-crime reputation of the area. The second important focus was to solicit views about accountability and responsibility for community problems.

Public viewpoints

Generally, interview participants had insights about how the Sandwich community was viewed by "insiders" and
"outsiders", when asked the first question regarding public viewpoints. Insiders, respondents said, viewed the community through the most obvious characteristics of its physical aspects, for example, public housing, air pollution, inappropriate land use (i.e. mixed residential and industrial), and some "past" criminal activity. Ironically, at the same time, their comments were peppered with words that signalled views reflecting admiration for the community: "unique", "diamond in the rough", and, "proud and spirited". Half the number of respondents focused their admiration more directly, on "a revitalized community with positive aspects, [for example] the waterfront, historic structures, an active Business Improvement Association, a popular health facility, community policing, community leaders and outstanding resident-volunteerism, community optimism, a community that applauds its schools and dedicated teachers, and people/groups fighting pollution".

How respondents heard "outsiders" refer to the community portrayed a very different impression: "high-crime community, transient ("raffies"), single-parent/low income, university students, inferior, dumpy and dead-end, cheap rents, working-class and dirty, [and with] poor education resources". Respondents felt that "outsiders" did not really know anything about the community, and were reflecting an outdated impression. Outsider views,
according to some respondents', were that Sandwich is seen "in the shadows of the Ambassador Bridge - a historical badge that signalled to others a reason for not coming here" and, "not worthy - ignore it". Repeatedly, there was a disconcerting anger from interviewees, that in the minds of "outsiders", this community had become so totally enigmatic, almost dispensable to urban utility. One summarized the general frustration of interviewees, that the community was often referred to by public and media as the "West end", an inference "denoting [the] end of something and not worthy".

Impact of high-crime label

Questioning respondent's views about the impact of the high-crime reputation on the community drew remarkable insights from them, and is probably best summed up by one of them as "disheartening". Reasons given inferred effects that would normally incite and defeat community efforts. It made residents "have to fight harder to change things", and at the same time, they viewed themselves as "victims of circumstances beyond their control". Others stated that the impact of the high-crime reputation caused an "exodus of established citizenry", thereby, further stripping the community of vital support and political clout. An educator wondered what could be expected when "our" community has "54% of school children coming from public housing units
where 75% of the residents are female single parents. However, another educator stated that his school held the record of "fewest students transferring out", and attributed this to healthy relationships between students and teachers.

"Yes, these kids have absent fathers...[but] it is this absenteeism that creates the problem, not the kids themselves". Disappointed with the efforts of "the City", one respondent stated that "the community had been left stagnant for so long that it felt like the "arm pit" of Windsor.

As far as the effects that the high-crime reputation had on community life, respondents stated that they experienced fear, anger, and frustration. Community social values suffered largely because residents began to feel inferior, "that others were better than us". The community image also "took a beating" because the effects deterred business ventures, home buying, and other financial investments, thus diminishing the community's tax base. Some respondents equated the onset of this condition with more aggressive police measures being exercised, but weaker by-law and other regulation enforcement. The situation seemed particularly noticeable in the 1970's decade, by some respondents. Ironically, a sentiment expressed by a law enforcement respondent indicated that officers "didn't much like" being assigned to the Sandwich area at that time.
Upon further exploration of this comment, it was revealed that police officers probably based opinions more on "what officers heard about the community, then what they actually knew about it".

Respondents reasoned that attitudes at that time (1970's), reflected hopelessness. Then, community social functions, and attempts to hold "Town Hall" meetings, resulted in disappointingly low attendances. Disinterest and distrust seemed to be the primary dissuasions, said some respondents. Senior citizen interviewees especially, rationalized that residents of the time rejected public participation because they saw that the community "was stagnant" and "scavenged", and "probably" held little hope for survival.

The reputation of the Sandwich community had similar impact on community education, stated some respondents, and people "hesitated" and "dreaded" sending their children to area schools. Some responses which could address how interviewees generally felt about the impact, may simply be summarized as "resentment". Respondents either experienced, or were aware of a high level of disenchantment within the Sandwich population. Some wondered why many community members had to undergo such experiences when they had been law-abiding throughout the years. Although they are aware that the community is finally "being noticed", the community
reputation with which they lived was not "home-grown", and they "should not have had to pay the price". At the same time though, some respondents reflected that they were now "wiser" and probably better off because they experienced the frustrations and hardships related to the community, and "learned from them".

Notions and conceptions of "outsiders" invoke and support the 'high-crime community label', as does "word of mouth", according to the majority of respondents. Others stated that the reputation "tends to be an understood concept", perhaps still attached to many negative features of the community, and more common in the "past". "It's a feeling you pick up" stated a young teenage resident. Some respondents thought that the community high-crime reputation was responsible for the failure of "even one family physician" to locate in the area, for over a decade, despite the area's higher than average population of children and youth. This "lack of good health services", especially for "babies", most concerned senior citizen respondents.

That the community could exercise little control over infusion of polluting and noisy industries near, or within residential areas, frustrated respondents, many of whom have resided in Sandwich all their lives. Other "inappropriate" commercial activities which invited heavy traffic, for example "aggregate storage areas", "oil and gas facilities", 
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and a scrap yard, exist in the backyards of community residents. Respondents felt "saturated" with student housing and "noisy bars". Much of the responsibility for such problems were attributed directly to "local [urban] administrators and government officials" who paid little heed to the numerous consequences that compromised the community's quality of life, and posed health and safety problems for its residents.

The media, in all aspects (newspapers, television, etc.) had been seen in the past (presumably less so in recent times), as unfriendly, chiefly because they repeatedly "exaggerated" the high-crime reputation of the Sandwich community with the manner of news coverage. This occurred in several ways, and for those respondents who addressed this issue, they spoke very passionately about it. When police chases in the area were reported, media sensationalized them. Interviewees worried about the underlying public assumption which may link these offenders [as residents] to the Sandwich community. When respondents were asked if they thought public assumptions were correct, some respondents did not discount the Sandwich residency of some offenders, but added that often these persons lived in other areas of the city, or were "Americans" who took advantage of "the Bridge" (located in the community) as an escape route. Something that has always worried residents,
some interviewees related, was that many vehicles around 
public housing units bear American licence plates, and that 
many of these cars were driven by young people. It can only 
be presumed that these respondents hear about Detroit crime 
levels, and assume some linkages to criminal activity in the 
community.

Additionally, interviewees objected to media using 
references such as "West Windsor", which geographically 
could be area west of downtown Windsor. But because West 
Windsor is traditionally known as the land area west of the 
Ambassador Bridge, the Sandwich community can be a "victim" 
of misinformation.

Community status is an important issue to the 
neighborhood, and almost half the respondents rated it "as 
good as any other". They did admit though, that the 
community's socioeconomic power base was devalued by the 
presence of dense public housing. One respondent reflected 
this view by stating that there is a "pecking order [which 
is] established and rated by the people in power (economic 
power)". It may be this 'order' that determines community 
status, he said.

Basis for high-crime community reputation

Was 'high crime' the only factor that contributed to 
the high-crime label of the Sandwich community, respondents
were asked. While taking issue with the label itself as being inappropriately applied to the community, the majority (95% of respondents) implicated housing density, urban planning and "weak" strategies, air and noise pollution, low property values, unemployed youth, the community's "long-depressed physical appearance", and its "economic poorness". One respondent replied that if realistic consideration is not given to the numerous "determinants" of the reputation, it is easy to see why crime, being a sensational subject, then becomes the "dominant" cause. Other issues are much less exciting, and addressing them is much more difficult.

As to the type of criminal activity most known to the community, respondents were given a list naming 'family violence', 'youth crimes', 'break and enter', 'alcohol-related' (offenses committed while under the influence of alcohol), and, 'traffic' offenses. Responses took the following order: a) youth crimes, b) family violence and break and enters (tied), c) alcohol-related, and d) traffic offenses. Further clarification of this order showed that youth crimes were more frequently related to vandalism and possibly drug use. Robberies, petty theft and graffiti were also mentioned. Respondents termed most of these offenses as "crimes of survival", and interpreted "youth crimes" as vandalism that reflected the situations of the "have-nots". While youth crimes were addressed frequently, I was reminded
that considering the small size of the community, the Sandwich youth population was probably the highest in the City of Windsor. As well, these crimes are usually petty, primarily limited to vandalism, but it was believed by some respondents that drugs and alcohol are involved. Youth interviewees agreed, but added some gang activity and violence. When they were asked to elaborate, similar responses were given, that many youth in Sandwich "having nothing to do but hang around", and "don't have things like other kids". The young interviewees revealed that they were somewhat irked by police action toward them, that often they were "harassed", especially when they congregated in groups on the street. This type of action is surprising because the Sandwich Teen Action Group Centre was initiated by two well-liked and respected community policing officers, and centre activities are often supervised by officers.

Some comments reflected media exploitation of these situation, when vandal acts, as an educator indicated, "are only youth messages of 'I am here'". Family violence revealed that with the prevalence of single-parent families in the area, "family life may not be as stable as in other areas". Comments again referred to the media and the "heyday" with this type of reporting. Most interesting were the references that interviewees made as to lack of sensationalizing by the media, of what they viewed as
"crimes" against the quality of life of people, such as management of waste which produces very offensive odors ("sewage treatment plant"), and extreme housing density.

