

AD-A171 913

FEAR OF CRIME AMONG MILITARY PERSONNEL IN DIFFERENT
RESIDENTIAL SETTINGS(U) AIR FORCE INST OF TECH
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB OH J K FIEDOR 1986


1/2


UNCLASSIFIED

AFIT/CI/NR-86-142T

F/G 5/10

NL





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS
BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER AFIT/CI/NR 86- 142T	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Fear of Crime Among Military Personnel in Different Residential Settings		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED THESIS/DISSERTATION
7. AUTHOR(s) Josephine Karen Fiedor		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS AFIT STUDENT AT: California State University Sacramento		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE 1986
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 91
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASS
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: IAW AFR 190-1

John E. Wolaver
JOHN E. WOLAVER
Dean for Research and
Professional Development
AFIT/NR

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

DTIC
ELECTE

SEP 17 1986

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

ATTACHED ...

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

86 16 100

AD-A171 913

DTIC FILE COPY

FEAR OF CRIME AMONG MILITARY PERSONNEL
IN DIFFERENT RESIDENTIAL SETTINGS

Josephine Karen Fiedor
B.A., University of Nevada, Las Vegas



THESIS

Submitted in partial satisfaction of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

CRIMINAL JUSTICE

at

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

Summer
1986

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

86 9 16 120

FEAR OF CRIME AMONG MILITARY PERSONNEL
IN DIFFERENT RESIDENTIAL SETTINGS

A Thesis

by

Josephine Karen Fiedor

Approved by:

Thomas R. Phelps, Chair
Thomas R. Phelps

James M. Poland, Second Reader
James M. Poland

Date: 17 July 1986

Name of Student: Josephine Karen Fiedor

I certify that this student has met the requirements for format contained in the Manual of Instructions for the Preparation and Submission of the Master's Thesis or Master's Project, and that this thesis or project is suitable for shelving in the Library and credit is to be awarded for the thesis or project.

Thomas R. Phelps
Thomas R. Phelps
Graduate Coordinator

19 July 1956
Date

Department of Criminal Justice

Abstract
of
FEAR OF CRIME AMONG MILITARY PERSONNEL
IN DIFFERENT RESIDENTIAL SETTINGS
by
Josephine Karen Fiedor

Statement of Problem

Fear of crime has become a serious problem in the United States. Many studies are being conducted in civilian communities to determine the amount of fear people are experiencing, who are the fearful, and the causes of fear. This study was conducted to determine if military personnel who reside on a military base feel safer living in that environment than personnel living in a civilian community.

Sources of Data

A literature review of books, journals and other articles pertaining to fear of crime was accomplished. Additionally, data collected from a 27-question self-administered survey was used. The survey was administered to 200 military personnel living either in military housing at Mather Air Force Base, California, or in the community of Rancho Cordova, California during March 1986.

Conclusions Reached

Military personnel who live in base housing at Mather AFB feel safer in that environment than personnel living in the community of Rancho Cordova. No significant difference existed between the responses between males and females, however a very small number of females were available to survey. The majority of military personnel surveyed, 58% wanted to reside on base when they arrived, however only 23% had immediate on base housing available. The most important reason military members wanted to live on base was due to financial considerations. The fact the base provides a safe environment was the second reason they would choose to live on base. Further research should be directed toward determining the causes of fear of crime among military personnel in order to develop effective fear reduction programs. In addition, this study only examined the level of fear experienced by military personnel assigned to one geographic location where housing was located on the main portion of the base.

Committee Chair's Signature of Approval

Theresa R. Phelps

Dedication

To Pearl and Andy Fiedor, my mom and dad.

Acknowledgements

I sincerely thank the following people for assisting me during the preparation of this study.

Colonel Bruce R. Johnson, Commander, 323d Air Base Group, Mather Air Force Base, California, and members of his staff; without their assistance, the survey research would have been impossible.

To the many men and women assigned to Mather Air Force Base who took the time to complete and return the survey.

To Dr. James M. Poland, for his initial suggestion which gave me the idea for this study.

To Dr. Thomas R. Phelps, for his helpfulness and support throughout the year.

Finally, to P.J. Ancker for editorial assistance.

