

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL, NEIGHBORHOOD, AND CITY
CHARACTERISTICS AND FEAR OF CRIME

A THESIS IN
Criminal Justice and Criminology

Presented to the Faculty of the University of
Missouri- Kansas City in partial fulfillment of
the requirement for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

by
COURTNEY JENE CAULDWELL

B.A. University of Missouri in Kansas City, 2009

Kansas City, Missouri 2012

© 2012

COURTNEY JENE CAULDWELL

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL, NEIGHBORHOOD, AND CITY
CHARACTERISTICS AND FEAR OF CRIME

Courtney Jene Cauldwell, Candidate for the Master of Science Degree
University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2012

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of individual, neighborhood, and city characteristics on fear of crime. While previous research has shown which factors predict fear of crime at each level, few have considered all levels simultaneously to discover which characteristics predict fear of crime when considered together. Using data derived from the NCVS 12 Cities survey, the study will analyze which characteristics, individual or structural are better predictors of fear of crime. This study finds that individual, along with neighborhood and city level contexts are significant predictors of fear of crime.

APPROVAL PAGE

The faculty listed below, appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences have examined a thesis titled “The Relationship Between Individual, Neighborhood, and City Characteristics and Fear of Crime” presented by Courtney Jene Cauldwell, candidate for the Master of Science degree, and certify that in their opinion is worthy of acceptance.

Supervisory Committee

Toya Like- Haislip, Ph.D., Committee Chair
Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology

Kenneth Novak, Ph.D.
Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology

Jessica Hodge, Ph.D.
Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
DEDICATION.....	viii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	6
3. METHODOLOGY.....	31
4. RESULTS.....	45
5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	52
REFERENCES.....	63
VITA.....	67

TABLES

Table	Page
1. Total number of respondents for NCVS 12-Cities Sample.....	33
2. Descriptive Statistics on the National Crime Victimization Survey 12 Cities Sample, 1998 (N= 13, 918).....	40
3. Response to Fear of Crime Question (% of responses).....	41
4. Ordinal Regression Models 1 & 2 Predicting Fear of Neighborhood Crime.....	47
5. Ordinal Regression Models 3 & 4 Predicting Fear of City Crime.....	51

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank God for always being there for me and loving me, especially when I did not deserve it. The reminder of his grace and his love is what brought me through. I know that without him nothing is possible and I am truly thankful for his presence in my life

I would second like to thank Dr. Like for believing in me even when I was losing faith in myself. I thank her for her guidance and reassurance throughout the entire process. Her direction and perseverance has made me a better person and student. I now believe I can do anything I set my mind to. Thank you, Dr. Like for everything you have done and for the amazing woman you are.

Dr. Lucas, Dr. Novak, Dr. Hodge, Dr. Holsinger, and Dr. Holsinger, thank you for your time and support throughout my graduate career. You are all truly remarkable professors and people. I am blessed to have had each of you in my life. Thank you.

To my family, thank you for always encouraging me and reminding me of what is really important. Thank you for your prayers and constant support. I love you and I would not be the woman I am today without you.

Lastly, I would like to thank my husband. Without him this would not have been possible. He is my best friend and he believed in me and pushed me when I was ready to give up. There were many sleepless nights in our house and he was with me every step of the way. You are truly the greatest blessing in my life and I love you with all of my heart.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this project to others that work in the criminal justice system. It is important to understand fear of crime and what causes it. By understanding fear of crime and identifying the causes we can help alleviate fear among the general public.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Around 7:00 pm June 2, 2007 Kelsey Smith, 18, went into an Overland Park Target department store to buy supplies to make an anniversary gift for her boyfriend. Minutes later as she was returning to her car Edwin Hall, 27, shoved her into her vehicle and drove away. He brutally raped and sodomized the teen before he murdered her and dumped her body in a park in Missouri. Her body was found four days later. Hall reported he randomly chose Kelsey because she looked like she was twelve and she had nice legs (The Associated Press, 2008).

This story is nothing short of horrific. While the story is horrifying, it is rare. Violent crimes like this do not happen every day. In fact, according to the FBI in 2010, there were nearly ten times as many property crimes (9,082,887) as violent crimes (1,246,248). Violent crimes include murder, forcible rape, aggravated assault, and robbery. Property crimes include burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. While 1.2 million appears to be a large number of violent crimes, the rate has decreased by 6% since 2009. That being said, property crimes also decreased by almost 3% since 2009 (U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2010). Similarly, NCVS data from 2010 found large decreases of violent crime since 1993. The data showed that violent crime had decreased from 49.9 per 1000 people ages 12 and older in 1993, to 14.9 per 1000 people ages 12 and older in 2010. This decline in violent crime is a 70% decrease in seven years (Truman, 2011). When serious crimes do occur they are sure to be front page news, although property

offenses are much more common. Individuals may believe personal crimes have more serious consequences than property crime.

Fear of crime is, and continues to be, an issue in the United States that affects the everyday lives of citizens and has a great impact on crime policies. Many people are afraid of crime based on their lack of knowledge of the aforementioned statistics and due to the distortion of statistics often in media outlets. Overall, people are afraid even if they are at a very low risk of victimization. Another source of fear of crime may come from politics. Wanner & Caputo (1987) discuss strong disciplinary attitudes regarding crime policies. In their study, they are researching fear of crime in Canada. However, they reference the United States and their particular punitive attitudes towards punishment and crime. They argue that the punitive “get tough” views towards crime are based on fear of crime. Political leaders running for office take a “get tough” approach to crime and to future policies because they believe it is what the public wants. Anyone who does not take a “get tough” approach is seen as being soft on crime. This leads to particularly harsh and sometimes disproportionate sentences and punishment for offenders. Punishment and disproportionate sentences are not the point of this paper, but rather the fear that these harsh stances can create in order to gain election or re-election (Wanner & Caputo, 1987). While these things can certainly affect an individual’s fear of crime, some do however, have more ‘concrete’ reasons for their fear. These people may be afraid of crime because they have been victims of crime or live in a crime ridden area. Regardless of the reasons of the individuals, fear and specifically fear of crime, is a prevailing problem in America. Gallup polls from 2011 reported that 68% of American citizens believed there was more crime in 2011 than in 2010. When asked about

crime in areas in close proximity to their homes, 48% of citizens reported that they believed crime in their local areas was worsening. Gallup polls also found that 1 in 10 feel unsafe walking near their home at night (Saad, 2011). Whether the fear is justified by people who are at risk for being victimized or if it is simply individuals perceiving their environment as threatening, fear of crime is prevalent among most, if not all people and areas.

Fear of crime is important to research because it appears to be an entirely separate phenomena from crime. Fear of crime remains high while crime rates are on the decline and have decreased dramatically in the past decade. Fear of crime is important to study, especially fear of crime in the United States, because as shown above, it is a mounting issue. As Liska, Lawrence, & Sanchirico (1982) state, fear of crime can have detrimental consequences such as: anxiety and mistrust. They state that because of fear of crime, individuals may limit their exposure to possible dangers. By limiting their exposure it can lead to a host of new consequences like withdrawal and isolation which may lead to an overall dissatisfaction with life (Liska, Lawrence, & Sanchirico, 1982). Despite the growing concern about fear of crime and consideration given to this topic, scholars have disagreed over the definition and measurement of this phenomenon. Moreover, despite years of scholarship on this topic, it is unclear whether individual or contextual characteristics are better predictors of the fear of crime. Many works have noted that fear varies both across individuals and place, but few works have examined these factors simultaneously.

Specifically, much research has been done on these influences on fear of crime across individual and neighborhood levels. Less research is found in relation to city level predictors of crime. The present study will examine these factors and their relation with fear of crime,

with the goal of understanding whether individual characteristics or contextual features of individuals' neighborhood and city environments are better predictors of fear of crime. Further, this study will examine these characteristics simultaneously. The current study will add to the existing literature base in two different ways. First, while research has been done on individual and neighborhood predictors of fear of crime, research on city level predictors of fear of crime is lacking. It is essential to uncover city predictors of fear of crime, in that, factors that predict a person's fear of crime at the city level may be entirely different than factors that predict fear at neighborhood and individual levels. Second, it is imperative to examine these factors simultaneously. Research on fear of crime thus far has determined which characteristics predict fear of crime at the neighborhood level and at the individual level only. For example, previous research has found that females are more fearful of crime than males (Keane, 1992; LaGrange & Ferraro, 1989; Pain, 1997; Stafford & Galle, 1984; Stanko, 1995; Warr, 1990; Young, 1992). While generally this may be true, in some instances, there may be males that are more fearful than females. What factors would make a male more fearful than a female? When neighborhood composition, marital status, education, and other variables are taken into account, it could explain the contradiction with previous literature. This research purports that in order to fully understand which factors contribute to fear of crime, all significant factors relevant to fear of crime need to be considered together. When considered together, we can appreciate the differences in fear of crime among these factors and understand that while certain individual and neighborhood factors have been found to predict crime, all factors need to be considered to comprehend the full picture. For example, we would be able to understand why a single, white, female from an upper class

neighborhood is not fearful of crime in her city while a single, black, female from a disadvantaged neighborhood is very fearful of crime in her city, or vice versa. Once we uncover how these variables interact with each other we will be able to make a more educated and complete conclusion on fear of crime as a whole.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A substantial amount of research has been done on fear of crime and specifically those that are most fearful of crime. Among those individual level predictors of fear of crime, age, race/ethnicity, and gender continue to be a common focus. Other individual-level factors are also proximate causes of fear and include prior victimization, marital status, education and income. In addition to individual characteristics, neighborhood conditions have also been linked to fear of crime. Namely, residential instability and community disorder have been shown to increase fear of crime among individuals. Finally, city characteristics may also induce fear of crime. It goes to reason, that structural disadvantage and inequality might be related to fear of crime among city residents. These factors are detailed in the following subsections.

Before turning to a discussion on the proximate causes of fear of crime, we must first define this concept. Garofalo (1973) defines fear of crime as: “an emotional reaction characterized by a sense of danger and anxiety” (p. 840). He goes on to distinguish between the types of fear of crime. Fear of physical injury is an emotional automatic reaction to physical cues from one’s environment. Fear of property crime involves a more complex thought process that could also be described as worry. Fear of crime is not limited to fear of personal victimization. The term “fear of crime” encompasses all types of crime which can include property crime. As stated earlier, much debate has occurred over the definition of fear of crime. Warr (2000) argues fear is a feeling of dread caused by the expectation of

danger. He states it is a reaction to a perceived environment. Further, he purports that fear of crime is not a separate entity in and of itself. Rather, fear of crime is like any other type of fear, like fear of a traffic accident or fear of a family member dying. Fear of crime, as Warr (2000) defines, cannot be defined as Garofalo (1973) does. Being that “an emotional reaction from one’s environment” does not distinguish fear from any other emotion. Emotions like joy, sadness, and anger are all “emotional reactions from one’s environment” (Garfalo, 1973, p. 840). Factors found to have an effect on fear of crime include previous victimization, disadvantage, disorder and individual characteristics such as age, gender, and race/ethnicity. These influences can vary among the individual, the neighborhood, and the city. We will examine literature on individual level characteristics, neighborhood level characteristics, and city level characteristics, and observe the ways in which they each may or may not have an effect on fear of crime.