No attempt was made to discount the occurrence in the area of some incidents of serious crime. But, respondents felt the circumstances of serious crime is not characteristically area-specific. Somewhat vehemently, two thirds of interviewees stated that they "did not see or know" of sufficient crime activity to warrant the community high-crime label. An elderly respondent whose relative lives "in the projects" referred to this area as possibly a breeding ground for criminal activity. Although many of the respondents were aware of the high-crime label, some wondered aloud about the basis for it. If this activity occurs, "it is not visible in the community", a neighborhood so dense that neighbors are usually aware of others' activities. Some interviewees referred to the high visibility of the community's socioeconomic and physical condition, and wondered how a high-crime label could displace such an obvious reality.

To the question regarding victimization by crime occurring in the Sandwich community, only a small number of respondents experienced offenses. These acts were classed as vandalism and petty theft, for example "stolen bikes" (in one case "twice in 42 years"). They knew of some acts of
verbal abuse, which were usually attributed to youth. Where there was knowledge of physical abuse incidents, these occurred mainly in family situations. A small number of respondents live outside the community. Some claimed to have been victimized in their communities, by crimes of break and enter, and other offenses. Several respondents claimed that "serious" offenders go to areas "that are more profitable" than the Sandwich community.

Windsor police crime statistics, approximating the land area of Sandwich, for the years 1991, 1992, and 1993, showed a slightly different picture, although categories of crime are more all-encompassing, for example "assault - level 1 - non family"; or "theft - under -other". The major offense in the Sandwich community was 'auto theft' in all three years. This was followed by 'break and enters' into homes, and then 'assault - level 1 - non family'. In asking for clarification, the local police unit informed that 'auto theft' is an offense that occurs in large numbers throughout the City and County. There is some indication though, that many of these thefts are committed mainly by younger people. Regarding 'break and enters', these crimes, the police unit stated, can often be committed by the same person or group, and again, this offense is common to many urban areas. As pertains 'assault', and as it concerns Sandwich, this offense is often seen either amongst young people, or
between neighbors. Although the police would not elaborate on the circumstances of the latter, it is logical that in densely populated neighborhoods, tension, noise, and arguments could be instigators of aggravation, and culminate in assaultive behavior.

All four grade schools in the area are 'compensatory schools', more commonly known as 'special schools'. This fact was known by the majority of the respondents who believed, as one respondent put it, that education in the area suited the "reality issue". This was explained as relative to the fact that children in this community, due to the neighborhood's problematic conditions, required more sophisticated and unique learning methods. Compensatory schools provide that. What did prevail throughout the responses was that the proficiency of educators in this type of learning approach, was extensive. A number of respondents were involved with schools, mainly as volunteers. Senior citizens especially, volunteer to read to children, fund school projects and trips, and work on breakfast programs. One respondent asserted that these schools teach a child "how to be a good person first, and then how to be a good student".
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Urban planning

There was an overwhelmingly affirmative response when the researcher asked respondents "whether the community needed a different physical planning strategy". Problems existed in areas such as public housing, the numbers of high-rise apartment buildings, and University of Windsor student housing. There was some suggestion that the "saturation" level in these areas had long been surpassed. A respondent reflected that "when you pocket large numbers of people in an area, the baggage comes with them". The responsibility of such problematic conditions, in the eyes of community residents for whom respondents believed they were speaking, falls squarely on "regulators" who dictate urban planning.

Respondents felt the community tolerated a 'mixed' population fairly well as regards gender, age, cultural ethnicity, and socioeconomic situation, but the types of people that live in the community still concerns them. This concern was primarily directed at the "strain" on the community. Single parents who sometimes lack sufficient parenting skills and support, economically poor immigrants who, in addition, may integrate poorly into social life (many lacking employment skills), university students who take little pride in the community, and the
socioeconomically poor, "drain community resources, have poorer health, and little political clout". Respondents saw a serious "imbalance" as an obvious feature of the Sandwich community. Some hope was held out by one respondent who added (facetiously) that perhaps this situation unites people, because "the beer, pretzel, cocktail and praying crowd come together".

The Sandwich community attaches more importance to residential comfort and quality of life, than to the presence of industry in its midst. Respondents rated 'location of industry' on a scale of 'important' to 'critically important', and chalked up an extensive list of negative influences they have observed and experienced in their community due to land-use conflicts. Because transport is the main 'vehicle' of industry, poorly planned transportation routes that create dangers for schoolchildren and community residents, vehicular pollution and congestion, and parking problems seemed to dominate a question relative to appropriate location of various community structures. "Good urban planning is good marketing and investment enticement for the community" remarked one respondent, in apparent annoyance with urban planners.

Areas of the community that are "trapped" by industry, and ill-situated 'affordable' housing units are urban planning mistakes the community could not afford. Old and
overloaded sewers, lax sanitation laws, and "regulation standards" that seemed seldom enforced out-distanced any concerns the respondents had about crime. Parks and green spaces give "breathing" room for area children and residents, and a place to experience real 'community', some asserted. Presence of industry "complicates the building of new homes", mused an area businessman.

The majority of respondents (90%) observed portentous indications of community change over the years. As the University of Windsor grew, so did the demand for student housing. Landlords, that some interviewees called "unscrupulous", purchased single-family homes, and converted them into multi-dwelling facilities. "Established" citizenry "packed up and left". Public housing problems stayed unaddressed until more recent times. Sandwich residents possessed "little to no power for input" and became victims to whims of industry", stated a senior citizen who was "forced" to sell her home because a noisy business located next door. A respondent who works as a community service provider at a local agency shared her initial experience of being told by a resident, "you won't be here long". Most interviewees differentiated 'past' community conditions from those of the present, the latter some referred to as "renaissance", "rejuvenated", and "unbelievable, both physically and culturally".
An equal number of respondents believed detrimental changes could have been averted with appropriate and sufficient attention. "City Council and administrators could have done a better job", stated a business operator, saying that eventually "stresses [became] too difficult to change". Another respondent also chided urban officials, saying that the "area now needs substantial improvement which is extremely expensive both socially and financially". Another stated that [lack of] early intervention "bred apathy as the community was dumped on, [and] people just simply gave up".

Asked if any past community problems still permeate the area, interviewees, while pointing to a new community atmosphere, seemed in agreement about old problems fuelling new problems, some of which remain. Many residents, particularly those in public housing, still lack confidence in themselves and the "system". "It's hard to put a shine on things when you're forced to live in situations beyond your control", stated a respondent.

Heavier traffic has created more noise and pollution, and local police have problems enforcing traffic bylaws. Many of the area's youth, say most respondents, have spent their early years in dense housing conditions, with idle pastimes, and don't know how to apply themselves to constructive activity. Senior citizens, who volunteer on
school and other interactional projects with young people, seemed quite adamant about this assertion. Vandalism is a problem, most respondents admitted. And, absentee landlords are still 'absent' from housing maintenance responsibilities.

Correcting community problems and improving community life

When respondents were broached with the question, "who should deal with these problems now", their attention turned to their community leaders, because "they possess the respect of others in the community". But it really should be a "community effort", almost half of respondents believed. Such responses could be attributed directly to occurring, and currently ongoing community rejuvenation projects which serve as triggering mechanisms of greater community confidence. Although no one should be excluded from the "effort", respondents particularly designated "community residents, local urban officials and politicians, police, schools/parents/teachers, churches, service providers, and industry". Less than a third of the respondent group believed the responsibility was solely that of the housing authority and urban officials.

To a question that asked whether administrative strategies were applied to this community by the City of Windsor, 'similarly' or 'different[ly]' from those applied
to any other community in Windsor, respondents agreed that these were 'differently' applied to Sandwich. There is a distinct sense that all is not well yet, in comments like "politicians listen to lobby groups and we have students here", and, "the community's label and socioeconomic position [number of have-nots] precludes neighborhood entitlement in minds of urban administrators".

Sandwich residents are more interested in their community, than others in their respective areas, according to 85% of respondents. Several comments seemed to summarize the general feeling: "community has leadership, is well informed"; "in the last fifteen years, Sandwich has achieved more than any other community"; "lots of energy, pride, and loyalty"; and, "[now there is] real community focus".

Community Policing

The community looks favorably on their local community policing unit. When interviewees were asked if they could compare policing responses of past and present times, according to both 'time' and 'type', recollections of past police response attributed zero to the 'good' category. Present police response indicated just the opposite. The majority saw a large difference in 'time' response, but of greatest value to the respondents seemed to be 'type' of response. Favorable comments were made, such as "how
incidents are treated by police, [i.e.] police know community and factors [that aggravate situations]", and therefore take heed of this in resolution of problems. Police were viewed even more admirably in their work "in the projects", and in area schools where they "know many kids", thus interaction with youth is more positive. Some respondents referred to the fact that the Sandwich Teen Action Centre was initiated by two officers from the local precinct.

The majority, 78%, saw this type of law enforcement as "non-threatening", "more [like] grass-roots type policing", "friendly and visible", where police officers are 'a part of the community' instead of 'apart from the community'. Of the teenage respondents, some "harassment" of youth by police was claimed. But other respondents expressed concern about public impression of Sandwich, and as one respondent explained, ":[this type of policing] has two faces, a) it is considered by the community from the aspect of safety, and b) this policing concept had to have a test case, but why Sandwich?".