Table of Contents

	Page
Dedication	v
Acknowledgements	vi
List of Tables	x
Chapter	
1. The Problem	1
Introduction	1
Need	1
Purpose	2
Hypotheses	3
Terms and Definitions	3
Overview	4
Notes	5
2. Review of Literature	6
Introduction	6
Background and Historical Information	6
Major Issue: Quality of Life	12
Review of Theories	13
Conflicting Sociological Models	14
Utilitarian Model of Behavior	15
Psychological Model	16
Opportunity Theory	16

Causes of Fear	17
Fear Reduction Strategies	21
Policy Issues	23
Discussion of Previous Research	25
Summary	26
Notes	28
3. Design of the Study	32
Introduction	32
The Sample	32
Measures	34
Design	36
Testable Hypotheses	36
General Research Questions	37
Analysis	38
Summary	39
Notes	40
4. Analysis of Results	41
Introduction	41
Section I	41
Results of Research Hypotheses	41
General Research Questions	53
Section II	57
Discussion of Results	57
Discussion of General Research Questions	64
Summary	66

5. Summary	69
Introduction	69
Literature Review	69
Design of Study	70
Results of Analysis	71
Conclusions	74
Implications for Future Research	75
Notes	79
Appendix A	80
Bibliography	87

Tables

Table		Page
4.1	Perceived Crime Rate in the U.S. in Response to: "Within the past year do you think crime in the U.S. has increased, decreased, or remained the same?"	42
4.2	Perceived Crime Rate in the Neighborhood in Response to: "Within the past year do you think crime in your neighborhood has increased, decreased, remained the same?"	43
4.3	Fear of Crime and Perceived Safety at Night in Response to: "How safe do you feel or would you feel being alone in your neighborhood at night?"	44
4.4	Fear of Crime and Perceived Safety During Daytime in Response to: "How about during the day? How safe do you feel or would you feel being alone in your neighborhood?"	45
4.5	Perceived Dangerousness of Neighborhood in Response to: "Is your neighborhood environment dangerous enough to make you think about moving somewhere else?"	46
4.6	Perceived Dangerousness of the Neighborhood in Response to: "How do you think your neighborhood compares with others in terms of crime?"	47
4.7	On Base Fear of Crime and Sex of Respondent in Response to: "How safe do you feel or would you feel being alone in your neighborhood at night?"	48
4.8	Off Base Fear of Crime and Sex of Respondent in Response to: "How safe do you feel or would you feel being alone in your neighborhood at night?"	49
4.9	Limiting of Behavior in Response to: "In general, have you limited or changed your activities in the past few years because you were afraid of crime?"	50
4.10	Evaluation of Police Performance in Response to: "Would you say your local police are doing a(n) _____ job?"	51
4.11	Reporting Crime to Police in Response to: "If you were the victim of any crime would you report it to the police?"	52

4.12	Reason Neighborhood Chosen As Place to Live in Response to: "Which is the most important reason why you selected this particular neighborhood to live?" 53
4.13	Perceived Problems in Neighborhood in Response to: "Is there anything you don't like about your neighborhood?" 54
4.14	Why People Would Choose To Reside on Base in Response to: "What would be the main reason you would choose to live in base housing?" 55
4.15	How Many People Wanted to Live On Base in Response to: "Did you want to live in base housing when you arrived at this base?" 56
4.16	How Many Had Base Housing Available in Response to: "Was base housing available when you arrived?" 56

CHAPTER 1

The Problem

Introduction

Today, "fear of crime" has become an important issue in the United States. It is important because it can affect almost anyone. Fear is causing the elderly to be afraid to leave their homes, women to fear walking the streets at night, and people to invest millions of dollars in security equipment. Fear of crime has the potential to break communities apart, cause self-protective isolation, and undermine our American democratic values.

Many studies have been conducted in the civilian sector to address the fear of crime. Research has been directed at establishing who are the fearful, the causes of fear, and how people are coping with the fear of crime. These studies have been conducted in the civilian community as a whole. The military residential community is a unique environment. It has not been examined to see the affect fear of crime has on these residents in comparison to those military members living in the civilian community.