Individual Characteristics

Age

Is there a specific age group that has a statistically significant higher level of fear of crime than other age groups? Research has shown that fear of crime is more prevalent among the elderly. However, research shows the elderly are among the groups that are least likely to be victimized (Clemente & Keliman, 1977; Keane, 1992; Scarborough, Like, Novak, Lucas, & Alarid, 2010). Clemente and Kleiman (1977) in their study of fear of crime in the United States found younger individuals are more likely to be the victims of crime than are older people. They also concluded that the elderly were more fearful of crime but report that this

finding was not substantial, at least in their study. Accordingly, Keane (1992) conducted a study on concrete and formless fear. Concrete fear is fear associated with a specific crime like theft or assault. Keane (1992) asked how likely the respondents felt they were to become the victims of specific crimes. Formless fear, on the other hand, is a general worry of crime in general. Questions measuring formless fear ask how safe one would feel walking alone in the neighborhood after dark. They found that younger individuals were more fearful of concrete fear like theft and assault. Alternatively, the elderly were more fearful of formless fear. They were more fearful of neighborhood crime, particularly at night.

Scarborough et al. (2010) also found that fear of crime increases as age increases. Though, they report that the relationship between age and fear of crime was not positive in baseline models. The relationship became positive when they included attitudes and neighborhood characteristics. They hypothesize that this finding suggests the environment is important when examining the relationship between age and fear of crime. Contrary to most literature Pain (1997), in her study on women and fear of crime, particularly sexual victimization and physical assault, found that elderly women were significantly less fearful than younger women. She also found that women ages eighteen to thirty were more likely to be inhibited by these fears of crime than elderly women. Pain (1997) contributed this finding to the rationale that the elderly have less exposure to possible dangers than younger individuals which in turn makes them less fearful of crime. Overall, literature has found that the elderly are generally more fearful of crime even though they may not be the most at risk. The rationale behind this finding is that the elderly feel they are more vulnerable to crime. It

is not necessarily that they believe they are at a higher risk; rather, they are less likely to be able to defend themselves (Clemente & Kleiman, 1977).

Race/Ethnicity

Are there racial and ethnic variations in fear of crime? The answer, according to research findings, is not definitive. According to research by Clemente and Kleiman (1977), African Americans are the most fearful of crime. They are also the group most likely to be victimized by personal crimes. Clemente and Kleiman (1977) found this in their study on fear of crime in the United States and the likelihood of victimization among race, age, and gender. They explain this increased fear is due to the need African Americans, particularly males, feel to protect themselves by owning guns and other weapons. Scarborough et al. (2010) found a significant positive relationship between blacks and fear of crime. However, they report when neighborhood characteristics and attitudes were included the relationship between race and fear of crime switches direction and significance. They purport this finding is due to the fact that race does not make individuals more fearful of crime by itself, rather, an interaction between race and environmental characteristics influence fear of crime. They also found that there was no relationship between those of Hispanic origin and fear of crime. They further explain this finding by stating that African Americans are overrepresented in disorganized communities compared to Hispanics and Whites. Therefore, this finding that environment plays an important role between race and fear of crime is sensible (Scarborough et al., 2010).

Alternatively, Ortega and Myles (1987) found that the relationship between race and fear of crime was insignificant. However, they did find a significant relationship between

race and factors that relate to fear of crime; perceived victimization and crime level. They found that blacks were more likely to live in high-crime neighborhoods and that they perceive their risk of victimization to be lower than their white counterparts. Ortega and Myles (1987) report is principally due to the fact that black males are less likely to express fear. They rationalize this finding by stating that black males are either the primary individuals committing the crimes or they do not feel vulnerable because they can and do protect themselves. A third explanation for this finding is that black males may in reality be more fearful and perceive their risk of victimization to be higher. However, fear on the streets is seen as a weakness which can lead to dire consequences. Therefore, even though they are the most likely to be victimized, they are the least likely to be fearful or to express fear.

While the literature on race and fear of crime is not clear cut, this may partially be due to the underreporting of blacks and their subsequent fear of crime. Consistent with literature, it is not clear which racial/ethnic group is most fearful of crime. As we have seen with literature from Scarborough et al (2010) and will discuss further, other factors such as previous victimization, neighborhood characteristics, disorder, and city level characteristics can interact with individual characteristics such as race. This interaction may result in an increase or decrease in fear of crime. While there is research on race/ethnicity, there is far more research on gender as will be discussed next.

Gender

Unlike the findings regarding race and fear of crime, the findings on gender are more consistent. Previous research has generally found that women are the most fearful of crime.

Warr (1990) proposed that women react to a specific level of perceived risk greater than that of their male counterpart. Why would women react to risk differently than men? This continues to be a quandary in criminological research as women have also been found to be among those that are the least likely to be victimized.

An explanation for the increased fear accompanied by lower actual victimization rates is the exposure to risk hypothesis (Stafford & Galle, 1984). According to Stafford and Galle (1984) the exposure to risk hypothesis is a formula developed to identify a persons' risk of victimization. This hypothesis is different than the conventional risk of victimization formula in that it takes into account each person's unique likelihood of becoming a victim. The conventional risk of victimization formula assumed that each person had the same probability of being a victim of crime. By using this hypothesis then, it would appear that women should have a lower fear of crime because they have a lower risk of victimization. However, this hypothesis proposes that women actually have higher rates of victimization than are reported, maybe even higher than the risk of males. The adjusted risk of personal victimization rates showed that females have a higher risk of victimization than males. The results of this study showed that white females group rates of victimization ranged from 38.39 to 73.35 per 1000 people while the white males group rates ranged from 26.25 to 61.47. Similarly, black females were found to have higher rates of personal victimization. The black females group ranged from 79.59 to 145.05. The black males group ranged from 110.43-85.41 per 1000 people. The reasoning for this finding is that this hypothesis takes into account not only the female's exposure to crime but also their vulnerability to crime. Therefore, their fear may not be irrational or unfounded (Stafford & Galle, 1984).

According to Young (1992) another theory behind the inequality between actual rates and increased fear of crime among women is the vulnerability model. This model posits that women are the most fearful of crime, among other groups like the physically handicapped and the elderly. It further assumes the reason for this fear is that these groups are those that are the most vulnerable to crime (Young, 1992). A study by LaGrange and Ferraro (1989) investigated age and gender differences in relation to perceived risk and fear of crime. They conducted 320 phone interviews with residents of a southeastern city in the United States. They measured crime risk by asking the resident what their probability was of being a victim of crime and distinguished fear by crime type, evaluating fear of both property and personal crime. They measured fear of crime by asking the resident how afraid they were of eleven different types of victimization or crimes. They found that women are generally more fearful than men. Men and women both felt they were equally as likely to be the victims of property crime although, women felt they were more likely to be victims of personal crime. The greatest gender differences in fear of crime were of those that included: having someone break into your house while you are there, being raped or sexually assaulted, and being beaten or threatened with a knife or a gun. The previous study measured fear of crime using purely perceived risk and fear of crime. It would be beneficial to determine the differences in fear based on the type of fear being measured.

Keane (1992) in his study on concrete and formless fear in Canada found differences in fear among age and gender depending on the type of fear being measured. Keane (1992) categorized fear into two separate entities: concrete and formless fear. Formless fear, researchers might agree, is the type of fear that is influenced by media coverage. In this

study, the respondents were asked about their general level of anxiety or fear while walking alone in their neighborhood both in the daytime and at night. Concrete fear, on the other hand, is fear corresponding to the likelihood of a specific crime occurring. Concrete fear, for example, is fear that occurs after a shooting occurs in your neighborhood. A shooting in one's neighborhood would increase one's fear of being shot. Many things can cause fear of crime. His data was collected from 9,870 individuals through a telephone survey. Questions were asked regarding concrete fear, fear that is based on a logical thought process regarding the likelihood a person perceives they are of being victimized. He also asked questions regarding formless fear, an emotional fear. Concrete fear was divided into three separate types of fear evoking offenses including: damage to property, theft of property, and assault. He found that females were more likely than males to see themselves as victims of all types of concrete fear. He also found that females were also more fearful of formless fear of personal victimization. As will soon be discussed, studies have shown that gender definitely plays a role in fear of violence.

LaGrange and Ferraro (1989) theorize that women feel more vulnerable and are less likely to be able to counteract an attack. While previous literature reports men and women felt equally likely to be the victims of property crime, women more likely to be the victims of personal crime (Keane, 1992). Women feel as likely as men to be the victims of property crime and more likely than men to be the victims of personal crime. Are women more fearful of crime overall? This question will be addressed in the next section.

A familiar theme among research regarding women and their fear of crime is the hypothesis that their fear actually stems from a general fear of sexual assault at the hands of

men (Pain, 1997). According to Ferraro (1996), this fear of sexual assault increases their fear of all crime. A female's fear of crime is actually their fear that becoming a victim of crime in general will lead to sexual assault and victimization. Although rape in the United States does not appear to be pervasive, as reported earlier, in 2010 violent crime (which includes rape) affected 14.9 in 1000 people (Saad, 2011). In 2010, there were an estimated 84,767 forcible rapes reported in the United States (U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2010). The problem with the official statistics is that rape is an underreported crime. Tjaden and Thoennes (2006) reported that only 20% of victims of sexual assault will report the crime. They also found that 1 in 6 women have been the victims of sexual assault. While it has been reported that women's fear of crime is higher than that of men's, it is likely that this fear of crime is not fear of all crime but fear that crime will lead to sexual assault (Ferraro, 1996). The next few studies focus on women's fear that specifically relates to sexual assault and men.

Pain (1997) researched the relationship between fear of crime with women, the elderly, and the disabled. Three hundred eighty-nine questionnaires were completed and 45 follow-up interviews were conducted with a section of those that completed the questionnaires. The study was done in neighborhoods of Edinburgh, Scotland. The three neighborhoods surveyed were a mix of affluent, middle class, and low-income. She examined a few different factors related to fear of crime. Among the topics researched were: social class and the effect it has on fear of sexual violence and domestic violence, women with disabilities, elderly women, and the effect motherhood has on fear of crime. Does a woman's social status have an effect on her level of fear of crime? The findings of Pain

(1997) have shown that this is not the case. She found that women across all economic or social statuses feared sexual victimization equally. She found the same in relation to physical violence. All women were also equally afraid of being attacked by a stranger. However, she did find that concern related to being the victim of physical and/or sexual assault by a person known to the women was significantly related to social class. She found the most economically and/or educationally disadvantaged were more fearful of physical or sexual assault at the hands of someone they know.