Friedmann (1992, p. 61) addresses this concern in two ways. He states that "rarely was there an attempt, within the context of policing, to understand better the historical, economical, political and social underpinnings of a neighborhood". He adds,
by taking many of the traditional social roles away from the family and the smaller community where elders and the church acted as social control mechanisms, responsibility has been shifted to large bureaucracies...and, of course, formal social control".

Friedman (1992, p. 61) urges that "it is...untenable to argue that communities were not there all along...[but it is the] way we frame our perception of the roles communities play" that establishes the "social control mechanisms" we impose on urban areas.

What kinds of effects does the presence of Sandwich community policing, as a policing concept, have on the community? The majority of the respondents indicated that due to the complex social and physical conditions that have long existed within the community's anatomy, these problems dominated the community-policing concept. However they indicated, public housing did seem to benefit from the proactive policing technique, 'VIP' (values, interests, and peers) programs were presented by police officers to children in schools, and officers served on various community Boards and Committees. These considerations offered sufficient reason to view this type of community policing in a positive light. It was observed that the major portion of an approval of community policing came from the older residents, and those more vulnerable to the consequences of deviant activity. Primarily, personal
safety was the main consideration. Friedmann (1992, p. 60) reflected on this situation by stating,

police are, perhaps, more effective in reducing fear of crime than having an unequivocal effect on actual crime figures, and a greater understanding that perception of police - and in turn, perception of citizens - are a crucial component in the coproduction of public safety.

Less than a quarter of respondents voiced concern about the presence of a police precinct in the community, a situation that raised the issues of "why was the policing unit installed in this area?", and, that police presence "gives an impression of community as being unlawful and in need of control". These respondents tended to be those more in control of their personal situations, for example, less physically vulnerable. They were more likely to respond variably: "[police unit in community] may give the outside community reason to perceive that police control is necessary for the area". Friedmann (1992, p. 34) addresses the confusion over the "police-role conflict in urban society", and states,

the strong emphasis on street crime, with a conspicuous avoidance of dealing with white-collar crime...[is an] analysis of political and class power relations...indicat[ing] that some think democratic society is likely to become - if it is not already - a garrison state.
Sandwich: some new life in an old community

Almost 75% of the respondents credited the rejuvenated state of the Sandwich community to "community leaders, residents, and [local] groups". Others credited "teachers and students in community and group action"; "'seniors' [who are] busy, healthier, and having fun"; "community pulling together to participate, taking pride, volunteering, taking care of one's own"; and, "rallying to its own salvation". It was no secret, respondents stated, that the community and its partners [local agencies and associations] have become an example not only to the City, but to other [Ontario] communities.

In addressing community 'control' over 'community life and structure', there was a major weight of opinion supporting this type of community power. An establishment of a "good pipeline to the outside", as stated by a respondent, seemed to give the community a visible focus. As regards the question of community input into local decision-making, almost all respondents similarly reflected the comments of two: "[the] community has a positive presence now [and] commands response", and, with the recent establishment of this community's activism, it is "hard to say 'no' to this community". A small amount of cynicism
still exists amongst respondents who voice similar concerns, that "many decisions are still made elsewhere".

Would changes to housing policies and strategies 'make a difference in the types of residents living in, or attracted to the community', respondents were asked. A major affirmative reaction from the interviewees resulted in a long list of modifications that respondents would suggest if they were given the job of urban planning. Single-family residents that have been converted into multi-usages invite a transient population, residing in "ramshackle structures [that are allowed] to exist". "Incoming people will choose [a] community by what it looks like", stated a respondent. Often "lack of enforcement of site plans for the area are overlooked and give way to design problems". Where student housing may be a necessary accommodation, facilities such as these serve the purposes of a population which is "[less] stable and less committed to the area". Traffic and environmental pollution increases, and property values decrease. It has been very difficult for the Sandwich community to exercise heritage preservation in light of economic priority. The end result is a community where density of housing exceeds that of other Windsor communities by almost six times (Sandwich Community Health Centre Needs Survey 1989). "People lose self-esteem and seem like pack rats", insisted one respondent.
'How would you characterize the population living in this/your community', and, 'is the population a good mix', were two questions posed to respondents. Respectively, while 69% referred to their community as a 'heterogeneous' population, and 73% thought it was a good mix, the rationalization was most interesting. It was probably best summarized by an educator, who related experiences with his students. He surmised,

A homogeneous population would certainly be easy to work with, but a heterogeneous community is 'exciting because it creates learning experiences, for example, how to live with people from other cultures. My students deny there is racism in their school. Black, white, and others interact freely, and attach no stigma.

He commented on an occasion, where his school debated another, on the topic of 'racism'. While the other school inferred racist attitudes, "my students were shocked at such a reaction, steadfastly denied racism in their school, and supported their friends of other races".

An older resident population prevails, as does the youth population. Single-parent and immigrant families are also prominent in the area. It is common for a portion of this type of population to experience unemployment and lack of skills. Within the comment of one respondent who said, "One has to see a ratio [of people] living here for economic reasons", it is easier to understand the statement of another, that "there is an imbalance in the population
living here, and this contributes to the lack of development in the area". Still another respondent rationalized that this may be what urban administrators have in mind when they pay little heed to "elevating the socioeconomic status of the community".

Respondents, despite possessing realistic awareness of the sociological reality inherent to their community, managed to find some justification in community conditions that have been less than ideal. When asked if 'this was an ideal population mix for the community', the majority of them answered affirmatively. Similar reasoning reverberated throughout the group, in comments such as "[we] cannot take away the right of people to live wherever they choose"; "community is an inspiration to others [in lessons on mixed interaction]"; and, "[a heterogeneous population] is exciting because it creates learning experiences". Alternately, a small number of respondents complained about the "overwhelming" student population (University of Windsor).

When respondents were asked whether community changes in Sandwich were 'natural' or 'forced' (the former indicating population shifts and normal socioeconomic changes; and the latter directed at planning decisions with possible inattention to consequences), the predominant thought indicated forced changes. Again the University of
Windsor was indicted for "not providing on-campus housing and forcing students into the community, which resulted in housing maintenance problems (run-down)". Industry was also admonished for "not respecting appropriate land use and environmental regulations". Again, blame was attributed to the "uncaring attitudes[s] of urban officials" in official planning responsibility.

Unique community needs and remaining stresses

As pertains to the question of 'unique needs' of the Sandwich community, respondents rated these in the following manner: a) social support (better social, education, and health), b) better physical planning, c) socioeconomic improvements (increase tax base), and, d) historic preservation (prominent community identifying theme). Within a very long list of notions and opinions that were offered by the interviewees, the primary focus which identified their concept of community needs was directed at community strength through social and physical enhancement, and self-sufficiency through increased control over community destiny. The most important 'unique need component' was stated as "independence...to help people help themselves". Others of major concern were "focus on social and economic improvement", "increase and maintain [community] stability", "tear down and remove ramshackle
homes and replace them with better housing...less need for absentee landlords", "community's young mothers need more education", "programs for youth", "restrain industrial development and strip malls, devise marketing strategy to make [community] more attractive", and, "keep [present] momentum going in community, which demonstrates to younger generation that striving for positive achievements can happen and 'will work with hard work'". And on goes the list.

In asking respondents what were 'some of the major stresses in the community', the majority referred to "physical aspects of the [area]". There is a real need for "space, especially [within] public housing, but in housing density overall". Controlling emissions and noise from industry operations, traffic congestion, and the dangers of air pollution also presented concerns, as did the removal of obstacles that prevent public access to the waterfront. Both socioeconomic and insufficient social support elements lagged further behind.

Dumping policy

Sandwich community residents are angered by social and physical abuses of their neighborhood, replied many interviewees. As the question regarding the practice of 'dumping' 4 was broached, 78% of respondents agreed that it
had long been practiced "within" the area, and they had much
to say about it. One respondent suggested that the area was
known as one of the "least resistant to unfavourable
locations of facilities, those that other communities
"outrightly refused". This made it easy for urban
administrators to direct such a practice to the Sandwich
area. She stated, "the community lacked political clout,
"in the past" [to oppose this]. Another respondent bristled
at the practice of 'dumping', stating, "give them an inch,
they want a mile". He agreed that 'dumping' "has happened
in Sandwich over time", and he compares this situation with
"River Rouge in Michigan". Industry's "only concern was
acquisition of riverfront property" he asserted. Generally,
respondents summed the 'dumping' issue in the following way,
a long-time practice, historical; devalues property
values; many examples, for instance factories in
residential areas, high traffic, hazardous waste
barge, ugly and large oil tanks near residences;
Brighton Beach [a residential area completely
surrounded by industry, and where residents now cannot
sell their homes - no buyers]; community badly planned
allowing polluting industry to get control of
riverfront lands; [and], truck traffic bylaw abuse -
historic practice of truckers trying to get away with
disregarding bylaw.

Some credit was given to urban administrators "doing a
better job now", as differs from the past. Particularly,
credible efforts on the part of urban administrators
occurred in the recent community rejuvenation initiatives.
Interviewees appreciated "updated" community parks, the
cultural centre, and some improvement in roads and street lighting. But others injected some cynicism into these efforts, that such endeavors "contributed to tourism, [thus] financial benefit to the City". Another chided officials for "too little, too late". Still others saw urban administrators as "having outdated concept [of the Sandwich community] and act[ing] accordingly".

When asked what was done to remedy these conditions, 54% of the interviewees thought that urban administrators applied "part-remedies" in

contribut[ing] mainly where it concerns tourism [financial benefits for the City]; too little too late; need updated urban planning; [and] urban officials don't sufficiently know the area, have an outdated concept of it and act accordingly.