Need

Many studies have been conducted to determine the level of "fear of crime" people in the civilian community experience. These studies have been conducted in order for criminal justice programs to be

developed to reduce crime and the fear of crime. It is equally important for military officials to be aware of the effectiveness of programs initiated to provide a safe environment for military members and their families. Public opinion plays an important role in the planning process; sensitivity to public opinion can be a key to success for programs geared toward crime reduction, and maintaining a high sense of safety.

If fear of crime is a problem with any military member, whether on the installation or in the civilian community, it is important for supervisory personnel to be aware of such information in order to provide assistance. Neighborhoods are important if, for no other reason, they circumscribe people's lifespace for a significant fraction of the nonworking day. Therefore, a need exists to evaluate the effect that place of residence has on military members' fear of crime.

Purpose

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the fear of crime affecting the military population. This thesis will be an attempt to compare attitudes of military members residing in two different living environments: a civilian community and the military installation residential housing community. A military member, and his/her family, who is forced to live off base may be experiencing fear that could possibly be affecting their ability to accomplish their military duties. Military members have a vital role to play in this nation's defense; therefore, these individuals must not be troubled by concerns that jeopardize a high sense of reliability.

Hypotheses

Several specific hypotheses will be tested in this study. The data collected through the use of a self-administered survey will be used to test each hypothesis. At this time only a broad overview of the research hypotheses will be identified. The specific hypotheses to be tested will be stated in Chapter 3.

1. Opinions about crime trends will be the same for both residential settings.
2. Military personnel residing in the military housing community will express lower levels of fear.
3. Military personnel living off base are more apt to feel their neighborhood is dangerous enough to make them think about moving.
4. Personnel living on base will indicate their neighborhood is less dangerous in terms of crime than off base residents.
5. Females will express more fear than males.
6. Behavior indicators of fear, such as limiting or changing of activities, will be greater for military personnel living in the civilian community.
7. Attitudes about the police will indicate military personnel living on the base feel more favorable toward the police.
8. Regardless of where military personnel live they would report a crime to the police.

Terms and Definitions

To ensure clear understanding of this thesis, the following terms are defined:

1. Crime is a violation of the criminal law, whether or not the act is detected, reported, or officially acted upon.¹

2. Fear of Crime is an emotional reaction characterized by a sense of danger and anxiety about physical harm or property loss/damage.²

3. Neighborhood is defined as the general area in which a person lives. The boundaries of this area are whatever each individual feels is his/her neighborhood.³

4. Installation is a Federal military base.

5. Military Housing Community is the area on a Federal installation specifically designed to house active duty military and their families.

6. Attitude will be used in a very broad, non-technical sense when referring to attitudes, beliefs, or opinions about crime. It will not be used when referring to specific factual situations.

Overview

In Chapter 2 a review of the literature on fear of crime will be presented. Specifically, background and historical information, and several theories about the fear of crime, to include causes and preventive strategies. Chapter 3 contains the design of the study, to include information about the study sample, measurement methodology, hypotheses to be tested, and the type of analysis to be used. Chapter 4 will detail the results of the data analysis gathered through a self-administered survey questionnaire. Finally, Chapter 5 is a summary of the research findings and recommendations.

A review of the pertinent literature to this research will be reviewed next.

Notes

¹ Joan McDermott, "Crime in the School and in the Community: Offenders, Victims, and Fearful Youths," Crime and Delinquency 29 (April 1983): 271.

² James Garofalo, "The Fear of Crime: Causes and Consequences," The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 72 (1981): 840.

³ M.J. Hindelang, M. Gottfredson, and J. Garofalo, Victims of Personal Crime: An Empirical Foundation For A Theory Of Personal Victimization (Cambridge, Mass: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1978), p. 172.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

Introduction

Fear of crime has been a major topic among residents and researchers in the United States since the mid-60s. There have been numerous studies conducted to evaluate the environmental effect on people's fear of crime.¹ Although these studies were conducted in civilian communities across the United States, the concepts examined can hopefully be utilized in evaluating the fear of crime experienced by military personnel in different residential settings. The data on fear of crime is almost exclusively limited to collection through either national opinion polls or surveys designed to evaluate specific crime reduction programs.²

Throughout the review of literature evidence is found to support the facts that fear of crime is more distinctive in certain groups of people, and their living environments. In order to evaluate the fear experienced by military personnel the knowledge of previous work in this area will be discussed in order to give direction in this research.