As reported earlier, Young (1992) reported the incongruity between fear and victimization rates may not be that women are irrational. It may be because women are not reporting the violent victimizations that are occurring. This could be especially true in relation to sexual assault. The same can be said for domestic violence. Young (1992) reported that domestic violence is another much underreported crime in the United States. Stanko (1995) reported that fear of crime among women is most primarily fear of men in general. In her essay she examined the role women have had in society in relation to men. She discussed sexual assault and the role it has played historically. Women's views were not taken into account or held with much regard. In relation to married women they were seen to be the property of men and were expected to behave as the man saw fit. The submissive nature expected of women led to marital rape and abuse. Stanko (1995) concluded in her essay that the only way for women to be protected from personal violent crimes is to be autonomous of men.

Previous Victimization/ Perceived Risk of Victimization

Other important factors to assess when looking at fear of crime are fear of crime with those who have been previously victimized and perceived risk of victimization. They are important factors to analyze in that they both have been found to impact an individual's fear of crime (Chadee, 2003; Gainey, Alper & Chappell, 2010; Rountree, 1998). A person's perceived risk of victimization, simply put, is how likely they feel they are to become a victim of crime. Perceived victimization is an important topic to explore because it impacts the amount of fear an individual has in relation to crime. Perceived victimization, as will be discussed shortly, is not the same thing as actual victimization risk. Individuals may perceive they are less likely or more likely to be the victim of crime regardless of their actual victimization risk. Likewise, perceived risk of victimization and fear of crime are separate entities. Chadee (2003) defined fear of victimization as an emotional reaction, while perceived risk involves a cognitive process that takes into account the likelihood of becoming a victim. There has been previous research that has studied the link between perceived risk of victimization and fear of crime.

Chadee (2003) did a study of ethnic groups in Trinidad in the West Indies. He researched the effect perceived risk has on fear of crime. He conducted a survey in 1999 in high and low serious crime areas of Trinidad. He categorized serious crimes as crimes that result in five years or more in prison which include: rape, murder, possession of narcotics, kidnapping, and etcetera. The sample comprised of 728 individuals that were the head of the household. The surveys were conducted face to face with the respondents. The questions were divided into two separate categories: fear of crime and risk of victimization. Fear of

crime questions involved those that asked how fearful they were of: being murdered, sexually assaulted, kidnapped, etcetera. Risk of victimization questions involved those that asked how likely they feel they are of being a victim of being: murdered, sexually assaulted, kidnapped, etcetera. They found that those who felt they were likely to be a victim of crime were more fearful of crime in general. They stated that perceived victimization was a better predictor of fear than being a victim previously.

Gainey, Alper, & Chappell (2010) in their study on disorder, risk perception, and social capital found results consistent with the previous literature. They conducted a telephone survey of residents in a U.S. southeastern City. Researchers asked the respondents a series of crime-specific questions regarding their worry of crime. The respondents were also asked about being previously victimized, the amount of social and physical disorder in their neighborhood, and questions related to their personal social capital or their participation in the neighborhood and trust in their neighbors. The respondents were additionally asked questions regarding their perception of risk. Specifically, how safe the respondent would feel being out alone in their neighborhood at night. Gainey et al. (2010) found that perceived risk was a significant predictor of fear of crime. Further, they found that perceived risk mediates the relationship between disorder and fear of crime. For example, a neighborhood that is socially disorganized with abandoned buildings and has a surplus of homeless people would perhaps increase an individual's fear of crime. If the individual does not perceive their risk of victimization to be high then they would not have an increased fear of crime. Hence, perceived risk mediates disorder and fear.

Rountree (1998) did a study comparing the violent crime-fear relationship with a property-crime fear relationship. The data for the study came from three different sources: a victimization survey of residents of Seattle, Washington, official crime report from the local police department, and U.S. census data. The sample was clustered into blocks with each block containing a house that had been burgled. Her most interesting finding was that routine-activities, specifically those that increased the likelihood of a crime occurring, were significantly related to fear of violence. These findings mean that those who are exposed more and with a greater frequency express higher levels of fear than those that are not exposed. Also, those who use greater safety precautions express higher levels of fear. The race and gender results from the violent-crime relationship were similar to the property-crime relationship; although, women and men were equally as fearful when it came to fear of burglary.

Wittebrood and Nieuwebeerta (2000) conducted a study on a previous victimization and the likelihood of re-victimization. The study was conducted in the Netherlands and 1,939 face-to-face interviews were done. Questions were asked regarding various demographic information, criminal victimization history and timeline, and any life changes that occurred. Information was also gathered pertaining to the criminal history of the respondent. In their analysis, the researchers included the routine activities of the respondents. The risks of being re-victimized were higher for those previously victimized for property crimes and assault crimes. The only crime that did not increase the risk of re-victimization was sexual assault. With the risk of victimization being higher for those who have been previously victimized, victims would be expected to express higher levels of fear. However, research on victims of

crime and subsequent fear of crime has been mixed. Some studies report that crime victims are more fearful while others report they are less fearful.

Wanner and Caputo (1987) conducted a study on fear of crime, punitiveness, and perceptions of violence. Among other things they found that being a victim did not increase levels of fear. However, they did find that having a friend or a family member who was a victim of crime statistically increased fear for the individual. Gainey et al. (2010) in their telephone interview study, examined fear of crime in relation to disorder, risk perception, and social capital. They, like previous researchers, reported findings on victimization that have not been conclusive. Some find previous victimization to increase fear while others did not. In their study they found a positive relationship between victimization and fear. Though, they contribute this finding to the idea that victimization leads to higher perceived disorder. Higher perceived disorder, they propose, causes lower levels of trust which, in turn, produces higher levels of fear.

Other Individual Characteristics

In addition to the most main individual characteristics, there are others that can influence a person's fear of crime. These characteristics include: income/disadvantage, education, and marital status. In regard to income and education, Keane (1992) found that those with a higher income and education were significantly more fearful of property crime than those with lower incomes and education. Rountree (1998) found wealthier individuals were less fearful and their odds of being victimized decreased as their income increased. Those with lower incomes and less education were more fearful of their neighborhoods than their richer counterparts. This finding could be because those who are better off live in safer

neighborhoods. Therefore, those that live in poorer neighborhoods may perceive disorder at a higher level than those that do not (Rountree, 1998). In relation to marital status, less research is found compared to other demographic characteristics. Some have found that marital status is a significant predictor of fear of crime (Keane, 1992). Keane (1992) found that the only marital status that had a significant relationship with fear of crime was being single. Single individuals were more fearful of assault than those that were married. Other studies have found that marital status is not a significant predictor of fear of crime (Gainey et al., 2010). Many of the studies like: Clemente & Kleiman, 1977, Ortega & Myles, 1987; Pain, 1997; Rountree 1998; Wanner & Caputo, 1987, to name a few, did not even take marital status into account. Because of the lack of research on marital status, this study will measure the relationship between marital status and fear of crime to see if a relationship does indeed exist.

Neighborhood Characteristics

Disorder

Disorder, as defined by Skogan (1990) “violates widely shared values, but the social order is not defined by everything people agree upon. Order is defined by norms about public behavior, and these norms are only a subset of the manners and morals of the community” (p.4). In his book on disorder and decline, Skogan (1990) differentiated between the types of disorder. He stated there are two forms of disorder: visible social disorder and physical decay. Visible social disorder is the behavioral evidence of disorganization in a community. Common social disorder can include: public drinking, corner gangs, street harassment, drugs, noisy neighbors, commercial sex or prostitution and the visibility of the homeless and the

mentally ill. Physical decay, on the other hand, is a daily aspect of an environment. Skogan (1990) stated that these aspects can be both legal and illegal. Among the most common forms of physical decay are: vandalism, dilapidation and abandonment, and trash strewn about the neighborhood. In an article in *Atlantic Monthly*, Wilson and Kelling (1982) shared their theory on disorder and crime. They stated that if a window is broken, left unattended, and never fixed it will give the perception that no one cares. This perception, then, invites decay and crime. Criminals, transients, and the like will move in and take over because it is clear that the social forces that control and police the neighborhood are no longer present or no longer care. They further hypothesized that disorder leads to fear which leads to physical and social withdrawal. The withdrawal then leads to increased predatory behavior which leads to increased crime. The cycle ends with a spiral of decline in the community. They purport that by using order maintenance along with other means of crime control such as: incarceration, police presence, and environmental design can decrease the level of disorder and crime in communities (Kelling & Bratton, 1998). In their broken windows metaphor to crime and decay they stated that disorder leads to fear. This theory does not state that disorder is the culprit of criminal activity. Disorder is not the issue in and of itself. Rather, disorder produces a feeling and/or a mood that can evoke fear. Furthermore, disorder can give the illusion or the idea that violence and inappropriate behavior is both welcomed and or ignored in these areas.

Skogan (1990) found in his research on disorder that residents of neighborhoods that had social and physical signs of disorder were fearful of going out into the community. He interviewed residents of 40 communities. In each community, around 325 citizens took part

in the study. The questions asked were about the levels of disorder in the community. These questions included questions regarding social and physical signs of disorder. He found that physical and social forms of disorder correlate strongly with each other. He also found that they were most prominent in areas characterized as poor, unstable, and were most commonly minority areas. He stated they were also tied to the amount of cohesion the neighborhood possessed. Skogan (1990) described the neighborhoods as having many abandoned buildings with rubble strewn over the streets and parking lots, vacant lots, cheap stores, and an abundance of bars. The residents were frightened by the gangs of juveniles that hung out on street corners. Often they would harass citizens as they walked by. They were also frightened by the homeless and transients. The old abandoned buildings were believed to harbor drug addicts and were seen as encouraging criminal opportunity. A general conception is that white middle-class individuals are the citizens that are most concerned with disorder. The neighborhood one lives in affects how they perceive and react to disorder. Therefore, where disorder is most prominent, in low income areas of cities, the individuals might not take as much notice to it or see it as a problem. Skogan (1990) however, found the opposite to be true. He found that racial minorities reported the most significant disorder problems. He also found, contrary to most research, that the elderly residents reported less physical disorder in areas they lived in compared with younger residents that lived in the same area. The level of disorder reported by residents directly impacts their fear of crime. Hence, those that report higher levels of disorder in their neighborhood should experience higher levels of fear of crime. In this case it seems that the younger individuals are the ones with the highest level of fear of crime.