Other interviewees either gave credit to the working partnership that urban departments have established with Sandwich community leaders, or chose not to comment.

When discussion turned to "what have community residents/leaders/groups done to remedy negative conditions in Olde Sandwich Towne", 70% of respondents were aware of the community's leaders' active opposition to practices that produced adverse conditions, and were grateful to them. Many interviewees gave credit for outstanding community achievements to the following local groups:

the Business Improvement Area; Sandwich Community Health Centre; community activists, schools, teachers, students "busy in community and group action"; seniors who were busy, healthier, and "having fun"; community
"pulling together to participate, taking pride, volunteering, "taking care of one's own" and "rallying to its own salvation."

They commented on how the community has become a good example, not only to the City, but to other [Ontario] communities (some years back, Sandwich was one of fifteen Ontario cities to receive an award applauding its citizens for exemplary community volunteerism).

When interviewees were asked if they wished to add anything else as pertains to the high-crime reputation of the Sandwich community, a few additions were made. Due to the similarity of these suggestions, they could probably all be encapsulated in the perceptive wisdom of a senior citizen respondent: "the community needs reliable and organized direction (urban and environmental planning)".

SUMMARY ON PRESENTATION OF DATA

Gubrium discusses qualitative research, its intent, and methods of interpreting responses and interactions of those studied. He addresses the "reality" of field research, and its "arbitrary" relationship to the analysis of data. The situation can be alleviated, he says, with sufficient discretion of a researcher who is able,

to some degree, ignore what people actually say, just as they do, and attend to what they could be telling each other and us...they voice much more than they say...they know that the route to the experiential logics of their lives runs through practice, not
official charter, nor credentials, [nor] authority... (Gubrium, 1988, p. 74).

Of the "fieldworker", Gubrium (1988, p. 74) advises that this type of research is not "just a matter of carefully observing and systematically documenting what people say and do, not just a matter of the mechanics of recording speech and activity". He stresses that fieldwork invites a participatory partnership of the researcher, in the "every day life" of research subjects, in order that we hear the philosophically astute voicing of the things and events of their world that simultaneously is heard by them and by us as voices other than their own (Gubrium 1988, p. 74).

Starr (1986, p. 197) as well, addresses participatory interpretation from a similar perspective, through the views of Schatzman and Strauss who state,

The researcher must get close to the people whom he studies...their actions are best comprehended when observed...in natural, ongoing environment where they live and work...A dialogue with persons in their natural situation will reveal the nuances of meaning from which their perspectives and definitions are continuously forged.

Utilizing the qualitative approach to research, Gubrium (1988, p. 5) says that this method "involves the reading of the social world or 'text' by interpretation of signs; and linking these signs into coherent wholes of structured domains of meaning". Similar to his example of music as being the sum of both "harmony and melody", the social life of a community consists of the sum of "realities
(components) of everyday life" (Gubrium 1988, p. 16), these
being the living and sharing of experiences by its members.

Heeding this advice, I assumed the task of interviewing twenty-three concerned, interesting, and
knowingly-aware persons, concerning the "high-crime
reputation of Olde Sandwich Towne". They informed me,
divulged additional information, declared views and
opinions, and thus elaborated on the topic of this thesis.

Upon completion of the interview process, I found the experience enjoyable, gratifying, and amply informative. I have a deep admiration and regard for the respondents, in how efficiently and enthusiastically they fulfilled their role as representatives of the Sandwich community; 'admiration' for their fortitude and will to empower themselves to gain, or in some cases regain personal ownership over their lives; and, 'regard', because community members, despite the exacting milieu of their neighborhood, don't appear alienated, and in fact, interact and willingly participate in community activities.

While listening to interviewees replying to various questions, and their expressions of fondness for "our" community, many of them agonized over the community's torment that they believe was created by a number of social forces, and for so long. They could offer scarce resolution to the problems. One interviewee lamented,
For years, [Sandwich] was frequently referred to...as the 'poorer part of Windsor' and...[disregarded]. But now, it is often used as an example, especially by 'outsiders', municipal officials, and politicians, as 'wonderful', 'improved', and 'unique', and they are amazed at the changes.

This interviewee tried to rationalize this turn of events, "after we did much of the work". If I had been able to reveal to her that according to interviewees' replies to the question 'where the high-crime reputation originated', that 85% perceived it as a judgement by "outsiders", could I have alleviated her disappointment? I think not. Sandwich residents "have had enough", according to another respondent. He went on to say,

The community was left 'stagnant' once amalgamated. No tax base was established, and business owners felt they had 'their hands tied'. It seemed the City 'scavenged' the area, contributing to an exodus of enterprises. The historic Post Office and Courthouse were abandoned, and this was a sin.

Another respondent voiced similar frustrations,

Established citizenry saw this community as a pleasant town, but were disheartened by the changes that were occurring. This [citizenry] was an aging group who had very little 'political influence'. They packed up and left, and were replaced with an influx of 'single-parent' families with many children. 'Kid vandalism' has become a norm for the neighborhood. Perhaps Sandwich became a 'victim of circumstances', not entirely directed by its own hand.

Still another perturbed respondent wondered aloud,

Where else would one find a worst form of planning for housing families with many children as that of 'College Green' [strip housing recently constructed on College Avenue], a strip of row-type housing squeezed between a busy roadway [a truck route] and a railway?
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"Yes, there are crimes in the Sandwich community, but these are crimes of survival committed by persons with short-term views", declared an interviewee. "Community crimes are mainly 'youth crimes'", states an educator. "They are acts of vandalism, and the main message is 'we are here'". Perhaps the educator may have surmised about these messages for the same reasons as did Heller in his introspective comment. According to Orford (1992, p. 5-6), Heller stated,

Our professional traditions tell us to attend to symptoms of depressed affect, such as the number of days when it was hard to get up in the morning, and to ignore signs of political apathy, such as the number of years of not registering to vote. We ask about queasy stomachs, sleepless nights, and family conflicts, but not about feeling safe in the street, the number of persons on our block that we know by first name, or the availability of recreational centers for teens. We ask our teenagers about their experiences with drugs, alcohol, and sex, but do not ask them about their hopes for the future, the community attributes they value, or whether they believe that they can make a personal impact upon the way they, or others will live 10 years from now.

Ordinary folks

Overall, respondents agreed that many structures and activities, for example, the Windsor Jail, the sewage treatment plant, and heavy vehicular traffic in the Sandwich community, are perceived by the public as having disparaging effects on the residents, and they are correct. But, respondents say, these conditions were imposed upon the
community. In defense of her community, an interviewee states,

these people are ordinary folk who do the best they can. A small group of individuals with a low calibre of intelligence may be at the root of community problems, but this is no reason to blame the rest of the community.

The 1989 Sandwich Community Health Centre survey of 500 Sandwich residents tested for variables such as "social interaction" and "social isolation", and cited "The National Council on Welfare", "Health and Welfare Canada", and several other information sources. Amplifying on these social measures which may, by their presence, respectively support or create community strengths and weaknesses, the survey considered the remarks of Cohen et al: "Social networks have been found to contribute substantially to wellness, especially for people who are under high stress" (Catton and Hutchinson 1989, p. 68). The Centre's survey graph results of "Frequency of Social Interaction" showed that 89% of Sandwich residents speak by telephone "to family or friends at least once a week". Further, 71% of the survey group receive guests in their home just as often, and 58%...go out at least once a week". Youth and women utilized their social networks more than men (Catton and Hutchinson 1989, p. 69). These activities seemed to indicate that Sandwich residents aren't alienated from their neighborhood. Instead, the extent of community interaction
showed that the residents lead rather ordinary lives, considering the stressful atmosphere of this densely populated area.

There were common opinions as pertains the types of people residing in the Sandwich community, a population that respondents termed "heterogeneous". The community has managed this issue well, considering the extent of heterogeneity. For example, as regards the ethnic population that resides in its catchment area, the Sandwich Community Health Centre has apprised itself of the needs of these diverse cultures. In accordance with its schedule of 'determinants of health', which addresses "emotional, mental, spiritual, environmental, and physical well-being" (SCHC Mission Statement), the Centre accommodates the various health needs of this mixed population very efficiently.

Kennedy (1983, p. 129) addresses these types of attitudes, and the varying arguments of researchers about homogeneous or heterogeneous area populations. He proposes that,

a) heterogeneity gives variety as well as demographic balance to an area and thus enriches the lives of inhabitants,

b) heterogeneity promotes tolerance of social and cultural differences and thereby reduces conflict between subgroups in the society,

c) heterogeneity provides a broadening education influence on children by teaching them about the existence of
diverse types of people... allows them to learn how to get along with these people. Homogeneity is thought to limit children's knowledge of diverse classes, ages, and races and to create problems in interaction between these groups in later years,

d) heterogeneity promotes exposure to alternative life styles.

