

Assessment of Neighborhood Watch Program in GIDAS Communities in Bohol Province: Basis for a Community Security Action Plan

Kim O. Yecyec¹ , Dominic Aguhar² , Jomil Morga³ , Euve Jane L. Flores⁴ 

Author Information:

¹⁻⁴Trinidad Municipal College, Poblacion, Trinidad, Bohol, Philippines

Correspondence:

kimyecyecoo@gmail.com

Article History:

Date Received: September 25, 2026

Date Revised: October 19, 2026

Date Accepted: October 22, 2026

Date Published: October 27, 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0514>

Document ID: 2026IJROMS0514

Recommended Citation:

Yecyec, K. O., Aguhar, D., Morga, J. & Flores, E. J. L. (2026). Assessment of Neighborhood Watch Program in GIDAS Communities in Bohol Province: Basis for a Community Security Action Plan. *International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(9), 686-694. <https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0514>

Abstract. This study assessed the Neighborhood Watch Program in selected geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas (GIDAS) of Bohol Province as a basis for a Community Security Action Plan. A cross-sectional descriptive-correlational survey included 302 respondents, comprising 10 barangay officials and 292 heads of families, during Academic Year 2025–2026. The appended questionnaire contains 17 implementation items, 10 awareness items, and 18 perceived-effectiveness items, rated on five-point scales. Reported implementation was moderate overall ($M = 2.94$), with community participation ($M = 2.81$) lower than program structure and organization ($M = 3.01$) and police–community coordination ($M = 3.00$). Awareness was moderate ($M = 2.96$), as was perceived effectiveness ($M = 3.07$). The reported correlations were positive for implementation and awareness ($r = .624$), implementation and perceived effectiveness ($r = .522$), and awareness and perceived effectiveness ($r = .516$), all $p < .001$. These findings describe associations rather than causal effects or verified crime reduction. Unequal stakeholder groups, unresolved scoring of negatively worded items, and conflicting reliability records limit inferential conclusions. The proposed action plan prioritizes accessible information, resident participation, role clarification, reporting and referral, and monitored police–community coordination. Final submission requires confirmation of the administered instrument version and scoring key and reanalysis of individual records.

Keywords: Community Security; GIDAS; Neighborhood Watch; Perceived Effectiveness; Program Implementation

Introduction

Community security depends on coordination among residents, barangay officials, and law enforcement agencies. Neighborhood Watch provides a structure through which residents can share concerns, participate in safety activities, and communicate with designated authorities. Assessing these arrangements is particularly relevant in geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas (GIDAS), where travel conditions, communication access, and the availability of public services may shape participation and referral. These circumstances should be documented locally rather than presumed identical across isolated barangays.

Philippine community-based peacekeeping includes Barangay Peacekeeping Action Teams (BPATs). DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2009-145 addresses local government support to BPATs and Police Auxiliary Units; the PNP's 2009 BPAT manual supplies a related operational reference. Neighborhood Watch and BPATs share community-participation functions, but their local organizational relationship must be documented rather than assumed. This study evaluates respondents' assessments of the program, not compliance with every provision of these policy documents.

International findings distinguish program participation, favorable perceptions, and objectively measured security. Bennett et al. (2008) associated Neighborhood Watch with lower crime across evaluated schemes. Gill et al. (2014) found clearer community-policing benefits for citizen satisfaction and legitimacy than for crime and fear. Recent research further identifies differences across offense categories, patrol strategies, and recording practices (Ekici et al., 2022; Weisburd, Petersen, et al., 2024; Weisburd, Wilson, et al., 2024). These distinctions support assessing implementation, awareness, and perceived effectiveness separately.

Recent official local reporting also requires careful interpretation. Chiu (2025), reporting BPPO data through the Philippine Information Agency, identified 230 index crimes during January–May 2025 compared with 322 during the corresponding 2024 period. The PNP section of Corella's CY 2024 annual report records BPAT/first-responder training and unmet equipment purchases (Municipal Government of Corella, 2025).

These sources provide Bohol context but do not identify a Neighborhood Watch effect or describe the sampled GIDAS barangays specifically.

The local gap is the absence, within the reviewed evidence, of an integrated assessment connecting implementation, awareness, and perceived security in the selected GIDAS communities. Provincial statistics and evaluations from other settings cannot supply that assessment. The study therefore examined respondents' ratings and their associations to develop a Community Security Action Plan. The questionnaire's actual implementation dimensions—program structure and organization, community participation, and police–community coordination—are used consistently throughout this revision.