Interestingly enough, Kohm (2009) found the same occurrence within his research. He conducted surveys of a neighborhood known as “Spence” in Winnipeg, Canada. This neighborhood is in close proximity to the downtown area of Winnipeg. It is a lower income neighborhood that is more dependent on government transfer payments. It is comprised of residents with lower levels of education and those less likely to own their homes and has great ethnic diversity. Kohm (2009) administered two face-to-face yearly neighborhood surveys to 394 residents of Spence. The residents were asked questions about the neighborhood, their perceived risk of victimization, prior victimization, fear of crime, and specific experiences with disorder in the neighborhood. The researchers then asked the residents to identify, on a map of the neighborhood, places that made them feel unsafe. They also asked the residents to compare their neighborhood to other neighborhoods and give an estimate of their neighborhood’s crime rate. Over half of the respondents felt that their neighborhood had higher levels of crime compared to other neighborhoods. Overall, residents of Spence based their level of fear on disorder in the community. Social forms of disorder were the most common cited type of disorder by the residents. The residents reported public drinking, panhandling, and transients sleeping on the street as the type of disorder that evoked the most fear. The second most fear evoking behavior was prostitution and drug dealing. The third most fear evoking behavior was gang activity. Physical signs of decay were the least common fear evoking type of disorder. Only fifty-six residents cited this type of disorder as fear evoking (Kohm, 2009). Franklin, Franklin, & Fearn (2008) also found neighborhood disorder (presence of gangs, noise, and traffic problems) to be the strongest predictor of fear. Gainey et al. (2010) in their study of 628 phone interviews of a

medium southwestern city also found disorder to be a significant predictor of fear. Becoming fearful of a neighborhood characterized by disorder is not an irrational response; Skogan (1990) found that levels of crime are strongly related to levels of disorder.

Neighborhood Instability

Skogan (1990) found that disorder has a detrimental impact on housing and, as a result, can sometimes make it unstable. Residents who can afford to move out of the neighborhood do and this leads to more abandoned houses. With vacant houses scattered about the neighborhood it makes it difficult to attract any commercial businesses to come in. He defines a stable neighborhood as one where the same amount of residents move in as move out. Shaw and McKay (1942) found, along with other Chicago school theorists, that social disorganization occurs in a community when there is high residential turnover. Financially stable or affluent residents choose to move to more desirable communities leaving the poorer communities with higher crime rates which lead to residential instability.

Using 2,534 census tracts in thirteen cities Hipp (2010) did a study on whether a neighborhood's structural characteristics affected crime rates or if crime rates affected the neighborhood's structural characteristics ten years later. They found that neighborhoods in 1990 (the start of the study) with higher levels of disadvantage experienced higher levels of violent crime and property crime in 2000. He reports that violent crime seems to affect higher levels of disadvantage ten years later but property crime does not. In relation to the ethnic/racial composition of neighborhoods, he did not find any evidence that neighborhoods with a higher level of African-Americans had a higher crime rate. On the contrary, he did find that neighborhoods with more African-Americans had lower crime rates ten years later.

In relation to the amount of racial/ethnic heterogeneity, he found that neighborhoods with a greater amount of heterogeneity had an increased violent crime rate ten years later. Overall, Hipp (2010) found that neighborhoods with more concentrated disadvantaged people had higher crime rates and neighborhoods with high crime rates had high levels of disadvantage. He also found that neighborhoods characterized by disadvantage had a lower number of retail businesses but a higher number of bars and liquor stores. Hipp (2010) discovered that neighborhoods with more residential instability did not have increased crime ten years later. This is inconsistent with the social disorganization theory and prior research.

Taylor and Covington (1993) sampled sixty-six neighborhoods in Baltimore, Maryland where they completed interviews with the head of each household. In addition, twenty percent of the blocks the respondents lived on were measured to determine the amount of physical decay. They found that neighborhoods that experienced unexpected change in age and racial composition over ten years expressed higher levels of fear. They reported that the concentration of minorities in certain areas has only increased segregation. They stated that the problem was not that minorities are more prone to crime, but that they have fewer resources than others. The decreased amount of resources can lead to physical and social problems. These problems, Taylor and Covington (1993) reported, may be the reason that fear was increased.

Skogan (1986) reported that there are a number of things that could cause a spiral downfall of neighborhoods, such as: landowners and mortgage institutions failing to keep up housing, and highways being constructed that run through neighborhoods. Real-estate agents have been known to scare whites out of neighborhoods, forcing them to sell their houses for

less than they are worth, and then selling them at increased prices to minorities. The closing of factories has also led to despair among residents who moved to the city to begin work at the factories. This leaves inner city residents with little opportunity for work and adequate housing. With factories being closed and businesses leaving, it leaves old abandoned buildings all around the neighborhood (Skogan, 1986). These abandoned buildings and deteriorating conditions of the inner-city neighborhoods leads to fear of crime as purported by Wilson and Kelling (1982). While the research is mixed on the causation between residential stability, racial heterogeneity, and crime rates, it is clear that these ecological changes in inner city neighborhoods are not positive changes. Regardless of the causes, instability in neighborhoods, physical and social decay, and social isolation all lead to fear of crime.

City Characteristics

Research on city level predictors of crime is quite scarce. The reasoning for this limited supply of research could be that most believe the same predictors for individual and neighborhood fear of crime apply to the city level fear of crime. However, there are a few city-level predictors of crime that have not been discussed. Measures of disadvantage such as unemployment and the number of female-headed households may certainly have a significant effect on fear of crime within cities. It is plausible that cities containing higher amounts of unemployment, poverty, and female-headed households are more fearful of crime. Like (2011), in her study on urban inequality and violent victimization, found that blacks were more likely to be victims of violent victimization in higher segregated cities. Like (2011) also found that residential instability and disadvantage was positively associated

with blacks' risk of violent victimization. She reports the relationship between these factors may be that blacks in highly segregated cities are more likely to be found in disadvantaged areas where there is an increased risk in victimization.

It is also plausible that things like racial inequality, specifically segregation between whites and minority groups within cities, affect city-level fear of crime and disorder. For example, if cities are racially segregated would fear of crime be higher or lower? It is proposed, in this study, that fear of crime would be lower among whites. The reason being, whites generally associate African Americans with high levels of disorder and likely criminal behavior (Sampson & Raudenbush, 2004). Therefore, segregation between whites and minorities would perhaps decrease fear of crime among whites. Although, this may only affect their fear of crime in relation to the neighborhoods they inhabit.

Due to the lack of research regarding cities and fear of crime, it appears it is not an important topic to discuss. However, I purport that fear of crime in cities is an important topic to explore. We cannot assume that the same characteristics that cause fear of crime in neighborhoods causes fear of crime at the city level. Neighborhood characteristics like disorder may be different from disorder in the city. Also, a large amount of the public is in the city at one time or another. Many commute to larger cities to work and/or for entertainment. Other individuals may not go to the city for fear of crime. It is essential to understand what makes individuals fearful of crime in cities. Are abandoned buildings and vandalized streets the culprit for their fear? Or is there another kind of disorder that promotes fear?

Wikstrom (1995) conducted a study on city level crime and disorder. First, he acknowledges the lack of research on crime and disorder in the city. He states that much time has been spent on neighborhood and community levels regarding crime and disorder but research on city level crime is lacking greatly. In his study in the large metropolis of Stockholm, Sweden he found that urban “city centers” or downtown areas had larger amounts of crime than rural or suburban areas. He reports that burglaries and robberies are more likely to happen in urban areas than in rural areas. He states this is because there is a higher likelihood of offenses being committed because of a lower amount of informal social control. In the urban environments, individuals are less likely to know each other and to form social bonds. This is due to a higher concentration of individuals. With higher concentrations of individuals and lower amounts of informal social control the chances for crime to occur increase. He reports, as a result, crime is much higher in the urban areas than it is in rural or suburban areas. Wikstrom (1995) also found that disorder is also highest in urban areas. He attributed this finding to downtown areas being the most likely place for poor, uneducated, or social misfits to converge with conventional individuals. His finding makes sense. Most neighborhoods are sectioned or segregated largely due to income and sometimes race. People spend most of their time at home or at their place of employment. Therefore, unless the individuals were living in a disadvantaged neighborhood they would not come into contact with people of a different race/ethnicity or social class. Moreover, when these individuals commute to the city for work or for entertainment their chances of encountering their opposite is heightened. In turn, according to Wikstrom (1995) this increases their chances of becoming victims of crime. Further, he reports that Stockholm a large metropolis of Sweden,

has large concentrations of public drunkenness, drug use, vandalism, prostitution (which is legal in Sweden), and street harassment. All of which have been identified in previous research and earlier in this paper as forms of disorder. With the likelihood of victimization increasing when individuals travel to urban areas, paired with higher concentrations of disorder, it is likely to produce higher levels of fear of crime (Wikstrom, 1995).

Despite the vast amount of scholarship on fear of crime, it remains unclear which of the aforementioned characteristics are better explanations of the fear of crime. Fear of crime is affected by many different variables. However, it is important to understand whether such fear is driven by individual characteristics or their assessments of the environment surrounding them. The theories discussed previously purport that disorder causes feelings of uneasiness and can promote illegal or non-normative behaviors at both the individual level and at the neighborhood level. However, it is unclear if disorder has the same results at the city level. If abandoned homes and prostitutes soliciting in neighborhoods, for instance, promote criminal activity and frightens residents, it would be a plausible hypothesis that these same forms of disorder would generate comparable feelings of fear of crime. This study aims to examine the proximate causes of fear of crime. Importantly, the study will first examine individual characteristics and their relationship with fear of crime. Second, environmental factors such as neighborhood disorder and its influence on fear of crime will be examined. Finally, city characteristics and their impact on fear of crime will be assessed. The goal of the current research is to underscore if and how these factors relate to individual fear and which of these factors are most important to individual fear of crime.

Research Questions

Previous sections of this paper discussed research that was very extensive to individual characteristics and neighborhood characteristics. A current limitation of this research is that studies on city-level characteristics and fear of crime are not as readily available. With this limitation in mind, the following research questions will be addressed.

1. What specific individual-level characteristics have a statistically significant impact on fear of crime?
2. What specific neighborhood-level characteristics have a statistically significant impact on fear of crime?
3. What specific city-level characteristics have a statistically significant impact on fear of crime?
4. Which characteristics serve as better predictors of fear of crime when they are all (individual, neighborhood, and city) considered simultaneously?

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The current research examines whether individual characteristics or structural characteristics better account for fear of crime. First, an examination of the relationship between individual characteristics and fear of crime will be undertaken. Second, this research will examine the relationship between neighborhood conditions and fear of crime. Third, the relationship between city characteristics and fear of crime will be considered. Finally, the relationship between both individual characteristics and neighborhood and city characteristics and their influence on individuals' fear of crime will be explored to determine whether individual characteristics or environmental context are better predictors of fear of crime.

Data

The proposed research is a secondary data analysis using the NCVS 12 Cities survey data. The data includes individual characteristics, criminal victimization, citizen perceptions, and satisfaction with the local police in 12 cities across the United States. The data collected was a joint effort between the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS). The project collected information from citizens living within the city boundaries using the GENESYS Random Digit Dialing (RDD) telephone methodology. The data was collected using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). The goal of the project was to develop an instrument and methodology that could be used by law enforcement agencies to collect information on criminal victimization, attitudes toward that police, their willingness to report crime, and to measure

the impact community-oriented policing practices have on the community, crime, and neighborhood conditions as well as individuals level of fear of crime in their neighborhoods and cities. The twelve cities that were selected were selected because they each had police departments that represented varying stages in the development of community policing. The cities included in the study were: Chicago, Illinois; Kansas City, Missouri; Knoxville, Tennessee; Los Angeles, California; Madison, Wisconsin; New York, New York; San Diego, California; Savannah, Georgia; Spokane, Washington; Springfield, Massachusetts; Tucson, Arizona; and Washington, D.C. The data collection took place over a four month period beginning in February, 1998. The survey was validated by calculating the variance by using the replication method. Each sample case was assigned a replicate code and then the samples were reweighted thirty times. The jackknife formula was then used to determine the overall sample estimator based on each reweighted replicate sample estimators. The target data sample was at least 800 households per city. Table 1 is a summary of the target and actual number of respondents of households and persons in the study. The total number of respondents in the sample of this study totaled 9,327 households comprising of 13,918 persons.