"We don't look back, we look ahead" (respondent)

Confidence was reflected in the comments of respondents who saw their community "in control now". They held firm beliefs that residents "owned their community", "respected it", and would not allow past errors to reoccur. When asked "does community have input into local decision-making", 93% of respondents replied affirmatively. A summary of their responses is as follows:

community has positive presence now...commands response; community coming together to celebrate many activities...sets example...becomes visible; [community power realized in] Business Improvement Area, Sandwich Community Health Centre, [annual] Sandwich Festival; 'Sandwich Street Sweep'; Mackenzie Hall; Towne Hall meetings; [and] with community activists;

and these days "its hard to say 'no' to this community". Perhaps not surprising, youth respondents expressed cynicism in this area of the interview. They felt impatient about the continuing lack of facilities to accommodate their age group in recreational activities. Despite efforts of two community police officers and volunteers, to provide activities at a centre called the Sandwich Teen Action
Group, there are few other activity areas for Sandwich teens.

"Would you like to add more comments on the subject of 'high-crime' reputations of communit[ies]" was one of the final questions posed to the respondents. "Yes", and the list was lengthy. But the comments are probably best summarized within the wisdom of one interviewee,

There should be a continued effort to bring in social-minded school educators as leaders, and an effort [directed] toward a change in philosophy, that education is not only academic, but community mindedness".

"We don't forget"

It is important to emphasize that as pertains the discussion on the final question which regarded interviewees' wishes to add any other comments pertaining to the thesis topic, almost every respondent made some reference to the positive support this community has received in recent years, with a variety of community rejuvenation projects. It appears that such support is a novelty, is unusual, and was absent in the past.

Many interviewees put forth names of officials, agencies, and service providers, and considered their actions to be sufficiently important to insist that they be included in this study. The following are some of those who, respondents say, deserve much credit.
i) City of Windsor Mayor M. Hurst, and especially Past Mayor J. Millson,
ii) City Council members,
iii) Department of Parks and Recreation, and, Department of Public Works (for waterfront parks and pathways),
iv) Local, provincial and federal politicians, but especially MPP Herb Gray,
v) Members of local media who have "captured the historical essence" of Sandwich, and its meaning of "community",
vi) Churches and service agencies, especially the United Way, senior citizen groups and service clubs that generously support children and youth group activities,

vii) Established community service agencies:
- Sandwich Business Association, especially Dr. G. Hanaka
- Sandwich Community Health Centre
- Sandwich Community Policing
- Sandwich Teen Action Group
- Westside Breakfast Club,

viii) "Those responsible" for refurbishing Mackenzie Hall Culture Centre and the Sandwich Post Office, especially Ms. E. McLean [local historian].

Most important though, many respondents stressed repeatedly throughout the interview process, is the work of "our community leaders".

COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT

Kurt Lewin, a social psychologist of the early twentieth century pioneered a form of social science, namely "community psychology". Its paradigm is located within "person in context". According to Orford (1992, p. 5), Lewin saw "behavior [as] a function of the person, the environment, and interaction between the two (B = f(P,E))". Traditionally, while sociological analysis of group behavior...
may address actions existing within "family systems", Lewin suggests,

we rarely extend this to consider seriously the workplace, the school, links between home, school and work, the neighborhood or community, media influences, housing conditions, the state of the labour market, or social stratification and other aspects of the wider structure (Orford 1992, p. 5).

These mediating units in our lives, says Orford (1992, p. 6), create a frame of reference from which we draw a sense of "social support". "power", "control, and "empowerment".

"Community empowerment" had its origin in the 1960's, as a metamorphosis of social and economic structure of neighborhoods. It offered an option which could effectively alleviate centralized urban governance, and increase ownership of community life for residents. Some sociologists saw it as a radical model that would do little in its supposed purpose to effect urban problems. But ironically, it was a system that seemed attractive, mainly to communities in problematic circumstances.

How plausible though, is 'community empowerment' within urban governance? What advantage does it infer on the community, and does it pose a potential threat to the larger urban system? Cohen (1988, p. 215), while addressing the area of social control, saw community empowerment as

some notion of decentralized community control...a project of traditional liberal reformism...[where] the very hegemonic systems of power and knowledge...were to be broken up and returned to the people.
Gallaher, Jr. and Padfield (1980, p. 2), on the other hand, saw this as a form of community strength, a "product of primary group ties, cooperative social interaction, and Gemeinschaft-type social relationships". Kennedy (1983, p. 145), in discussing horizontal versus vertical urban decision-making, referred to an Essex County example. In the Town of Tecumseh, the final decision to construct a French language school was made by the Province of Ontario. Consequently, he states, "The autonomy of the local communities was thus threatened", [because the province wished to force] the "Board back into line with the government's position". His second reference is to the Halifax case of Africville. Whereas "despite the problems in the area resulted from poverty, there was a strong sense of community", asserts Kennedy (1983, p. 146). Halifax dismantled the entire Africville community, but, he says, "the terms and conditions of these changes were not to be influenced by the community" (Kennedy 1983, p. 146).

Sociological and criminological perspectives have undergone change, over time. Concepts have moved away from the traditional positivist and correctional modes. Analysis of criminal behavior previously concentrated on spatial geographic processes such as social disorganization, and areal variations in crime. Commenting on changing concepts,

Ecology and epidemiology still exist in sociology, but as a source of ideas and commanding imagery, they have become almost mute. They tell us things, but intellectually they have nothing to say: they husband knowledge but not wisdom.

Transformation in criminological research began to emerge in the 1970's, and caused a theoretical shift toward "process and response", implicating economic, social and political systems in crime problems. Otherwise, criminology was being overhauled by involving "humanistic" components within the social environment of persons, groups and communities. "Freedom [is] the possibility of an organizational structure that can evolve through self- organizing and participation", and respond to its own needs, affirms Benello (1986, p. 128).

In this way, geographic space was now enjoined with other aspects, and "crime could be researched in a social geography of widening intellectual horizons" (Herbert 1982, p. 30). To demonstrate this, Herbert (1982, p. 26) outlines, as follows, "A conceptual framework for a geography of crime", in Figure 3.
Figure 3

Level 1 (Production)

SOCIAL FORMATION

[ideology, values, traditions]  [power and resources]

Level 2 (Distribution)

ALLOCATIVE PROCESSES

Resource allocation:
original managers, urban managers, differential access-inequalities

Socio-legal processes:
labelling, enforcement-sanctions, policing, judiciary, social services

Level 3 (Consumption)

SPACE

Patterns (crime areas)
Processes (spatial behavior)
Responses (sub-cultures, meaning of place)
This profile analyzes human behavior within a framework that shows the various processes which occur within a geographic space wherever groups congregate, as in community. Herbert (1982, p. 26) suggests, "it is from these 'roots' of the system, its ideologies and allocative systems, that any manifestations in space originate". 'Space' is but one component of the geography of crime. In this regard, Herbert discounts the long-held sociological concept which centered on "regional patterns" of crime. Such patterns, by failing to incriminate other factors and processes of the larger social system, contributed to the labelling of certain communities.

The 1970's were difficult times for the Sandwich community. At that time, positivist and correctional traditions dominated criminology and sociology. Attempts were made by a few Sandwich residents, to change conditions within the community. This small group envisioned their community being one, much as Benello (1986, p. 129) defines, "where the formal structure of the organization allows for full participation and control by those within it". In this way, he says, "social purpose can emerge...[in] development of forms of group behavior where individual needs and collective goals are capable of being synergized".

But Sandwich was seen as an impoverished and highly criminal area. Crime investigation still rested with dated
concepts, similar to what Herbert (1982, p. 100) calls "traditional theories...often guilty of drawing too many inferences from statistical correlations". There seemed neither justice nor fairness in this perception. The community, as though consumed by a self-fulfilling prophecy, assumed culpability for its problems.

Reiss, Jr. and Tonry (1986, p. 21) implicate political, social, and economic forces, and, urban managers and socio-legal systems in the creation of adverse community conditions. They attribute some responsibility for the problems that communities experience to "lack of enforcement of housing and sanitation codes and for a general neglect of urban amenities", and "density of...a community" (Reiss, Jr. and Tonry 1986, p. 23). "Public administration" may have dire effects on communities experiencing problems, they state.

Federal legislation, the administration of federal programs, and appellate court decisions have had some marked effects on...communities. These changes often are incremental, and their cumulative effect can ultimately destroy the integrity of communities (Reiss, Jr. 1986, p. 21).

Lewis et al (1988, p. 140) explain that sources of conflict may create and amplify community problems, especially between "superordinates", otherwise people in authority, and members of the community's population. The researchers draw attention to someone's particular insight.
The problem with us [superordinates] is that we have lost sight of the interactional realities of reform. First, we lose the perspective of the subordinate organizations and the meanings they attach to the behavior they are engaged in and second, we may not understand correctly what has transpired because we have only a partial view of the political situation...It means seeing the situation from their point of view and showing how that view affects what is happening.

Herbert (1982, p. 100) points out that theories about causes of 'community crime', otherwise about the genesis of non-conformity in geographic social aggregation, need to be re-evaluated for suitability. More effort must be directed at envisioning "a format which links indicators of local social conditions to the structural situations from which they have originated". British urban studies, he claims, have made suggestions for re-examining approaches to community crime studies. Research methods must instead, call for a greater utilization of subjective attitudes of residents, their evaluations, and input.

Community empowerment must be as much a realization for the larger urban centre to acknowledge, accept, and promote, as a willingness of communities for participatory input into urban decision-making. Kennedy (1983, p. 152) cites Wellman in predicting what a "Canadian city [would] be like in the year 2001". "He [Wellman] argues that future communities will be less spatially and more socially based". It is most important, Wellman states, that the intimates (community residents who form social ties) are known to be there...They form an
important part of the individual's psychological life space, and they can mobilize in times of need (Kennedy 1983, p. 153).