Research Questions

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of perceived effectiveness overall and in terms of crime prevention, perceived safety, and collective efficacy?
2. Do implementation, awareness, and perceived-effectiveness assessments differ when respondents are grouped by sex, educational attainment, and respondent category?
3. Are implementation, awareness, and perceived effectiveness significantly associated with one another?
4. What Community Security Action Plan can be proposed from the findings?

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

The study covered selected GIDAS communities in Bohol Province and included 302 respondents: 10 barangay officials and 292 heads of families. It assessed program implementation, awareness, and perceived effectiveness at one point in time. The municipalities, barangays, data-collection dates, population frame, and documentary basis for GIDAS classification were not identified in the supplied manuscript. Findings must remain limited to the actual sampled communities and period. The two respondent categories are highly unequal: officials constitute 3.31% and household heads 96.69% of the sample. A pooled mean consequently reflects household respondents much more strongly and cannot be described as an equal balance of stakeholder perspectives. Unequal sample sizes do not by themselves invalidate a t-test or ANOVA, but the small officials' group, ordinal responses, possible unequal variances, and uncertain distributional assumptions make unqualified significance claims inappropriate. Purposive selection of officials also limits population inference. The recommended feasible revision retains all 302 respondents and calls for Mann–Whitney U comparisons by respondent category using the original individual scores, with attention to ties and uncertainty. The test compares distributions; a median-shift interpretation additionally requires comparable distributional shapes. It cannot remedy purposive selection, clustering, or a small group's imprecision. Increasing officials to an arbitrary minimum of 30 would require actual recruitment and a justified sample-size plan. Treating officials as qualitative key informants would require interviews and analysis; questionnaire responses cannot be relabeled as interview data. The survey captures perceptions, not independently verified crime prevention. Cross-sectional associations may reflect common response tendencies, reverse direction, or unmeasured contextual differences. Responses from the same barangay may be correlated, and that clustering must be examined during reanalysis. Missing subscale statistics, group summaries, questionnaire details, and original statistical outputs prevent independent verification of several findings. No causal effect or province-wide estimate is supported.

Literature Review

Neighborhood Watch and community participation

Rosenbaum (1987) questioned whether collective participation can be established and sustained merely by introducing a Watch program. His review draws attention to implementation conditions and to the possibility that vigilance can coexist with heightened fear. Accordingly, a visible program structure should not be taken as evidence of either resident participation or improved security.

Bennett et al. (2008) synthesized 19 studies in a narrative review and 12 in a meta-analysis and concluded that Neighborhood Watch was associated with crime reduction. The review provides direct evidence for the intervention, but its older evaluations and varied settings limit direct application to contemporary rural Bohol. Its outcomes also differ from the present study's self-reported perceptions. Lab (2014) places neighborhood initiatives within a wider prevention framework involving environmental opportunities, community organization, and evaluation; this supports specifying which activities are being assessed rather than treating the program as a single undifferentiated intervention.

Evidence from community policing evaluations

Gill et al. (2014) reviewed community-oriented policing and found benefits for satisfaction, perceptions of disorder, and legitimacy, with limited effects on crime and fear. This suggests that a resident may view a program favorably even when objective crime changes remain uncertain. The present study therefore calls its outcome "perceived effectiveness" and distinguishes its three components.

Ekici et al. (2022) extended earlier meta-analytic work using Turkish- and English-language studies. Results varied across crime categories rather than indicating uniform benefits for every offense. This matters for local planning: an overall security score cannot identify whether a program addresses theft, violence, public disorder, or other particular concerns. Barangay plans should identify locally documented problems instead of deriving offense-specific conclusions from a general survey score.

Recent patrol and reporting research

Weisburd, Petersen, et al. (2024) synthesized 17 studies of increased preventive patrol across large geographic areas. Estimated crime-prevention benefits were small and varied with the analytic approach. These interventions involved police patrol and should not be equated with volunteer Neighborhood Watch patrols. They nevertheless show why patrol frequency alone is an inadequate measure of quality: coverage, deployment, local risks, and implementation need separate attention.