Background and Historical Information

Charles E. Silberman wrote in Criminal Violence, Criminal Justice "In any society beset by violence, there is a danger that people's desire for safety and order may override every other consideration; the

United States has avoided that mistake so far".³ It appears he may be eluding to the fact that people may take the law into their own hands in order to protect themselves if the threat of violence becomes too severe.

Silberman contends people are not afraid of violent crime because of numbers alone; street crime is less dangerous than riding in an automobile, which people do without apparent concern. Chances of being killed in an automobile accident are ten times greater than those of being murdered. A reported five million people were injured in 1973, as a result of vehicle accidents, and 24 million hurt in home accidents, of which four million received disability. Radio and TV newscasts are filled with crime reports not accident reports. Silberman states that, "violence at the hand of a stranger is far more frightening than a comparable injury incurred in an automobile accident or fall; burglary evokes a sense of loss that transcends the dollar amount involved."⁴

Millions of people throughout the United States are afraid of becoming the victim of criminal violence. Manifestations of fear are permeating our existence. We see people's visible reaction to fear everyday: locked doors, increased gun sales, and empty streets. Two Americans in five who live in large cities, are afraid to go out alone at night. The chances of being robbed have more than tripled since the 1960s, which is also compounded by the fact that criminals today are becoming more vicious when committing a crime.⁵ Since the beginning of time violence has been one of the most durable aspects of the American way of life, however Silberman feels this offers "no comfort to victims of crime, or to those who live in fear of being attacked."⁶

When the colonies were first settled violence was present and continues to be prevalent in America today. Records documented by a Philadelphian in 1844 read, "people were arming themselves because experience taught them not to expect protection from the law."⁷ The fact that fear of victimization has existed for a long time can be demonstrated by Los Angeles' recorded forty-four murders in a fifteen-month period in 1850 with a population of 8,000.⁸ It is now evident that people are now concerned with the impact of fear of victimization on society.

Every man, woman, and child in the United States has the potential of becoming a "fear of crime" statistic. No one is immune to this problem. It is due to fear of becoming a victim of crime that the American way of life is slowly being paralyzed. People fear the thought of becoming a victim of a criminal act, physical harm, or losing personal property. With the increasing threat of terrorism, comes a new wave of fear: people are afraid to fly, visit foreign countries, and enjoy the once-safe and peaceful ocean cruise.

The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence Task Force on Individual Acts of Violence, Crimes of Violence, explains rather well why the fear of crime is incontestable regardless of what statistics may show. They write:

To millions of Americans few things are more pervasive, more frightening, more real today than violent crime and the fear of being assaulted, mugged, robbed, or raped. The fear of being victimized by criminal attack has touched us all in some way. People are fleeing their residences in cities to the expected safety of suburban living. Residents of many areas will not go out on the street at night. Others have added bars and extra locks to windows and doors in their homes.

Wesley Skogan, in the book, Reactions to Crime, explains fear of victimization as an "expressed attitude and a psychological state provoked by an immediate sense of personal risk--while individuals hold beliefs about crime, they feel danger".¹⁰ He further explains fear in terms of a physiological state which can be "triggered when we encounter fear-provoking stimuli--perhaps a band of youths, or a dilapidated street".¹¹

People develop individual images about the environment around them, which result in how people react to certain things. In the mid-60's opinion polls began measuring people's feelings about crime. It was during this same time frame that sociologists began to document research in the area of fear of crime. Perhaps this was the result of rising crime rates or the outcry of citizens. Polls used to determine facts about people's fear found that most people feel crime is increasing regardless of the crime statistics. In 1967 the Harris Poll recorded 46 percent of the population felt crime had increased in the areas where they lived. The same opinion polls find that people feel serious crime, such as robbery, is increasing and, overall, viewed serious crime as a more prevalent problem in other parts of the country outside their own neighborhoods.¹² M. J. Hindelang and others found a small difference in percentage between victims and non-victims in their beliefs about crime.¹³ In conjunction with this fact, Frank Furstenberg found that people over-estimate the seriousness of crime, and those who live in a low crime area are the most likely to request public action against crime.¹⁴