Table 1

Total Number of Respondents for NCVS 12-Cities Sample

City	Households		Persons	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Total	10,449	9,327	19,200	13,918
Chicago, IL	885	790	1,600	1,124
Kansas City, MO	884	798	1,600	1,162
Knoxville, TN	844	756	1,600	1,198
Los Angeles, CA	881	844	1,600	1,121
Madison, WI	840	731	1,600	1,162
New York, NY	866	744	1,600	1,059
San Diego, CA	868	791	1,600	1,131
Savannah, GA	891	766	1,600	1,245
Spokane, WA	875	801	1,600	1,239
Springfield, MA	894	771	1,600	1,231
Tucson, AZ	878	813	1,600	1,233
Washington, DC	843	722	1,600	1,013

Source (*NCVS 12 Cities*)

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in this study is fear of crime; specifically, the respondents' perception in regards to fear of crime in their neighborhoods and in their cities. Their responses were coded as the following: 1 Very fearful, 2 Somewhat fearful, 3 Not very fearful, 4 Not at all fearful, B Blank, D Don't know, R Refused. For all of the variables the blank, don't know, and refused responses will be counted as missing data. These items will be reverse coded so that an increase in the number value represents an increase in fearfulness.

There will be three separate models to examine fear of crime: fear of crime on an individual level, considering responses to fear of crime in their neighborhoods, and the other considering fear of crime in their cities.

Independent Variables

The independent variables measured are individual characteristics, neighborhood characteristics, and city characteristics of the twelve cities in the NCVS study. The three different levels of characteristics are further measured in depth. Regarding individual characteristics: age, race/ethnicity, gender, previous victimization (property or violent), education, and income. Regarding neighborhood characteristics: disorder (disorder, presence of homeless/transients) and neighborhood instability. Regarding city characteristics: residential segregation, percentage of female headed households, percentage of poverty, and percentage of unemployment.

Individual Characteristics

The age of the respondents range from 12 to 90 across the samples. Race is categorized as: White, Black or Negro, American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut, Asian or Pacific Islander or other across the sample. Ethnicity is categorized as either of Hispanic origin 1 or not of Hispanic origin 2, or B blank, D don't know, or R refused. Race/ethnicity was coded as non-Hispanic Whites, non-Hispanic Blacks, Hispanics, and non-Hispanic others. Non-Hispanic Whites were used as the reference category because they represent the largest racial group. Gender is coded for 1 male and 0 for female. Other individual characteristics included in the survey were marital status, education, and income. Marital status answers were coded: 1 married, 2 widowed, 3 divorced, 4 separated, 5 never married, B blank, D don't know, and

R refused. Education was categorized by highest grade or year of school attended with 00 being never attended or kindergarten, 01-08 elementary, 09-12 high school, 21-26 college, B blank, D don't know, and R refused. Another measure of education was to determine if the respondent completed the highest grade they attended. Completed highest grade attended was coded as: 1 yes, 2 no, B blank, D don't know, and R refused. Total household annual income was categorized in fourteen different increments with 01 being 5,000 or less, 02 5,000-7,499; 03 7,500-9,999; 04 10,000-12,499; 05 12,500-14, 999; 06 15, 00-17,499; 07 17,500-19,999; 08 20,000-24,999; 09 25,000- 29,999; 10 30,000-34,999; 11 35,000- 39,999; 12 40,000-49,999; 13 50,000-74,999; 14 75,000 or more. Other codes for annual income were B blank, D don't know, and R refused. In regards to previous victimization, respondents were asked whether they had been a victim of theft or attempted thefts, break in or attempted break in, auto theft or attempted auto theft, robbery or attempted robbery, assault or attempted assault, sexual attack or rape, and household victim of vandalism. These questions were grouped into violent victimization or property victimization. Within each group, all of these questions were coded the same - 1 yes, 2 no, B blank or missing, D don't know, and R refused. Individuals that reported experiencing any form of victimization were coded as 1 while those not reporting any victimizations were coded as 0. This variable is not disaggregated further due to the following reasons; some of the areas of previous victimization such as rape are of such low occurrence that the data may not be sufficient to draw any conclusions. Also, in regards to rape and sexual assault, women are more fearful of crime overall.

Neighborhood Characteristics

There are fourteen questions in the survey related to perceived disorder. These questions asked if any of the following were found in their respective neighborhoods: abandoned cars or buildings, neglected or rundown buildings, poor lighting, overgrown shrubs or trees, trash, empty lots, public drinking or drug use, drug sales, vandalism and graffiti, prostitution, panhandling or begging, loitering, truancy, and transients or homeless sleeping on streets. A principal components analysis using a varimax rotation was conducted to uncover the commonality among the items. The results of the analyses revealed two variables: disorder and homeless/transient. It was found that they do not bode well together. In other words, they were found to measure different things. A standardized scale of the individual level factors was created using the average of the z scores of each item. Disorder questions were then separated into two categories measuring neighborhood disorder. The first category is labeled disorder and consists of the questions related to buildings, cars, drinking, drugs, and loitering. The second category is labeled disorder/homelessness which consists of questions regarding panhandling, begging, and the presence of transients in their neighborhoods. All of the disorder questions were coded as 1 yes, 2 no B blank, D don't know, and R refused but will be reverse coded in order for higher values to indicate the presence of these forms of disorder. Neighborhood instability is also included in the analyses since some suggest it contributes to disorder and in turn fear of crime. Skogan (1990) found neighborhoods that had residents moving in and out resulted in heightened disorder. He reports that it leads to abandoned homes which are known to invite disorder and decay.

Neighborhood instability was measured in the data by the amount of time residents lived at their current address and was coded as 1 more than five years, 2 one year to 5 years, 3 six months to 1 year, 4 six months or less, B blank, D don't know, and R refused and will be reverse coded so that they are in ascending order.

City Characteristics

Data on city characteristics were obtained from the Initiative in Spatial Structures in the Social Sciences at Brown University and the Lewis Mumford Center and American Communities Project at the University at Albany websites. This data was not included in the NCVS survey and was collected outside of the survey itself. This was needed due to lack of city-level specific data in the survey. The Dissimilarity Index (or D) is used to measure racial residential segregation which can range from 0 to 100. The higher the D value, the higher the level of segregation between non-Hispanic whites and other racial/ethnic groups. For instance, a White/Black Dissimilarity index value of 0 would mean that black and whites were not segregated at all. A value of 100 would mean that black and whites are completely segregated within each city (Initiative in Spatial Structures in the Social Sciences, 2001).

There are three other city-level characteristics that will be examined: Female headed households, unemployment rate, and the poverty rate. This data was obtained from the 2000 Census Bureau (US Census Bureau, Systems Support Division). Female headed households were measured as a continuous variable (percentage) within each of the 12 cities.

Unemployment rate measures the percentage of unemployed in a given city. It was measured as a continuous variable (percentage of unemployed people) within each of the 12 cities.

Poverty rate measures the percentage of people living below the poverty level. It was

measured as a continuous variable (percentage of people living below the poverty line) within each of the 12 cities. A factor analysis was conducted and found that these two variables do not bode well together.

Table 2 contains the descriptive statistics for the variables included in this study. The youngest age of the survey respondents was 12 and the oldest was 90. On average the respondents were around 42 years. The lowest income was \$5,000 or less a year and the highest income was \$75,000 or more a year. The average income of the respondents was \$30,000-\$34,999 a year. Of the respondents that had been previously victimized around 19% were the victims of property crime and around 6 % were the victims of violent crime. In relation to race and ethnicity, 10% were of Hispanic origin and around 18% were Non-Hispanic Blacks. White was used as the reference group because it represents the largest racial group. In regards to marital status 34% were single or never married. 1% of the survey respondents dropped out of school at grade eight. 25% of the survey respondents ended their education at grade twelve. Around 20% made it to their senior year of college before ending their education. Only 16% made it to some level of graduate school. The minimum length respondents were at their current address was 0 years and the maximum length of time at the current address was 82 years. The average time at current address was 10 years. In relation to racial/ethnic residential segregation; with Hispanics and Whites the minimum amount of segregation was 15, the maximum was 67, and the average was 45. This means that on a scale from 0-100, 0 is no segregation and 100 is completely segregated. With Blacks and Whites the minimum was 25, the maximum was 85, and the average was 57. The descriptive table shows that on average among all cities Blacks and Whites were more segregated

compared to Hispanics and Whites. City characteristics measured were proportion of female headed households, proportion unemployed, and proportion below the poverty level. The city with the lowest amount of female headed households was 21.7% and the city with the highest amount of female headed households was 50%. The average percentage of female headed households was 34%. The city with the lowest amount of those unemployed was 4% and the city with the highest amount of those unemployed was 7%. The average percentage of unemployed was 5%. The city with the lowest percentage of residents below the poverty level was 14% and the city with the highest percentage of residents below the poverty level was 23%. The average percentage of those below the poverty level was 19%.

Table 3 shows the percentage of respondents that were fearful of crime at the neighborhood level and at the city level. About 24% reported being very fearful of crime at the neighborhood level while less reported being very fearful at the city level about 16%. A good amount of respondents reported being somewhat fearful at both levels with neighborhood being 39% and city being about 52%. Around 31% reported being not very fearful of crime at the neighborhood level and about 25% reported being not very fearful of crime at the city level. The lowest amount was found in those reporting not being fearful at all. Only 5% of respondents report not being fearful of crime at the neighborhood level. Those reporting no fear of crime are slightly higher at the city level with around 8% reporting no fear at the city level.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics on the National Crime Victimization Survey 12 Cities Sample, 1998 (N=13,918)

Variable	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>%</i>
Individual Characteristics					
Age	12	90	41.8	18.1	
Income	1	14	10.4	3.64	
Property Victim					19.4
Violent Victim					5.6
Hispanic					10
Non-Hispanic Blacks					17.8
Males					45.4
Never Married					33.7
Highest Grade Attended					
Grade 8					1
Grade 12					25
Senior in College					19.8
Graduate School					15.6
Neighborhood Characteristics					
Disorder	-1.40	2.94	-0.11	0.90	
Disorder/Homelessness	-1.69	2.24	-0.30	0.84	
Residential Stability	0	82	9.86	11.53	
City Characteristic					
Hispanic/White dissimilarity	15.3	67.1	45.36	17.51	
Black/White dissimilarity	24.9	85.2	56.80	19.75	
Proportion female headed households	21.7	50	33.87	8.88	
Proportion unemployed	3.5	6.8	4.84	1.03	
Proportion below poverty level	14.3	23.1	18.91	3.06	

Source: NCVS 12 Cities Study

* Based on the 14 unequal categories of income 1= < \$5,000; 2= \$5,000-7,499; 3= \$7,500- 9,999; 4= \$10,000-12,499; 5= \$12,500- 14,999; 6= \$15,000- 17,499; 7= \$17,500- 19,999; 8= \$20,000- 24,999; 9= \$25,000- 29,999; 10= \$ 30,000- 34,999; 11= \$35,000- 39,000; 12= \$40,000- 49,999; 13= \$50,000-74,999; 14= \$75,000 or more. Due to the extent of missing cases for this variable it was not included in the final analytic models.