Tocqueville, in similar thought, while referring to 'community' as "village", recognized the importance of the simple assemblage "of human living" necessary to serve and enhance "human needs" (Gallafer, Jr. and Padfield 1980, p. 2).

Lewis et al (1988, p. 138), in contrasting "modern society" with what some social scientists see as an outdated "concept of community", admit that it is "easier to change communities than to make communities change". Especially where groups subscribe more passionately to capitalist principles, the researchers say "communal ideologies will neither persuade nor work". Yet, expressions of sentiment about the "watershed when community was lost", seem to indicate a "need for some sort of attachment", according to Lewis et al 1988, p. 137).

Some type of social reform is possible, and perhaps necessary to distribute power more equitably in society, thus reducing social conflict. That communities may realize this equity, Lewis et al (1988, p. 139) find it necessary to confront the basic premise of social control, stating that overall, "coercion involved in forcing compliance challenges our democratic principles". To support their views, they call on Becker's criticism of social scientists, that "they
cannot help taking sides in looking at social institutions".

Lewis et al (1988, p. 139-140) agree with Becker, where he proposes that there is a hierarchy of credibility through which we accept the perspective of those at the top of organizations as the truth about what goes on...evaluations done by social scientists are the mechanism for establishing that moral hegemony.
CHAPTER SIX

The community: a rebirth of "localism"

C. J. Smith, as cited by Herbert (1982, p. 108), evaluates the concept of community as a "place" to which persons relate, and with which they are involved. Smith suggests that

a rebirth of localism and the decentralization of problem-solving are being widely reported. This trend is stimulating new interest in neighborhood as a concept and the view of neighborhood as a humanistic entity is of particular interest.

Encouraging a focus on "interdepend[ency] between outside and inside urban "forces", Smith, according to Herbert (1982, p. 108), postulates several "policy implications" that should be considered when researching the criminality of neighborhoods,

1. At the macro-scale, [there is] the need to tackle the roots of inequality in society,

2. There is a continued role for area policies designed to upgrade environments, improve access to resources and facilities, and provide a better quality of local living conditions,

3. There is the imperative to help individuals in need, which is the essential adjunct of any argument for an area policy.

To such regard, Herbert (1982, 109) addresses the necessity in crime research, of "strengthening the role of
the community in planning and managing its own environment...improvement of environment through an assault on dereliction and use of better recreational and social activities". These efforts illuminate and inspire the field of human and social geography, and "forge links with criminological theory and ongoing research" (Herbert 1982, p. 110).

Kennedy (1983, p. 103) is concerned with "social democracy" and that social democracy must be present in "urban planning". He encourages community subjective evaluation and "citizen participation [in] planning, and the delivery of municipal services". Kennedy (1983, p. 104) claims that citizens should have input in "decisions being made about neighborhoods to which they had strong attachment". He asserts that such planning efforts, which he calls "grass-roots approach[es]" have been initiated in "other areas of Canada" (Kennedy 1983, p. 115). As though speaking to each community resident, Kennedy (1983, p. 114) advises,

the city may look upon your neighborhood as one with low priority...but remember that what makes your neighborhood important is that you live there...you have a right to decide what you want your community to be like.

According to Kennedy (1983, p. 132), residents would be the beneficiaries of such thought, with enhanced "service programs,...policing, recreational facilities,...adequate
housing... [and resultantly] humanism in all forms of urban design". C. I. Jackson, as cited by Kennedy (1983, p. 157), supports this reasoning. Toward better community development, Jackson argues for a "steady improvement of quality of existing urban life". The objective goals of urban development "must reflect the basic aspirations and values of people". As regards improvement of social life in urban environments, Kennedy (1983, p. 160) suggests that the work of sociologists "is to identify public concerns and choices and to make them widely known". Only in this way, he says, can we understand, and "appreciate the patterns of the urban kaleidoscope" (Kennedy 1983, p. 161).

OLDE SANDWICH TOWNE

The road to recovery and rejuvenation

A notice taped to a Sandwich storefront window read, 'You can influence the revitalization of Windsor's oldest and most interesting neighborhood, the former Town of Sandwich. COME AND SHARE IN THE PLANNING. Some of the issues: Commerce, Housing, Culture, Historical importance, Schools, Beautification, Crime, and Air pollution' (1979).

This 1979 poster, announced the first Sandwich community 'Town Hall meeting', to be held in a local church hall. The community had been approved for a provincially funded program, one that had to be directed at community upgrading.
Community residents were expected to identify the most detrimental community conditions that required attention, and utilize the funding to correct them.

While the meeting was well advertised, and scheduled to address a vigorous agenda of speakers and presentations, the attendance of community members was meagre, in fact smaller than the number of panel participants and presenters. But the few members who ventured out on this cold wintry night, listened intently, politely expressed some cynicism, and asked many questions. At the end of the evening as they left, some expressed skepticism about the sincerity of such an ambitious scheme for their neighborhood. But they vowed to return for other meetings. Within a few days, a community resident wrote to the Windsor Star, titling her editorial "Let's rally around renewal of Sandwich". She thanked "Dr. Hanaka and the Sandwich Businessmen's Association" for organizing the meeting and wrote,

The speakers helped in showing the direction in which Sandwich improvement could go. It was heart warming to see the response of the people at the town meeting. Renewal could be possible with co-operation and support. The University of Windsor is situated in the old Town of Sandwich. The history, art...could leave a good lasting impression of Canadians with the foreign students attending university. Sandwich is so important in this respect and has so much potential in serving our country as an ambassador of good will. So many of us have our roots in Sandwich. Let us rally to the call of renewal. May this call reach the ears of the University of Windsor Alumni. Let's...save old Sandwich (Howells 1979).
Some months, and meetings later, a Windsor Star reporter wrote an article titled, "Sandwich trying to bring life to the city". She began by making a reference to Detroit, and the changes that city had accomplished. "If good things can happen to a disaster area like the old Detroit", then a similar "renaissance" can occur "around the downtown [Windsor] area...and that is justified", the reporter stated. "One of the areas of the city that has taken an interest in its own renaissance is the old Sandwich area" she said; and continued, "this area has advantage...because it has more of a past on which to build. It is in decline at the moment...[but] could be turned into something". City Council has to view Windsor "as a whole [and]...it usually takes neighborhood interest to get people ready to give their time and talents for local improvement", she declared. Sandwich "has its problems - the decline of housing, vandalism, [and] air pollution". At the same time, the reporter cautioned, "good intentions of course, are not quite enough when it comes to sizable projects like neighborhood improvement". "Any time more than a hundred people show up for any kind of meeting at all - especially when that meeting is not about sewers, highrisers, or low-income housing, which always draw crowds - you know that there is a significant interest. With enough interest and a few lucky breaks" (Precop 1979), speculated the reporter as
she wrote. Obviously, the reporter still had doubts about the results of the proposed community rejuvenation project, and she may not have been alone. During the interview process outlined earlier, in response to the question "how have you heard Olde Sandwich Towne described", an interviewee replied "they ["outsiders"] scoffed at revitalizing the [Sandwich] area".

A small committee, of which I was a member, was formed to launch the community improvement project. Countless committee meetings later, the planning exercise had stretched the patience of members, who did not always agree with urban and police officials, and other City of Windsor department heads, with whom they were required to work. Disagreements on issues occurred. For example, of the number of community problem areas the program could address, how would priorities be determined, and how could NIP 5 funds be most effectively utilized, giving consideration to both short and long term benefits for the community. Compiling information, researching community renewal concepts, and evaluating various suggestions from the residents was a monumental task. Continuing Town Hall meetings helped to solicit residents' suggestions, and served to appraise community members of project progress. Over time, and despite some differing views, a good working
partnership was established with City of Windsor administrators and department heads.

The completion of the Neighborhood Improvement initiative brought about the construction of a community centre, some improvements to streets and sidewalks, beautification of the community core with flowers, trees, and benches, some improved street lighting, an enhancement of parks and installation of some playground equipment, and the creation of more 'green spaces'. Community residents showed enthusiasm, and a renewed sense of hope for their community.

With such support, numerous community projects have since, been undertaken. Volunteerism on the part of community members, businesses, schoolchildren and teachers, teens, senior citizen groups, and the Sandwich Community Health Centre, has been the community's sustaining force. Also joining in community achievements were a number of associations, and their members, for example, historian Evelyn McLean, who wished to see reanimation of Sandwich history in some format, and worked tirelessly in drawing attention to restoration of some of the community's historic structures.

Over recent years, residents adopted countless community issues which concerned their quality of life. For example, they focused on truck traffic and pollution, held
meetings, wrote letters, took up petitions, appeared before City Council, and pressured for political support for community causes. One of the staunchest supporters of Sandwich community actions and initiatives has been MPP Herb Gray, on whom residents have learned they can depend. In addition to Mr. Gray's political representation of West Windsor, he serves the community in multiple ways, especially as an information resource on community rejuvenation and other neighborhood-regeneration projects. Sandwich residents can be sure that Mr. Gray will often appear personally to support and applaud community events, from large meetings, festivals, and social gatherings to small group activities.