Weisburd, Wilson, et al. (2024) examined crime reporting sensitivity bias using a reanalysis of an experimental intervention. Better police–community cooperation can change the likelihood of reporting, so recorded incidents may not track underlying victimization directly. A community with more reports may have more accessible reporting channels rather than more crime. In this study, reporting is therefore an implementation dimension; it is not interchangeable with a verified security outcome. Future monitoring should combine reporting records with response documentation and residents' experiences.

Philippine policy and administrative evidence

DILG Memorandum Circular No. 2009-145 concerns LGU support to BPATs and Police Auxiliary Units. Together with the PNP BPAT manual (2009), it supplies an institutional basis for reviewing coordination, supervision, and operational support. These policy documents explain organizational responsibilities; they do not demonstrate local program effectiveness. The originally cited DILG 2021 manual and PNP 2022 COPS manual were not sufficiently identifiable from the attachment and are not retained as verified references.

The PNP section of Corella's CY 2024 annual report records three BPAT/first-responder seminars or trainings and identifies purchases that were not yet accomplished, including a motorcycle for PNP operations (Municipal Government of Corella, 2025). Training delivery and resource gaps can thus coexist. Because Corella is not established as a study site, this evidence is contextual only. A national PNP 2024 Annual Accomplishment Report link was located indirectly, but its full text could not be verified; no findings are attributed to that report. An authenticated national or BPPO annual report remains an author-completion requirement.

For recent provincial context, the verified index-crime counts in Chiu (2025) indicate fewer recorded index crimes during January–May 2025 than during the corresponding 2024 period. The article's total-crime figures and some category totals are internally inconsistent, so this revision does not reproduce them. Even consistent provincial counts cannot establish conditions in the sampled GIDAS barangays. Matched barangay-level records, offense definitions, population denominators, and reporting periods are needed for a future outcome evaluation.

The review incorporates six international research works—Rosenbaum (1987), Bennett et al. (2008), Gill et al. (2014), Ekici et al. (2022), and two distinct Weisburd-led studies (2024)—in addition to Lab's prevention text and Philippine policy and administrative sources. They collectively distinguish participation, program delivery, public perceptions, and recorded crime. Community-policing research is relevant adjacent evidence, but it should not be presented as direct proof about volunteer Watch programs.

The unresolved local issue is whether implementation and awareness are associated with perceived security in the selected GIDAS communities, and which specific activities need operational attention. The present survey can address the perceptual and associational questions. It cannot resolve whether Neighborhood Watch caused crime reductions, why a particular subscale is lower, or whether proposed interventions work without additional evidence. This boundary guides both interpretation and the action plan.

Methodology

Research Design

The study used a cross-sectional descriptive-correlational survey with comparisons across pre-existing respondent groups. The full thesis also labels the design "causal-comparative"; that label is not used here to

imply causal identification. No manipulation, baseline comparison, random assignment, or credible counterfactual was documented. The analyses describe differences and associations among reported scores.

Research Locale

The study covered GIDAS communities in Bohol. Population frame: 50 officials and 1,348 household heads, total 1,398. Sample: 302. These figures are transcribed from the full manuscript and are not a census of all GIDAS communities in Bohol. The appended permission letters identify municipal authorities approached in March 2026.

Research Participants

The full manuscript reports Cochran's sample-size approach, a 95% confidence level, a 5% margin of error, a .50 population proportion, and stratified random sampling with proportional allocation. For a population of 1,398, the usual finite-population correction gives approximately 302 respondents, consistent with the final total. The sampling record should confirm that correction, the actual selection process, and nonresponse handling. The allocation of 10 officials and 292 household heads is close to, but not exactly, proportional to 50 and 1,348; it must not be described as perfectly proportional without explanation. The describes stratified random selection across both categories, whereas the earlier abbreviated version described officials as purposively selected. This revision prioritizes the full thesis account but identifies that discrepancy for author confirmation. Barangay-level strata, selection lists, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and allocation by municipality were not supplied in a form that establishes the final sampling design.