Table 3

Response to Fear of Crime Question (% of responses)

	Fear of Neighborhood Crime	Fear of City Crime
Very Fearful	24.4	15.6
Somewhat Fearful	39.1	51.7
Not Very Fearful	31.3	24.8
Not Fearful	5.2	7.9

Hypotheses and Analytical Strategy

This study will address the proximate causes of the fear of crime in one's neighborhood and city. The first set of analyses will examine fear of neighborhood crime, using three models. The first model considers the relationship between individual characteristics and fear of neighborhood crime. The second model will examine both individual and neighborhood characteristics to determine which are better predictors of fear of crime in the neighborhood. The second set of analyses will examine the proximate causes of fear of crime within the city. Again, the first model will consider individual characteristics solely while the second model will consider both individual and neighborhood and city context and their impact on fear of city crime. The type of analytical tool used in this study will be **Ordinal Logistic Regression (OLR)**. OLR was chosen since the dependent variable is not dichotomized. OLR is also a powerful tool because it takes into account that the dependent variable is ordinal (categorized). Using this analytical strategy, we can estimate the significance that each of the independent variables has on the dependent variable. There will be four models used in this study. First, OLR will be used where fear of crime is regressed against the individual-level characteristics. Second, OLR will be used where fear of crime is regressed against the neighborhood-level characteristics. Third, OLR will be used where fear of crime is regressed against the city-level characteristics. The final model will consider the individual and contextual characteristics simultaneously (Norusis, 2012). With these models in mind, the following hypotheses can be expected:

1. Individual-level characteristics

- a. Older individuals are more fearful of crime than younger individuals.
- b. Blacks are more fearful of crime than whites.
- c. Females are more fearful of crime than males.
- d. Single individuals are more fearful of crime than married individuals.
- e. More affluent individuals have a lower fear of crime than poorer individuals.
- f. Educated individuals are less fearful of crime than those with less education.
- g. Previous victimization has a positive relation to fear of crime with persons with previous victimization having a higher fear of crime than those not previously victimized.

2. Neighborhood-level characteristics

- a. Neighborhoods that have higher levels of disorder produce higher levels of fear of crime than neighborhoods with lower levels of disorder.
- b. Neighborhoods with higher populations of homelessness and transients produce higher levels of fear of crime than neighborhoods with lower populations of homeless and transients.

- c. Neighborhoods with higher levels of instability produce higher levels of fear of crime than neighborhoods with lower levels of neighborhood instability.

3. City-level characteristics

- a. Cities that are more segregated have higher levels of fear of crime than cities that are less segregated.
- b. Cities with more female headed-households have higher levels of fear of crime than cities with less female headed-households.
- c. Cities with high unemployment levels have higher levels of fear of crime than cities with lower unemployment rates.
- d. Cities with higher levels of poverty have higher levels of fear of crime than cities with lower poverty levels.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine characteristics of individuals, neighborhoods, and cities to determine which factors predict fear of crime. The current study provided four detailed models to determine which factors have the most significant impact on fear of crime. The effects of micro and macro conditions on fear of neighborhood crime and city crime are analyzed.

Fear of Neighborhood Crime

The effects of individual characteristics on fear of neighborhood crime are shown in Model 1 of Table 4. Beginning with demographic characteristics, of those considered gender, race, and ethnicity are significant predictors of fear of neighborhood crime. Males are more fearful of crime in their neighborhoods than are females ($b=0.549$). Individuals of Hispanic origin, Blacks, and Non-Latino Others are less fearful of crime than are Whites. Next, the effect of victimization on fear of crime is examined. Victimization is divided into two categories: property victimization and violent victimization. Property victimization has a strong effect on fear of crime within the neighborhood ($b=-0.380$). Those that were victims of property crimes are less likely to fear neighborhood crime than were non victims. Similarly, violent victimization has a strong negative effect on fear of crime ($b=-0.367$). Interestingly, age, marital status and educational attainment are not significant predictors of fear of crime in the models shown. However, in baseline models (not shown) that considered these factors separately, age was a significant predictor of fear of crime but this relationship is no longer significant when victimization risks is considered. Similarly, educational status is a

significant predictor of fear of crime but likely interact with age and gender given that once these characteristics are considered, education no longer has a significant impact on fear of neighborhood crime. The effects of individual and neighborhood characteristics on fear of neighborhood crime are shown in Model 2 of Table 4. This model takes into account the aforementioned individual characteristics and includes the neighborhood characteristics of disorder and homeless/transients as well as residential stability. The individual demographic characteristics race, ethnicity, and gender all remain significant predictors of crime when considering neighborhood characteristics. Marital status also becomes a significant predictor of fear of crime when neighborhood characteristics are considered, in that single individuals are significantly more fearful of crime than are other groups. The previous victimization characteristics differ from the individual model. Previous property victimization remains a significant predictor of fear of crime, while previous violent victimization is no longer significant once neighborhood context is taken into account. In spite of these significant individual characteristics, neighborhood context is also a significant predictor of fear of crime. Two of the neighborhood characteristics, disorder ($b=-0.360$) and homeless/transients ($b=-0.558$), considered in this model are negatively related to fear of crime. This model shows that as these types of neighborhood disorder increase, fear of crime at the neighborhood level decreases. To validate the results, individual OLR models were performed with no other variables considered. Each of the variables when regressed with fear of neighborhood crime produced a significant negative relationship independent of each other and also when combined with each other. Residential stability is not a significant predictor of fear of crime.

Table 4

Ordinal Logistic Regression Models Predicting Fear of Neighborhood Crime				
Variable	Model 1 (N=12,032)		Model 2 (N=9,008)	
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>
Individual Characteristics				
Age	0.001	0.001	-0.002	0.002
Male	0.549***	0.035	0.622***	0.041
Hispanic	-0.396***	0.060	-0.379***	0.069
White (reference group)				
Black	-0.287***	0.047	-0.171**	0.056
Others	-0.349***	0.079	-0.276**	0.095
Married (reference group)				
Single	0.017	0.043	0.186***	0.052
Divorced/Separated	-0.074	0.051	0.065	0.061
Widowed	-0.004	0.081	0.021	0.099
Property Victim	-0.380***	0.042	-0.237***	0.05
Violent Victim	-0.367***	0.074	-0.123	0.086
Education level (Highest Grade Attended)	0.010	0.036	0.047	0.043
Neighborhood Characteristics				
Disorder			-0.360***	0.024
Disorder Homelessness			-0.558***	0.024
Years lived at current address			0.004	0.002
<hr/>				
Nagelkerke Pseudo R-squared	0.042		0.133	

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Fear of Crime in the City

Due to the lack of previous literature on fear of crime at the city level, the same individual characteristics are analyzed to determine which (if any) are significant predictors of fear of city crime. Also, to determine whether individual or contextual characteristics are the most significant predictors of city crime, the models must also account for the effects neighborhood and city characteristics on this fear. First, the effects of individual predictors of fear of city crime are shown in Model 3 of Table 5. Many of the individual predictors (race, ethnicity, gender, and previous victimization) are significant predictors of fear of crime in one's city. Their effects differ from those found in analyses related to fear of neighborhood crime. This model shows that Blacks and Hispanics are more fearful of crime in their city than are other racial or ethnic groups. Gender, while still a significant predictor of fear of crime, changes when fear of crime of one's city is examined. This model shows that males are more fearful of crime in their cities than are females. Age is positively related to fear of crime ($b=0.010$), in that older respondents are more fearful of crime in their city than are younger respondents. Marital status is also a significant predictor of fear of city crime with single and divorced/separated respondents reporting greater levels of fear than married people. The same is true of education level. Education level is negatively related to fear of crime ($b=-0.282$), showing that respondents with less education are more fearful of city crime. Victimization is a significant predictor of fear of crime at the city level, but unlike the findings for neighborhood fear of crime, these relationships are positive. Those who were victimized were more fearful of crime in their city.

Lastly, the effects of individual, neighborhood, and city characteristics on fear of crime are shown in Model 4 of Table 5. The individual characteristics (age, ethnicity, gender, marital status, education, and previous victimization) all remain significant predictors of fear of crime in the city. Race, however, becomes an insignificant predictor of fear of crime when neighborhood and city contexts are considered. Next, the neighborhood characteristics are analyzed with the effects of disorder differing from fear of crime at the neighborhood level. Unlike the findings for neighborhood fear and in line with previous research on fear of crime, disorder exerts a positive effect on fear of crime ($b=0.149$) in this model. The presence of homeless/transients in the community is not a significant predictor of fear of city crime. It is important to point out; however, than in a baseline model including just this variable, it is a positive and significant predictor of fear of city crime but is no longer significant once the proportion of residents living below the poverty level for the city is taken into account. Finally, city characteristics are considered. There are two types of disadvantage that are discussed. The first are measures of economic disadvantage (proportion unemployed, proportion below the poverty level, and the number of female headed households). The next are measures of racial inequality (black/white dissimilarity, and Hispanic/white dissimilarity) which measures the amount of residential segregation between the groups. Economic disadvantaged, regardless of how it's measured – the proportion unemployed, living below the poverty level and female headed-households – significantly increases fear of crime in the city. Lastly, measures of racial inequality at the city level had disparate effects on individuals' fear of city crime. As residential segregation between Hispanics and Whites increases, so too does fear of crime in the city. This shows that the more the two ethnic

groups are separated, the higher the level of fear. The opposite is true for Black/White segregation. The amount of city dissimilarity of Blacks and Whites has a negative effect on fear of crime. This shows that the more the two races are integrated within a city, the higher the level of fear of crime.