About 1987, rumors reached the Sandwich community that the historic Sandwich post office would close its doors, and the possibility that the building would be demolished. The community was stunned. This neighborhood hallmark, with its stalwart presence at the corner of Mill and Sandwich, is a historic landmark, and is well known for its unique structural architecture. In 1990, the Windsor Star published an article which was directed to community concerns about this structure. "Neither rain, nor sleet, nor snow, nor the gloom of competition from franchised postal service will threaten the historic post office in Sandwich Town", stated the reporter. "It's a showpiece, the
centre point of our community", stressed Dr. Hanaka, of the Sandwich Business Association. Meantime, with assistance of MPP Herb Gray, and an outpouring of community support to save the building, the reporter wrote, "The Sandwich post office was built in 1907 for $17,000. Eighty years later, $700,000 was spent on renovations". This structure continues to serve the Sandwich community, and has become the community's logo. And thus, another portion of the community's rich heritage has been preserved (Windsor Star 1990).

In 1988, the Windsor Star featured an editorial titled "Old Sandwich - New Life in the Cradle".

Things are beginning to look up for Windsor's Sandwich district. The historic west-end area, long neglected by development that tended to concentrate in the downtown city core, is rising again through the efforts of a committed group of residents and the growing recognition of its importance as Windsor's cradle. With the restoration of Mackenzie Hall as a cultural centre, the area was bound to pick up. The nearby University of Windsor, which for years has played a rather subdued role in the life of the district, now promises to become an active participant in the artistic and cultural life of Sandwich. As Sandwich enthusiasts never tire...the Sandwich strategy is a long-term project, but one whose beginning is well founded in the enthusiasm, solidarity, and hard work of the residents (Whealen 1988).

And of that 1979 poster in the Sandwich storefront window, "YOU CAN INFLUENCE THE REVITALIZATION OF WINDSOR'S OLDEST AND MOST INTERESTING NEIGHBORHOOD", it seems that Sandwich community residents, by invoking the wisdom of
these words, have turned them into reality. The phenomenon of Sandwich community rejuvenation is most likely unprecedented in urban history.

The neighborhood shares a memorialization of its unique history, with annual celebrations of the Olde Sandwich Towne Festival. An article in a news circulation reported on this year's event, quoting festival organizer Frank Pare, "Some members of the families will be reunited just to talk about old times and see their genealogy". The paper also states, "Organizers are hoping for a turnout of 20,000 over the three days [duration of activities], which would better last year's mark by 5,000 people" (City Scene, 1994). Is it any wonder that the Sandwich Community Health Centre, which serves the health needs of approximately 15,000 community residents, features a stanzaic narration on the front page of its community newsletter, which reads: TELL ME AND I WILL FORGET, SHOW ME AND I WILL REMEMBER, INVOLVE ME AND I WILL UNDERSTAND.

CONCLUSION

C. Wright Mills was known to "challenge" social scientists to "develop a point of view and a methodological attitude that would allow them to examine how the private troubles...are connected to public issues and to public responses to these troubles", according to Denzin, (1989, p.
7). One of the frameworks, in my view, within which such an examination could occur is the "community". This dynamic compendium of human interactions and experiences has a beginning in a place, develops and cultivates a social character and pattern, and has no end. In response to the "challenge" of Mill, the community, I would suggest, possesses both properties: the 'point of view' which may be found within a community atmosphere, and the 'methodological attitude' that may be reflected within responses of community residents. Poplin (1979, p. 13) perfected the term 'community' as that possessing a sense of "oneness", a system which performs "the locality-relevant functions of socialization, social control, social participation, [and] mutual support". Two other concepts of 'community' are "social interaction" and "common ties".

Levin (1980, p. 257-258) elaborates on elements that contribute to changes in a dying community. She identifies the most effective component of this change as "community subjectivity": "It's a place where I live", and "It's the only place where I can trust anyone". And while Levin (1980, p. 260-264) states that much depends on the individual's sense of human autonomy within the community, the "human drive for community is not easily stifled". Where a community sense of "oneness" does exist in some manner and extent, Levin (1980, p. 272) posits that
community members don't "cease[e] to care for what was good and meaningful in past relationships...[and] reintegrat[e] it to meet the needs of the present and the future". It is the presence of this phenomenon that may sustain a most troubled community, says Levin (1980, p. 277), and it can "serve as [a] model, reassuring us that a sense of community can exist".

To realize the significance of 'community', is to examine its background by retracing its evolutionary growth. In outlining the nature of a community such as Olde Sandwich Towne, the researcher has the opportunity to acquaint and sensitize the reader to the aspects that initiated group interaction, excited relationships, and promoted discovery within the maturing neighborhood. Knowledge about such human aggregation makes it easier to understand how profound the effects of a community's past may be on its short and long term prospects. Tracing the historical origin of a sub-urban area also allows the researcher to demonstrate the community's various connections to the larger society, as well as the complexities and consequences of these associations.

I have attempted to demonstrate such a sequel in an account of the Sandwich community, and the high-crime reputation attributed to it. Responses from twenty-three interviewees, representative of the Sandwich population,
have informed this research about the origin and basis for the high-crime label. Interviewees represent most sectors of the Sandwich community. The primary condition upon which they were approached was the extent of their knowledge of the community, and the amount of interaction in which they engaged with other community members. Community residence was not a major requirement.

Educators who were interviewed, including a University of Windsor professor, had a firm base of knowledge and experience with community conditions, and how this related to the lives of their students. As well, they gave extensive outlines about the education concepts and tools that they employed in their schools, and methods that appealed to students. Most of the number of senior citizens interviewees have resided in the community for several decades. They are very knowledgeable about past community practices and affairs, and offered an excellent 'comparative analysis'. Not only did they share with me their knowledge and experience of Sandwich community life, but as well, they brought out photographs, media articles, memorabilia items, and documents that demonstrated their involvement in local community affairs. Teenagers responded enthusiastically to questions posed to them, and offered countless ideas for community entities and changes that they would wish to see. While peppering their responses with occasional skepticism
about their futures, they are all determined to get the best education possible, and "good jobs". Business owners and operators shared their community knowledge, and outlined the economic process of the community. They spoke of 'what was', and 'what could be', not with skepticism, but enthusiasm. They had survived the worst of times, and 'profited' from the best of them. And they were determined to stay in the community. Family service providers and local agency directors shared general knowledge about the community and its residents. One very obvious message that seemed common amongst all of them was that community members, when "given a chance", would partake to the fullest extent in most services, educational programs, and other activities. City urban planners are very knowledgeable about Sandwich community demography. And they are well aware of the neighborhood's past history. They voiced surprised amazement at the achievements of Sandwich as a "community", and the amount of co-operation they have received while assisting the community in various projects. A similar response came from a City Councillor who has actively assisted the community over the years. A police officer spoke of past and present law enforcement techniques, and elaborated on the concept of community policing. This proactive policing method is more acceptable to community members. The officer is especially
enthusiastic about the VIP (Values, Influences and Peers) school programs in which community officers are involved, as well as the Sandwich Teen Action Centre which was established by two policemen from the Sandwich Unit. In addition to formal interviews, I engaged in informal discussions with other community members, with single mothers, immigrants, and community religious leaders.

Among respondents, there is a consensus that the Sandwich community has been unfairly labelled as a high-crime community. While not denying that crime exists in their community, interview participants stressed that many other aggravating community factors are present to a degree that exceeds fairness, and urban uniformity of treatment. Some community conditions, for example the practice of "dumping", and the proliferation of dense and public housing are afflictions with many negative influences. Research has been shown in this paper, how such social and structural arrangements influence the quality of life, and encourage formal social control.

Other pernicious elements are present in the community, some to an overwhelming degree, such as vehicular traffic and industrial pollution. Iniquities exist, for example, with inefficient bylaw and regulation enforcement pertaining to land uses.
All these factors impact the community, and may contribute to public impression of community criminality. Respondents voiced resentment toward urban administration strategies which may have detrimentally affected the social, physical, and psychological orientation of the Sandwich community. They expressed annoyance with public attitudes toward their neighborhood, and demonstrated this in their responses, that "outsiders" posit judgements on a community about which they have little knowledge.

This paper outlines various sociological and criminological concepts that inform urban studies on the perspectives of the labelling and conflict theory. Lack of attention and thoroughness in urban planning results in community conditions, which, once created, become cumulative. Reactions of residents to persistently unsuitable situations may invite negative labels of the community. When layers of incongruent neighborhood developments are created, conflict is generated by circumstances that become intolerable for residents. Negative community reputation may be the result of such actions and reactions.

Podolefsky and Dubow (1981, p. 224) researched aspects of community crime. They expressed their concerns.

When we looked at the concerns, inclinations and collective behaviors of urban residents, we found... them to be more far ranging than a victimization perspective. We found that, i) community groups do
not wish to isolate crime from the myriad of social problems, [and] ii) collective responses to crime range over a broader spectrum of behaviors and approaches

As the researchers continued their examination, they realized that community residents did not separate criminal behavior from other community problems. They stated,

Unlike large bureaucracies which...segregate social problems into different agencies -- one for crime, one for housing, one for education, and yet another for employment, etc., -- many of the community groups were aware of the inherent linkages (Podolefsky and Dubow 1981, 224).

Podolefsky and Dubow (1981, p. 226-227) found that citizens were also concerned with,

unemployment, lack of recreational facilities, ...abandoned buildings, troublesome youth, alcohol and drug abuse,...[and] the lack of community power...[these] are all part of what people are reacting to when they react to crime.

Additionally, say the researchers, community residents "are concerned about their community in general, and the loss of community in particular, and "about the effects of environmental conditions on their children" (Podolefsky and Dubow 1981, p. 228).