Research Instrument

The appended questionnaire contains four parts: demographic profile; implementation, 17 items; awareness, 10 items; and perceived effectiveness, 18 items. Implementation comprises six organization items, five participation items, and six police-coordination items. Perceived effectiveness comprises six items each for crime prevention, perceived safety, and collective efficacy. There are 45 substantive items in total. Appendix A reproduces their English–Cebuano wording, retaining negative wording and original response anchors for auditability. The actual instrument uses five response points. Implementation anchors are 1 Very Low Extent through 5 Very High Extent; awareness anchors are 1 Not Aware through 5 Fully Aware; perceived-effectiveness anchors are 1 Not Effective through 5 Very Effective. The reviewer's requested four-point description conflicts with the questionnaire and SPSS outputs, which show observed values up to 5. Replacing the scale retrospectively would misrepresent data collection. A four-point version would require an approved recoding rationale or new validation and data collection; neither is claimed here. The methodology reports face and content review by the advisory committee. The validation sheet names Christopher A. Aguirre, PhD, as chair; Joenard C. Duno, PhD; Verna R. Belarmino, PhD; and Jun Jun J. Ogares, PhD (CAR), as members. Committee records identify criminology representation, and Belarmino is identified as dean. These are the named reviewers in the supplied record; their specific instrument-validation expertise, dated ratings, and item-level revisions should be documented rather than inferred from titles. The methodology reports a pilot involving 30 people—15 officials and 15 residents—from a barangay outside the study sample. It states an overall Cronbach's alpha of .846. Appendix 9 instead presents alpha values of .930 for 17 items, .908 for 5 items, and .926 for 14 items, under implementation, awareness, and effectiveness headings. The latter two counts do not match the questionnaire's 10 awareness and 18 effectiveness items. Accordingly, these values cannot be represented as confirmed reliability coefficients for all three final scales. The pilot dataset, instrument version, deleted-item record, and SPSS syntax are needed to reconcile the discrepancy. Negatively worded items appear in participation (items 4–5), police coordination (items 4–6), and collective efficacy (items 4–6). If responses were coded as agreement in their original direction, a positive composite requires reverse scoring, $x^* = 6 - x$, before aggregation. If another scoring method was used, the codebook must explain it. Raw questionnaire wording alone does not establish whether recoding was performed. Recalculate reliability, means, group tests, and correlations after confirming the scoring key.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher reports securing school and local-government permissions, explaining the research purpose, voluntary participation and confidentiality, and collecting completed questionnaires. Administrative permission is distinct from ethics review. The approving ethics body, review status or identifier if applicable, actual collection dates, consent documentation, storage safeguards, retention period, and disposal procedure require confirmation. No approval identifier or completed interview procedure is invented in this revision.

Results and Discussions

Research Question 1: What is the level of perceived effectiveness overall and in terms of crime prevention, perceived safety, and collective efficacy?

Table 1. Reported results with breakdowns matching the administered instrument

Question and construct	Items	Mean	Reported interpretation
1. Implementation overall	17	2.94	Moderately implemented
1.1 Program structure and organization	6	3.01	Moderately implemented
1.2 Community participation	5	2.81	Moderately implemented
1.3 Police–community coordination	6	3.00	Moderately implemented
2. Awareness	10	2.96	Moderately aware
3. Perceived effectiveness overall	18	3.07	Moderately effective
3.1 Crime prevention	6	3.09	Moderately effective
3.2 Perceived safety	6	3.08	Moderately effective
3.3 Collective efficacy	6	3.04	Moderately effective

The implementation composite is 2.9454 in the SPSS group summary, which rounds to 2.95, whereas the chapter summary reports 2.94. This difference is explicitly retained as a source inconsistency, not resolved by choosing a favorable value. The SPSS composite SDs are approximately .642, .716, and .594 for implementation, awareness, and effectiveness; chapter summary SDs of .85, .87, and .78 appear to be averages of item SDs and should not be labeled composite variability without verification.

The shared “moderate” labels conceal operational contrasts. Community participation was numerically lower than organization by .20 points and lower than police coordination by .19. This pattern suggests that formal organization and institutional coordination may be more visible to respondents than broad resident involvement. The differences are descriptive: no paired subscale test establishes their statistical significance, and the mixed item directions may change the ordering after score verification.

Positive organization items in the original SPSS item sequence ranged from approximately 2.90 for defined leadership roles to 3.28 for a clear leadership structure. A program can be recognized as having leaders while responsibilities and guidelines remain less clear. This distinction favors role clarification and practical examples during orientation rather than assuming that creating another committee alone would address the gap.

Participation items concerning meeting attendance and involvement in planning had reported means of approximately 2.79 and 2.88. Awareness of specific program activities was 2.81, and awareness of outcomes was 2.79, compared with 3.17 for knowing whom to contact and 3.04 for knowing how to report. These item patterns distinguish awareness of a contact channel from knowledge of ongoing activities and feedback. An action plan should therefore report progress back to residents rather than only distribute contact numbers.