Table 5

Ordinal Logistic Regression Models Predicting Fear of City Crime				
Variable	Model 3 (N=11,937)		Model 4 (N= 8,945)	
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>
Individual Characteristics				
Age	0.010***	0.001	0.008***	0.002
Male	-0.660***	0.036	-0.676***	0.042
Hispanic	0.421***	0.063	0.170**	0.074
White (reference group)				
Black	0.411***	0.050	0.090	0.062
Others	0.102	0.082	-0.045	0.099
Married (reference group)				
Single	-0.250***	0.045	-0.371***	0.054
Divorced/Separated	-0.112**	0.053	-0.127**	0.063
Widowed	-0.119	0.086	-0.092	0.105
Property Victim	0.267***	0.044	0.222***	0.052
Violent Victim	0.353***	0.077	0.321***	0.089
Education level (Highest Grade Attended)	-0.282***	0.038	-0.299***	0.045
Neighborhood Characteristics				
Disorder			0.149***	0.024
Disorder Homelessness			0.041	0.026
Years lived at current address			0.002	0.002
City Characteristics				
Proportion unemployed			0.109***	0.025
Proportion below poverty level			0.048***	0.009
Proportion of female headed households			0.017***	0.003
Hispanic/White dissimilarity			0.016***	0.002
Black/White dissimilarity			-0.004**	0.002
Nagelkerke Pseudo R-squared		0.068	0.128	

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The literature base and knowledge on the relationship between individual characteristics and fear of neighborhood crime is vast. However, few studies have considered these factors simultaneously (for exceptions see Scarborough et al., 2010). The current study aimed to add to the extant literature by not only considering the effects of individual and neighborhood characteristics on fear of neighborhood crime but also by examining the effect of individual and environmental characteristics on fear of city crime.

Before discussing the findings of this study we will revisit the hypotheses. The hypotheses for fear of neighborhood crime are as follows: older individuals are more fearful of crime than younger individuals, blacks are more fearful of crime than whites, females are more fearful of crime than males, single individuals are more fearful of crime than married individuals, more affluent individuals have a lower fear of crime than poorer individuals, educated individuals are less fearful of crime than those with less education, previous victimization has a positive relation to fear of crime with persons with previous victimization having a higher fear of crime than those not previously victimized, neighborhoods that have higher levels of disorder produce higher levels of fear of crime than neighborhoods with lower levels of disorder, neighborhoods with higher populations of homelessness and transients produce higher levels of fear of crime than neighborhoods with lower populations of homeless and transients, and finally neighborhoods with higher levels of instability produce higher levels of fear of crime than neighborhoods with lower levels of neighborhood instability. The individual demographic level hypotheses stay the same for fear of crime at

the city level. Hypotheses for fear of crime at the city level are as follows: cities that are more segregated between all races and ethnicity have higher levels of fear of crime than cities that are less segregated, cities with more female headed-households have higher levels of fear of crime than cities with less female headed-households, cities with high unemployment levels have higher levels of fear of crime than cities with lower unemployment rates, and lastly cities with higher levels of poverty have higher levels of fear of crime than cities with lower poverty levels.

Individual Predictors of Fear of Crime

The results of this study show that age is not a significant predictor of fear of crime at the neighborhood level. This is not consistent with the current literature base. Scarborough et al. (2010) found that age, when considered alone was not a significant predictor of fear of crime. However, when neighborhood context was taken into account age became a significant predictor of fear of crime. Age, however, is shown to be a significant predictor of fear of crime at the city level. The results show that age is positively related to fear of crime, with older respondents being more fearful of city crime. This is in line with the extant literature base (Clemente & Keiman, 1977; Keane, 1992; Scarborough et al., 2010). The disparate results between neighborhood and age could be contributed to the rationale that the elderly might feel safer in their neighborhoods compared to their cities. Gender is shown to be a significant predictor of fear of crime. The gender that is more fearful of crime varies between fear of neighborhood and fear of city crime. Males were found to be more fearful of crime in their neighborhoods while females were found to be more fearful of crime in their cities. The contradictory results of fear of neighborhood crime could be due to the types of

neighborhoods the respondents in this study live in. Males might be more fearful in that they might be involved in riskier behaviors in their neighborhoods compared to females. They might also take on the role of the protector which could incite fear. It stands to reason that females would be more fearful of crime in their city compared to their neighborhood. Their neighborhoods are more familiar places than their cities. Unfamiliar locations could incite fear with females because they may feel more vulnerable to crime.

Race is shown to be a significant predictor of fear of crime in the neighborhood and city when only individual, and neighborhood characteristics are included. Whites are more fearful of crime in their neighborhoods while blacks are more fearful of crime at the city level. Race, however, is not a significant predictor of fear of crime when measures of structural and economic disadvantage are considered. These results are somewhat consistent with previous literature (Clemente & Kleiman, 1977; Ortega & Myles, 1987; Scarborough et al., 2010). Scarborough et al. (2010) found similar results in their study on fear of crime. They found that race alone was a predictor of fear of crime but when neighborhood context and attitudes were included the relationship became insignificant. It appears that race is a predictor of fear of crime but the relationship is limited. When other factors are considered the significance between race and fear of crime decreases. The results of this study show that ethnicity and its effects on fear of crime cannot be absolutely defined given the difference in the relationships to fear on the neighborhood and city levels. The results could purport that Hispanics are less fearful in their own neighborhoods but they are afraid of crime in their city as a whole. These findings are not consistent with the limited amount of research found. Scarborough et al. (2010) found that there was no relationship between those of Hispanic

origin and fear of crime. Hispanics may be less fearful of crime in their neighborhoods because they are more familiar with their neighbors and their surroundings compared to their city.

Lastly, marital status, educational attainment, and prior victimization are significant predictors of fear of crime. Marital status is mainly a predictor of fear of city crime. The results of this study show that married people are more likely to be afraid of crime in their city. These findings are somewhat contrary to the limited amount of literature on marital status and fear of crime. Keane (1992) reported that single individuals are more fearful of assault. It is proposed that married individuals may be more fearful of crime in their cities because they are not as familiar or integrated with their cities as they are with their neighborhoods. Neighborhood context must also be taken into account. The neighborhood the individual comes from could certainly affect the way the individual perceives fear at the city level. Marital status may not matter as it relates to neighborhood context. In that, individuals may be well integrated and familiar with their neighborhoods, therefore living alone or being alone would not matter as much in the neighborhood context as it does in the city context. Further, single individuals might have greater exposure in the city than those of married people. Therefore, they might not perceive their risk of victimization to be high because they are more familiar with their cities.

Education level is only a significant predictor of fear of city crime. People who have attained higher education are less fearful of crime in their city. As predicted, victimization is a significant predictor of fear of crime. The literature, on previous victimization is mixed. Some report that it does have an effect on fear of crime while others report that it does not

(Gainey et al., 2010; Wanner & Caputo, 1987). This study presents different relationships between victimization and its effects on fear of neighborhood or city crime. Those who have been victimized (violent or property) are less fearful of crime in their neighborhoods than those who have not been previously victimized. On the other hand those that were previous victims (violent or property) were more fearful of crime their city than those who were not victimized. Previous victims of crime in their neighborhoods may be desensitized or accustomed to crime in their neighborhoods. Thus, it is not something that would contribute to their fear because it has happened to them before. Alternatively, because these individuals may not be as integrated in their cities as they are in their neighborhoods their previous victimization might bring on anxiety of being re-victimized and fear of crime in general.

Contextual Predictors of Fear of Crime

The majority of the contextual characteristics considered in this study are significant predictors of fear of crime. Disorder is a significant predictor of fear of crime, but its impact is different across neighborhood fear and city fear. Disorder is negatively related to fear of neighborhood crime, but positively related to fear of city crime. This is inconsistent with previous literature. Disorder has been shown in previous literature to have a positive relationship to fear of crime with higher levels of disorder producing fear of crime (Franklin et al., 2008; Gainey et al., 2010; Kelling & Bratton, 1998; Kohn, 2009; Skogan, 1990; Wilson & Kelling, 1982). The difference in this study could be related to the types of neighborhoods considered. Respondents within those neighborhoods could be used to the types of physical and social disorder in their neighborhoods and therefore their fear of crime there decreases. Individuals are desensitized to their environment the longer they live in that environment.

Suppose a person lives in a home in a disorderly neighborhood for ten plus years. The neighborhood would not look as bad to the person that has lived there for so long.

Conversely, someone who did not live in that neighborhood may perceive that neighborhood as much more disorderly than the person that has lived there for years. The same reasoning can be applied as to why disorder was significant and positive at the city level. Individuals may not frequent their cities often; as a result any type of disorder that is present may seem more conspicuous because they are not accustomed to seeing disorder.

The last contextual characteristics considered in this study are measures of economic and structural disadvantage at the city level. This study shows, as predicted, that all of the measures of disadvantage are significant predictors of fear of crime. The results show that as all of the measures of economic disadvantage (unemployment, poverty, female headed households) rise, so does fear of crime in the city. Structural disadvantage is also a significant predictor of fear of crime with levels of ethnic and racial segregation within the city impacting the fear of crime.

This study proves that it is not so much the individual characteristics, but more so the contextual characteristics that have the largest impact on fear of crime. The Nagelkerke Pseudo R-squared value for Model 2 in Table 4 which is just individual and neighborhood characteristics is 0.133 which is greater than that of the Model 4 in Table 5 is 0.128. This shows that contextual factors are not only important but have the greatest explanatory power when fear of crime is considered. Model 1 in Table 4 and Model 3 in Table 5 which are comprised of only individual characteristics have lesser Nagelkerke Pseudo R-squared values than those that contain either neighborhood characteristics or all characteristics combined.

This shows that individual characteristics alone are limited in explaining the relationship with fear of crime. These findings give hope to policy makers because it is the contextual and environmental factors that can be changed. Another important finding is the significant relationship between measures of disadvantage and segregation in the city. All were positive and significant predictors of fear of crime. Fear of crime in the combined model at the city level were found to be more consistent with previous literature than that at the neighborhood or city level alone.

Next policy implications will be discussed that will take these findings into account to change people's perceptions of fear of crime and how time, effort, and resources can be directed in order to accomplish this. Many may still be wondering why it matters to understand the interaction between the predictors of crime. Why do we need to know who is most afraid of crime when all things are considered? What will understanding the predictors of fear of crime do for society? As Warr (2000) puts it, in order to change or at least control fear of crime we have to understand where it originates and why it originates. He reports that it is not necessarily fear of crime, per se, that we are controlling, rather the causes of fear of crime that increase an individual's perceived risk. By understanding the factor(s) that predict fear of crime at all levels we can seek to eliminate or curb the power they have over citizens. As was discussed earlier, a person's fear of crime most of the time is not equivalent to their actual risk of crime. If we can discern the causes of fear then we can decrease the amount of fear individuals have while educating the public on the reality and prevalence of crime. When citizens understand their likelihood of becoming a victim of crime is not as likely as they once believed it will hopefully decrease some of the aforementioned consequences of

fear of crime. Education to the public on crime would lead to more informed political decisions, decisions that are based on facts rather than fears. Further, policy makers, law enforcement officials, and neighborhood organizers could spend resources and time on the predictors of fear of crime such as poverty, unemployment, disorder, and etcetera.