Podolefsky and Dubow (1981, p. 230) outline their research findings,

A picture has emerged in this research which reveals substantial differences between citizens on the one hand and researchers and policy makers on the other with regard to the conceptualization of the crime problem.

These research results are similar to the thoughts expressed by Sandwich interview respondents. Community
residents' views of crime differ from those of police and urban officials. Citizens see poor and inefficient urban planning as more harmful to the quality of community life than fear of crime. Adverse physical and social conditions impose negative factors on a community, and these may be perceived negatively within public impressions of a neighborhood. Criminological studies must establish a "parallelism" with the human element of communities, because "social dynamics of place are critical components to be understood", according to Herbert (1982, p. 111-112). This is the work of academics, for they have power and knowledge. As Denzin (1989, p. 30) stated, "those who have power determine how knowledge will be defined". And, according to Focault, "knowledge derives not from some subject of knowledge, but from the power relations that invest it" (Denzin 1989, p. 30).
'Outside forces' refer to urban administrative policies that contribute to, what Herbert (1982, p. 94) terms, "problem areas". These areas share factors such as poor "local planning and housing department policies", a "paucity of social and recreational facilities for youngsters", "actions of police and stereotyping [an area] as bad", and the "dumping policy".

This document is the Sandwich Community Health Centre Needs Survey which was compiled in 1989, updated from a similar investigation in 1984. Over 500 Sandwich residents were personally surveyed, and a needs assessment was completed. In 1994, this document was again updated.

Denzin's concept of "triangulation" permits several methods of observation.

"Dumping" policies are prevalent in declining communities. In such cases, unwanted, unsightly, and/or hazardous/dangerous operations (such as industrial, i.e. factory; service agency, i.e. corrections; waste, i.e. landfills and handling stations, etc.) are situated in communities known to pose least resistance and/or little concern for the consequences of such operations. Additionally, impact studies are often not undertaken beforehand, and adherence to zoning bylaws may be lax.

Neighborhood Improvement Project funding is provincial funding of projects which encourages community development and improvement. Specific funding is granted only upon approved community plan submission outlining areas that require improvement. A consensus between the community and urban officials has to be achieved.
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Schedule A

RESEARCH DEPOSITION

My name is Leona Leveque, and I am a graduate student at the University of Windsor. Presently, I am researching a thesis titled, "High-crime Reputation of an Urban Community: Olde Sandwich Towne, Windsor, Ontario. I ask for your participation in an interview. Your involvement is voluntary and you will not be asked to identify yourself or your place of residence.

The interview requires that you answer several questions, and have the opportunity to comment on topics suggested to you by the research. All information that you volunteer will be utilized in the formation of this research study.

You may clarify any questions regarding the validity of this research by calling the Sociology and Anthropology Department, University of Windsor, 253-4232.

Thank you.

________. (Initials of Researcher) Date:
Schedule B

Prelude to the Interview

I am going to ask you some questions which may require that you recall past and present situations about Olde Sandwich Towne. Whether you have actively participated in helping to bring about changes in this community, or have shown support for the momentum, you may have observed and participated in various experiences during different periods of time.

Based on you experiences, your input in this study validates the human experience of community life. Documentation of the experiences, methods, and processes utilized to bring about the results which have occurred in your/this community could help to engage similar courses of action in other urban communities.

Leona Leveque
University of Windsor
Schedule 1

INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. How have you heard Olde Sandwich Towne described?
   a) by people who live there:
   b) by outsiders:

2. Have you heard your/this community referred to as a "high crime area"
   a) frequently?
   b) seldom?

3. If people have this impression, where does it originate?
   a) from within this community?
   b) from outside this community?
   c) Can you suggest some origins of ideas about the community?
   d) What do you think are reason[s] for this/these impressions?

(If high-crime reputation is affirmed in above, then go to ques. 4: if not, then go to ques. 6)

4. What impact has this reputation had on you as a citizen of this community?

5. In what ways do you notice this reputation (i.e. through media, local agency response, City of Windsor administration, etc.)?

6. How would you rate the reputation "status" of your community as compared to the status of other Windsor and Essex County communities?

7. If you felt that there was high crime, is it the only
factor that contributes to the reputation of your community?

8. What other reasons could account for this reputation?
   a) 
   b) 
   c) 
   d) 

9. What do you know about education in Olde Sandwich Towne?
   a) Would different educational approaches be of benefit to the community? Explain.

10. Does the community need a different physical planning strategy?
    a) How would this help?

11. What kinds of people live in Olde Sandwich Towne?
    a) Does the kind of population effect the community in any way (Sandwich has a high population of single parent and ethnic families, youths, and seniors)?
    b) Do the kinds of people living here contribute to the reputation you described?
    c) In what way?

12. How important to you and your/this community is the location of:
    a) industry:
    b) traffic routes:
    c) parks (green spaces):
    d) enforcement of sanitation and environmental regulations:
    e) Why is this important?
    f) Is there a need for change in these areas? In which of the above?
       How?
Why?

13. Have there been any indications of community change in the past history of Olde Sandwich Towne?

   (If negative changes are indicated)
   
   a) Would you consider such changes as indications of community decline?
   
   b) Could, or should changes have been averted by early intervention into such situation?
   
   c) Would this have prevented decline?

How?

By whom should the changes have been made?

14. Can you think of any problems your community has experienced, and is continuing to experience?

   a) How can these be overcome with intervention?

15. Who should deal with these problems?
   Residents? Local officials? Politicians? Anyone else?

16. What is the relationship of Olde Sandwich Towne to greater Windsor?
   
   Same as any community? Strained? Poor? Tolerated?

17. What are administrative strategies and policies?

   a) are they applied by the City of Windsor to this community

   similarly or differently

   from those applied to any other community in Windsor and Essex County?

18. Are residents of Olde Sandwich Towne interested in their community

   more or less

   than are other residents in their communities?

   a) What makes you think so?
19. In your opinion, why does interest or disinterest happen?

20. Do you see any specific crime problems in the Sandwich community?

21. Have you been victimized by crime
   a) in this community?
   b) elsewhere?

22. By what types of crimes have you been victimized
   a) in this community?
   b) elsewhere?

23. How do you think the police responded to crime situations before the establishment of the Sandwich community Policing Unit?

24. Is there any difference in the type of policing now? How so?
   a) in time response?
   b) in type of response?

25. Are you aware of the following types of crimes occurring in this community? Choose and rate those mentioned below.
   a) family violence?
   b) how much/often?

26. a) youth crime?
    b) how much/often?

27. a) break and enter?
    b) how much/often?

28. a) alcohol-related (physical abuse)?
    b) how much/often?

29. traffic violations?

30. any other?

31. Have you ever heard of "Dumping" policies?
a) If "yes", where do they occur?

If "no, haven't heard", (researcher defines):

"Dumping" policies are prevalent in declining communities. In such cases, unwanted, unsightly and/or hazardous and dangerous operations (such as industrial, i.e. factory: service agency, i.e. corrections: waste, i.e. landfills and handling stations, etc.) are situated in communities known to pose least resistance and/or little concern for the consequences of such operations. Additionally, impact studies are often not undertaken beforehand, and adherence to zoning bylaws may be lax.

b) Does such activity occur in your area? Explain.

33. What have City administrators done to remedy such conditions in Olde Sandwich Towne?
   a) How?
   b) When? (describe time period)

34. What have community residents/ leaders/groups done to remedy negative conditions in Olde Sandwich Towne?

35. How do you hear about actions taken by your community to improve community standards?

36. How much control does Olde Sandwich Towne have over its community life and structure?

37. Does the community have input into local decision-making?
   How?

38. Is community control influenced by the high-crime label?
   How?

39. Are you aware of any actions/activities taken on behalf of your/this community by persons/groups/organizations to improve the community standards of Olde Sandwich Towne?

40. What type of actions?
   a) by whom?
41. Do you think changes in housing make a difference in the types of residents living in, or attracted to the community? (let respondent answer before asking for specific detail)
   a) single-family to multiple accommodation and apartment buildings?

42. Is there much moving around in this community?
   Why?

43. How would you characterize the population living in your community? (i.e. more than in other communities/less than in other communities
   a) age:
   b) gender:
   c) race/ethicility:
   d) employed: unemployed:
   Is this an ideal population mix for your community?
   If no, why not?

44. If you think there are changes in your community:
   Are these "natural changes" (i.e. types of changes that happen in any community)?
   Are these "forced changes" (i.e. types of changes that are forced by outside actions or changes which have been, or may be detrimental to this community?

45. Who/what is responsible for these changes?

46. What are the "unique needs" of this community (i.e. types of needs that may distinguish your community from others)?

47. Does the presence of the Sandwich Community Policing Unit make a difference in this community?
   a) in a positive way?
   b) in a negative way?
If positive:

i) does it make the community safer (i.e. lessens criminal activity and the potential for criminal activity)?

ii) does it contribute to an orderly community (i.e. more stable community)?

If negative:

i) does it damage the image of the community?

ii) does it make the community residents more fearful of the police?

48. Are you aware of any special municipal, provincial, and federal government programs that have been initiated in this community?

a) if aware of any, name some.

b) do they help the community?

49. What are some of the major stresses in your/this community which affect the quality of life here?

50. Would you like to add more comments on the subject of "high-crime" reputations of community[ies]?

Any other comments relative to the topic?
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