Crime-prevention, safety, and collective-efficacy means were closely grouped at 3.09, 3.08, and 3.04. The .05-point spread does not establish materially distinct outcomes. The positively phrased visibility/deterrence item received about 3.18, but it is still a resident belief about deterrence. It cannot demonstrate fewer offenses. Some questionnaire items themselves use causal language; preserving them in the documentary appendix does not justify causal language in the analysis.

Research Question 2: Do implementation, awareness, and perceived-effectiveness assessments differ when respondents are grouped by sex, educational attainment, and respondent category?

Table 2. Sex and education comparisons in the supplied SPSS output

Grouping and construct	Group means	Source test	p and qualification
1. Sex Implementation	Male 2.922; female 2.977	Welch $t \approx -.763$	$p = .446$; source pooled $p = .466$
2. Sex Awareness	Male 2.900; female 3.036	Welch $t \approx -1.714$	$p = .087$; source pooled $p = .103$
3. Sex Perceived effectiveness	Male 2.952; female 3.224	Pooled $t = -4.025$, $df = 300$	$p < .001$
4. Education Implementation	Elementary 2.758; high school 2.982; college 3.036	$F(2, 299) = 4.163$	$p = .016$
5. Education Awareness	Elementary 2.492; high school 3.146; college 3.017	$F(2, 299) = 22.997$	$p < .001$; unequal variances
6. Education Perceived effectiveness	Elementary 2.790; high school 3.165; college 3.128	$F(2, 299) = 10.666$	$p < .001$; unequal variances

Male $n = 174$, female $n = 128$. Education group $n = 70, 145$, and 87 . Labels include level through graduate, not graduates exclusively. Means are transcribed or reconstructed to the displayed precision from the full output. All tests concern the source's composite scores and remain subject to score verification. The education awareness and effectiveness tests need variance-robust reanalysis.

The available sex comparisons provide no evidence of a difference in implementation or awareness at the original .05 threshold; they do not prove equivalence. Female respondents reported higher perceived effectiveness than male respondents. The survey does not establish why this difference occurred, and explanations based on women being intrinsically more sensitive to safety are not supported. Education differences likewise describe assessments rather than an educational cause of program quality. The source post hoc tests suggest lower elementary-group scores, but heteroscedasticity and measurement issues qualify those inferences.

Table 3. Officials versus household heads and Welch sensitivity checks

Construct	Officials $n = 10$ M (SD)	Households $n = 292$ M (SD)	Pooled p	Welch t and df	Welch p and mean-difference CI
1. Implementation	3.258 (.443)	2.935 (.645)	.117	2.229; 10.35	.049; 95% CI [.002, .645]
2. Awareness	3.610 (.509)	2.935 (.712)	.003	4.060; 10.25	.002; 95% CI [.306, 1.044]
3. Perceived effectiveness	3.534 (.276)	3.051 (.596)	.011	5.130; 12.09	< .001; 95% CI [.278, .688]

Welch results were checked using rounded summary n , means and SDs from the full manuscript; confidence intervals concern officials minus household heads. They are approximate sensitivity checks on the reported scores. The pooled p for effectiveness is .011 in the detailed output; the chapter summary's < .001 for the pooled $t = 2.549$ is inconsistent. The Welch result has $p < .001$. These are different tests and should not be mixed.

Officials' average ratings exceeded household heads' ratings on all three constructs. Different administrative exposure and lived experience are plausible explanations, but were not directly tested. The implementation comparison is especially sensitive to the variance assumption: pooled $p = .117$ and Welch $p \approx .049$ lead to different classifications at .05. Thus the earlier blanket assertion that respondent-category differences were uniformly significant is too strong. The .049 finding is marginal, unadjusted, and subject to scoring checks. It should not be used as a firm justification for policy differences between the groups.

The requested Mann–Whitney U analysis remains pending individual scores. Its result must not be predicted from the Welch p values, and it cannot establish population representativeness. Regardless of test choice, separate stakeholder descriptions are more informative than presenting the 302 observations as an equally balanced comparison of officials and residents.

Research Question 3: Are implementation, awareness, and perceived effectiveness significantly associated with one another?