Wilson and Kelling (1982) believed that if the police were concerned with protecting citizens they needed to be concerned with fear of crime. The best way they believed to do this was to work on decreasing the amount of social and physical disorder within a community (Greene & Taylor, 1988). Wilson and Kelling (1982) were onto something. While disorder is not the primary concern of this study, it is a correlate of fear of city crime. As the results showed, the contextual features had the greatest explanatory power. It showed that disorder, homelessness, and neighborhood instability are very important to fear of crime. Decreasing incivilities like physical and social disorder in neighborhoods and cities may prove to decrease the amount of fear citizens have as previous research has shown. Nevertheless, the importance of the police working in the community cannot be overstated. If law enforcement partnered with communities to educate the public on crime and victimization, and spent resources and developed programs to aid with education and job training and opportunities, fear of crime would decrease. Along with fear of crime, crime rates could also decrease. Time and energy spent working on troubled areas, disadvantaged areas, may not only decrease fear of crime but also decrease crime in and of itself. Things like neighborhood watch, city wide clean up days, and community policing could certainly decrease fear of crime. With fear of crime decreasing, citizens would be more apt to venture

from their residences and become more involved members of their society whether that is at the neighborhood or city level or both.

Despite the contributions of the present study, several limitations warrant further research on fear of crime. First, the NCVS 12 Cities data was collected in 1998; in essence the data is fourteen years old. It is important to use more current data to examine whether or not these factors are proximate causes of fear contemporarily. For example, the effects of fear of crime may have changed since 1998. Technological advances such as the wide use of cell phones has become prevalent in recent years. This advancement could certainly have an effect on independence and safety. More individuals may be apt to venture outside their routine activities because their cell phones can act as a safety precaution.

In preliminary analyses income is found to be a significant predictor of fear of crime in all models tested much like previous research has shown (Keane, 1992; Rountree, 1998). These findings did not change the significance of the other characteristics' findings. However, income was not included in the final analyses due to the extent of missing cases for this variable. Another limitation of this data is that it was limited to 12 cities in the United States. All of the cities were selected because they had a police department that was in some stage of the community policing, and this factor alone may have impacted fear of crime in that those cities with more active community policing activities might have fewer residents who are fearful of crime. Moreover, 12 cities is a very limited number of cities to be surveyed in the United States, it is not a comprehensive sample and the results cannot be generalized to every city in the United States. One reason being that the cities sampled were all fairly large cities. Had other cities been taken into account, smaller ones perhaps, the

results may have been different. City composition is another limitation of this study. The data was limited to city residents. The way the city is made up and laid out could certainly skew the results. Some cities may be wealthier than others. Some cities, like Kansas City, have a very mixed landscape in regards to income. Affluent neighborhoods such as Brookside are in close proximity to disadvantaged neighborhoods. All were included in this study because they were found within the city limits of Kansas City. This definitely skews the results of the study. Those in Brookside or in close proximity to the Plaza would have very different ideas and fears of crime compared to those living on Prospect or Troost. Future studies could use MSAs or Metropolitan Area which includes urban and suburban communities. Future studies could also include rural areas. An interesting direction in future research would be to examine fear of crime on specific neighborhoods and their respective fear of crime in their cities. That would take into account fear of neighborhood and city crime individually while respecting the relationship and interaction that exists between the variables.

The questions regarding fear of crime within neighborhood and city cannot be directly linked to the amount of disorder. Therefore, we do not know whether or not the neighborhoods had high levels of disorder. We only know if individuals were fearful of crime and if individuals had disorderly neighborhoods. Future research should ask more specific questions regarding disorder in neighborhoods and the resident's respective fear of crime, thus linking disorder and perceived fear of crime. Further, previous studies have not distinguished between which type of fear of crime they are measuring (fear of city crime or fear of neighborhood crime). Future studies on fear of crime should be specific in which level

of fear of crime they are measuring. Fear of crime, as this study has highlighted, may not be the same at the neighborhood and city levels.

While this study has many limitations it has certainly added to the literature base. It has provided a detailed and yet comprehensive look at fear of crime at the individual, neighborhood, city level, and measured the interaction these variables have when considered collectively. This study shows that an individual's fear of crime can be combated by policy makers focusing on the contextual characteristics such as city structural and economic disadvantage. Hopefully this has given hope to researchers concerned with fear of crime because this study has shown some consistencies as well as some inconsistencies with previous research. Fear of crime is not only limited to an individual's characteristics but also a product of individuals' assessment of their surrounding environment as well as the level of structural disadvantage of their cities.

References

- The Associated Press. (2008, July 23). Hall pleads guilty in kelsey smith slaying. Retrieved from <http://www.kmbc.com/news/16967006/detail.html>
- Chadee, D. (2003) Fear of crime and risk of victimization: An ethnic comparison. *Social and Economic Studies*, 52 (1), 73-97
- Clemente, F., & Kleiman, M.B. (1977). Fear of crime in the United States: A multivariate analysis. *Social Forces*, 56 (2), 519-531
- Disorder. 2012. In *Merriam-Webster.com*. Retrieved January 28, 2012, from www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/disorder
- Ferraro, K.F. (1996). Women's fear of victimization: Shadow of sexual assault? *Social Forces*, 75(2), 667-690
- Franklin, T. W., Franklin, C.A., & Fearn, N.E. (2008). A multilevel analysis of the vulnerability, disorder, and social integration models of fear of crime. *Social Justice Research*, 21 (2), 204-227
- Gainey, R., Alper, M., & Chappell, A.T. (2010). Fear of crime revisited: Examining the direct and indirect effects of disorder, risk perception, and social capital. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36 (2), 120-137
- Garofalo, J. (1973). The fear of crime: Causes and consequences. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 72 (2), 839-857
- Green, J.R., & Taylor, R.B. (1988). Community-based policing and foot patrol: Issues of theory and evaluation. In Green, J.R., & Mastrofski, S.D, *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality*. 195-233. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Hipp, J.R. (2010). A dynamic view of neighborhoods: The reciprocal relationship between crime and neighborhood structural characteristics. *Social Problems*, 57 (2), 205-230
- Initiative in Spatial Structures in the Social Sciences. (2001). *Metropolitan Racial and Ethnic Change*. Retrieved February 26, 2012, from www.s4.brown.edu/cen2000/WholePop/WPsegdata.htm
- Keane, C. (1992). Fear of crime in Canada: An examination of concrete and formless fear of victimization. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 34(2), 215-224

- Kelling, G.L., & Bratton, W.J. (1998). Declining crime rates: Insiders' views of the New York City story. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 88 (4), 1217-1231
- Kohm, S.A. (2009). Spatial dimensions of fear in a high-crime community: Fear of crime or fear of disorder? *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 51 (1), 1-30
- LaGrange, R.L., & Ferraro, K.F. (1989). Assessing age and gender differences in perceived risk and fear of crime. *Criminology*, 27 (4), 697-719
- Like, T.Z. (2011). Urban inequality and racial differences in risk for violent victimization. *Crime & Delinquency*, 57 (3), 432-457
- Liska, A.E., & Baccaglioni, W. (1990). Feeling safe by comparison: Crime in the newspapers. *Social Problems*, 37 (3), 360-374
- Liska A.E., Lawrence J.J., & Sanchirico, A. (1982). Crime as a social fact. *Social Forces*, 60 (3), 760-770.
- Norusis, M.J. (2012). Ordinal regression. *IBM SPSS Statistics 19 Advanced Statistical Procedure Companion*, 5, 69-89
- Ortega, S.T., & Myles, J.L. (1987). Race and gender effects on fear of crime: An interactive model with age. *Criminology* 25 (1), 133-152
- Pain, R.H. (1997). Social geographies of women's fear of crime. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, New Series, 22 (2), 231-244
- Rountree, P.W. (1998). A reexamination of the crime- fear linkage. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 35 (3), 341-372
- Saad, L. (2011). Most Americans believe crime in the U.S. is worsening. Retrieved from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/150464/americans-believe-crime-worsening.aspx>
- Sampson, R.J. & Raudenbush, S.W. (2004). Seeing disorder: Neighborhood stigma and the social construction of "Broken Windows". *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 67 (4), 319-342
- Scarborough, B.K., Like-Haislip, T.Z., Novak, K.J., Lucas, W.L., & Alarid, L.F. (2010). Assessing the relationship between individual characteristics, neighborhood context, and fear of crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 819-826
- Shaw, C., & McKay, H.D. (1942). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas*. Chicago: The

- University of Chicago Press.
- Skogan, W.G. (1986). Fear of crime and neighborhood change. *Crime and Justice*, 8, 203-229
- Skogan, W. G. (1990). *Disorder and decline: Crime and the spiral of decay in American Neighborhoods*, Los Angeles: University of California Press
- Stafford, M.C., & Galle, O.R. (1984). Victimization rates, exposure to risk, and fear of crime. *Criminology*, 22(2), 173-185
- Stanko, E.A. (1995). Women, crime, and fear. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 539, 46-58
- Taylor, R.B. & Covington, J. (1993). Community structural change and fear of crime. *Social Problems*, 40 (3), 374-397
- Tjaden, P. & Thoennes, N. (2006). Extent, nature, and consequences of rape victimization: Findings from the national violence against women survey. *National Institute of Justice*, 1-41.
- Truman, J.L. (2011). *National crime victimization survey criminal victimization, 2010*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- U.S. Census Bureau, Systems Support Division. (n.d.). *Census 2000 Gateway*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html>
- U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2010). Uniform crime report; crime in the united states, 2010. Retrieved from website: <http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crimein-the-u.s/2010/crime-in-the-u.s.-2010>
- Wanner, R.A., & Caputo, T.C. (1987). Punitiveness, fear of crime, and perceptions of violence. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 12 (4), 331-344
- Warr, M. (1990). Dangerous situations: Social context and fear of victimization. *Social Forces*, 68 (3), 891-907
- Warr, M. (2000). Fear of crime in the United States: Avenues for research and policy. *Criminal Justice*, 4, 451-489.
- Wilson, J.Q., & Kelling, G. (1982, March). Broken windows. *Atlantic*, 29-38.

- Wikstrom, P.H. (1995). Preventing city-center street crimes. *Crime and Justice*, 19 (1), 429-468
- Wittebrood, K., & Nieuwebeerta, P. (2000). Criminal victimization during one's life course: The effects of previous victimization and patterns of routine activities. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 37(1), 91- 122
- Young, V.D. (1992). Fear of victimization and victimization rates among women: A paradox? *Justice Quarterly*, 9 (3), 419-441

VITA

Courtney Jene Cauldwell was born on December 24, 1987 in Springfield, Missouri to the parents of Brent and Pam Colley. She received her education in the Willow Springs School District and graduated from Willow Springs High School in 2006. Courtney continued her education at the University of Missouri- Kansas City, receiving her Bachelor of Arts in Psychology in 2009. In August of 2010, Courtney was accepted into the master's program at the University of Missouri-Kansas City.

As Courtney continued her education, she interned at the Jackson County Courthouse in the Victim Services unit. She also volunteered at the Johnson County Courthouse working with advocates and attorneys in assisting victim's needs.

Outside of volunteering, Courtney worked at Johnson County Adult Detox Unit. There she was involved in assisting those that are drug and alcohol dependent in obtaining treatment along with other needs such as housing and mental/medical assistance. Upon completion of Courtney's degree, she plans on becoming a probation officer.