Table 4. Pearson correlations reproduced from the full thesis SPSS matrix

Pair of source composite scores	r	n	Reported p
1. Implementation and awareness	.624	302	< .001
2. Implementation and perceived effectiveness	.522	302	< .001
3. Awareness and perceived effectiveness	.516	302	< .001

Implementation was positively associated with awareness and perceived effectiveness, and awareness was positively associated with perceived effectiveness. The strongest reported coefficient was .624 between implementation and awareness. The coefficients of .522 and .516 were close; their numerical ordering does not show a statistically significant difference between them. The full matrix supports .522 for implementation and effectiveness, correcting .570 in the abbreviated manuscript.

The relationships indicate that respondents who gave higher ratings on one dimension tended to give higher ratings on another. They do not show that increasing awareness will improve effectiveness or that implementation caused greater safety. Common measurement, unmeasured exposure, response style, and barangay context may contribute. Because the scoring of negative items remains unresolved, the full matrix should be regenerated after the codebook audit before final inferential claims are made.

Research Question 4: What Community Security Action Plan can be proposed from the findings?

Community Security Action Plan

The six-month pilot plan below adapts the full thesis's proposed action areas to the measured constructs. It emphasizes participation and information feedback, while treating patrol-specific needs as questions for verification. All targets and costs are proposed; they are not observed baselines, approved commitments, or demonstrated intervention effects. Implement the pilot in one participating barangay, then adapt it to other sites after reviewing local conditions.

Table 5. Activities responsibilities and monitoring

Priority and action	Responsibility and timing	Proposed indicator
1. Verify program roles, the sampling/site record, existing resources and corrected survey baseline.	Barangay council/BPOC, PNP focal person and researchers; Month 1	One approved roles sheet, site list and baseline report; separate official and household summaries.
2. Clarify roles and protocols through Cebuano orientation and accessible printed guidance.	Barangay information focal person and PNP; Months 1–2, refresh Month 4	Reach at least 80% of listed households by Month 3; check understanding of contacts, roles and safe reporting.
3. Strengthen participation through purok consultations, feasible meeting schedules and voluntary recruitment.	Purok leaders and Watch/BPAT coordinator; Months 2–6	One consultation per purok during the pilot; monthly attendance and volunteer-retention records, with reasons for nonparticipation.
4. Maintain verified reporting contacts, offline access, confidential intake and referral.	Barangay intake officer and municipal police; Months 1–6	Monthly contact test; acknowledgment/referral status recorded for every logged report; access gaps reviewed.
5. Review patrol feasibility using routes, rosters and logs; agree safe observation and referral arrangements.	Watch/BPAT coordinator with PNP guidance; Month 2 onward	Approve locally feasible coverage; document completed duties and reasons for cancellation rather than assume patrol weakness from the survey.
6. Train volunteers in factual reporting, human rights, confidentiality, safe coordination and emergencies.	PNP trainers and barangay officials; Months 2 and 4	All active volunteers oriented before duty; two practical exercises; quarterly equipment inventory.
7. Provide resident feedback and evaluate participation, information reach and corrected perception scores.	BPOC, household representatives and researchers; monthly review and Month 6 assessment	Monthly action log; one pilot review separating process indicators, public perceptions and documented incident patterns.

Volunteer participation must be safe, voluntary and non-discriminatory. Police retain responsibility for law-enforcement functions. Reporting guidance should focus on factual conduct and appropriate referral and should protect complainant identities. Consultation should include residents whose work schedules, literacy, transport or connectivity make attendance difficult. Recognition may support participation, but no paid incentive or allowance is assumed in the illustrative budget.

Table 6. Illustrative six-month budget for one barangay

Item	Basis	Estimated PHP
1. Orientation and contact cards	200 copies × 10	2,000
2. Flashlights	10 × 350	3,500
3. Reflective vests	10 × 250	2,500
4. Whistles	10 × 50	500
5. Communication load	500 × 6 months	3,000
6. Training materials	2 sessions × 1,000	2,000
7. Monitoring and reproduction	Lump sum	1,000
8. Subtotal		14,500
9. Contingency	10%	1,450
Total		15,950

These are planning estimates rather than quotations. They replace neither the thesis's broader proposed budget ranges nor an LGU appropriation. The scale is explicitly one barangay and six months. Venue and trainers are assumed in kind; transport, boat access, radios, compensation and other site-specific

requirements are excluded and need separate costing. Validate quantities, lawful funds and procurement requirements before adoption.

For evaluation, compare baseline and Month 6 using the same verified instrument and scoring, comparable respondents and periods, and documented participation records. Report attrition and uncertainty. A before–after pilot alone cannot isolate program effects. More recorded reports may indicate improved access rather than worse security; assess referrals and response documentation alongside incident categories.

Ethical Considerations

The study observed ethical principles relating to voluntary participation, privacy, confidentiality, and informed participation. Respondents were informed of the research purpose and were not coerced to participate. The researcher treated respondents' information confidentially and used it for research purposes. The researcher also maintained integrity in collecting, processing, interpreting, and reporting the research data.

Conclusion

The moderate implementation, awareness and perceived effectiveness of Neighborhood Watch in the selected GIDAS communities. Its measured implementation profile identifies community participation as numerically lower than organization and police coordination. These descriptive patterns support accessible orientation, opportunities for resident involvement, clear roles and feedback on activities. They do not establish that patrolling was lower than reporting, because a separate patrol subscale was not administered. The reported positive associations are .624 for implementation–awareness, .522 for implementation–perceived effectiveness, and .516 for awareness–perceived effectiveness. They describe relationships among survey scores rather than actual crime reductions or causal improvements. Officials' average scores were higher than household heads' scores, but category comparisons are affected by the small officials' group and analytic choices. Unresolved item scoring and reliability discrepancies require correction before final inference. The proposed action plan provides a reviewable operational output while leaving its outcomes to future evaluation.

Recommendations

Barangay officials and the PNP may prioritize plain-language information, verified reporting contacts, practical role clarification, feasible participation schedules and regular feedback to households. Review patrol feasibility through actual rosters and logs rather than infer it from unmeasured dimensions. Mobilize resources according to the confirmed needs of each barangay. The researchers should confirm the final instrument version, negative-item key, pilot records and SPSS syntax; reconcile the .846 versus appendix reliability coefficients; and regenerate corrected composite scores. Complete the Mann–Whitney U sensitivity comparisons requested by the reviewer, check variance-robust education tests and appropriate post hoc analyses, and disclose multiplicity and clustering limitations. Future longitudinal or comparative research may examine victimization, incident categories, reporting access and response records alongside perceptions to provide stronger evidence on community security outcomes.

References

- Bennett, T., Holloway, K., & Farrington, D. P. (2008). The effectiveness of neighborhood watch. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 4(1), 1–46. <https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2008.18>
- Chiu, R. A. (2025, July 11). Bohol police office strives to cut response time to 5 minutes. Philippine Information Agency. <https://pia.gov.ph/news/bohol-police-office-strives-to-cut-response-time-to-5-minutes/>
- Ekici, N., Akdogan, H., Kelly, R., & Gultekin, S. (2022). A meta-analysis of the impact of community policing on crime reduction. *Journal of Community Safety and Well-Being*, 7(3), 111–121. <https://doi.org/10.35502/jcswb.244>
- Gill, C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C. W., Vitter, Z., & Bennett, T. (2014). Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder and fear and increase satisfaction and legitimacy among citizens: A systematic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 10(4), 399–428. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-014-9210-y>
- Lab, S. P. (2014). *Crime prevention: Approaches, practices, and evaluations* (8th ed.). Anderson Publishing. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/book/monograph/9781455731374/crime-prevention>
- Municipal Government of Corella. (2025). CY 2024 annual report. <https://corella-bohol.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/CY-2024-ANNUAL-REPORT.pdf>

-
- Philippine National Police. (2009). Barangay peacekeeping operations and Barangay Peacekeeping Action Team (BPAT) manual. Directorate for Police Community Relations. <https://pro3.pnp.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/bpatmanual.pdf>
- Rosenbaum, D. P. (1987). The theory and research behind neighborhood watch: Is it a sound fear and crime reduction strategy? *Crime & Delinquency*, 33(1), 103–134. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001128787033001007>
- Weisburd, D., Petersen, K., Telep, C. W., & Fay, S. A. (2024). Can increasing preventive patrol in large geographic areas reduce crime? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 23(3), 721–743. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12665>
- Weisburd, D., Wilson, D. B., Gill, C., Kuen, K., & Zastrow, T. (2024). Are we underestimating the crime prevention outcomes of community policing? The importance of crime reporting sensitivity bias. *Journal of Law & Empirical Analysis*, 1(1), 162–179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2755323X241233469>