Historically the manner in which researchers have measured fear

of crime is by asking people to anticipate how they felt or would feel about such things as walking alone in their neighborhood at night or during the day. Because street incidents are most important in the public's eye, there is an advantage in evaluating fear based on how safe one feels at night. Marvin Wolfgang found, with regard to the seriousness of crime, that physical injury and use of a weapon outweighed all levels of financial loss.¹⁵ This manner of measuring fear has naturally been challenged by some critics as to the real validity of such measurement. One argument is that these measurements do not measure fear of crime but, instead, "other things besides people's reactions to the risk of crime itself".¹⁶ Secondly, it has been suggested that fear of crime is an "irrational attitude" unrelated to the reality of crime because of the emotionalism that clouds people's responses.¹⁷

Furstenberg made a contribution to the conceptual clarification between concern about crime and fear of victimization, hoping to provide an adequate definition. He criticized the Harris Poll surveys and Crime Commission studies in America because he felt the two concepts were interchangeable. He felt that, "fear of crime can be measured by a person's perception of their own chances of victimization, whereas concern is based on the individual's estimation of the seriousness of criminal activity in his locality or society".¹⁸ He basically viewed it as a person expressing feelings of concern over crime that is reported, but will not necessarily be afraid of personal victimization. Fear of crime is thus fear of victimization.¹⁹ Fear can be interpreted as a product of perceived threat rather than actual threat.

R. Sundeen and J. Mathieu defined fear of crime as "the amount of anxiety and concern that persons have of being a victim".²⁰ Stinchcombe and others stated, "fear requires that we be able to recognize that we have entered a high risk situation so that we can be afraid in advance, not just when danger suddenly appears."²¹ Patterns of street activity, the amount of vandalism, the visible characteristics of people seen on the street, and the physical character of the environment are all clues people use to associate with danger, and which cause fear. Personal violence is considered fear-provoking because it is seemingly random and most of the time it is out of an individual's control. The potential for a person to be seriously injured in street crime is very real. During one's normal day-to-day activities it is difficult to avoid becoming the victim of crime, once targeted by a criminal, without taking extra security precautions.

Another important aspect that has questioned the validity of measuring fear of crime as a rational response to crime is the relationship between the levels of victimization reported by women and the elderly and their high levels of reported fear. Recent research has explained this discrepancy as rational due to the fact that less-victimized people may fear the "potential consequences of victimization rather than its sheer frequency."²² Disparities about measuring the actual amount of fear of crime can be threatened by the simple facts of life. For example, the fact that women indicate they are afraid about three times more often than men has been attributed to the fact men are reluctant to admit fear, for it would be a threat to their masculinity, in most cases, to do so.

Major Issue: Quality of Life

The criminal justice system's attempt to reduce crime has been without success. It is now estimated by many researchers on the subject of fear of crime, that even if a reduction in crime is achieved, the fear that is prevalent in citizens throughout the United States will go unchanged. The fear of becoming the victim of a crime is important because it is a major social problem in this country. John Conklin exemplifies the importance of the problem by stating, "as fear becomes manifest in the avoidance of strangers, sociability, mutual trust and the willingness to help others disappears...a serious erosion in the quality of life in the United States will happen."²³ There has been much discussion over the theories of what causes crime, why certain people become criminal, and how to prevent crime. Finding a solution to reducing people's fear will be just as difficult for various reasons. The most obvious reason is everyone is affected by fear differently and for different reasons. Research has found some similarities in the demographic factors—who are the most fearful, but no clear resolutions as to why, only theory and speculation. Hartnagel states, "there is a link between fear and various delirious psychological states, such as anxiety, mistrust, alienation, dissatisfaction with life, and even mental disorders; and to various social states, such as breaking down of social cohesion".²⁴ When reports show 60% of women are afraid to walk alone in their neighborhoods, society is indeed faced with a serious problem. The quality of life in a community should be measured by how many people feel safe to live in their neighborhoods without feelings of fear. In the past, most of the criminology studies have centered around

the causes of crime. Recently a turn has been made toward the compensation for victims. In 1967 the President's Commission on Law Enforcement commented on the fact that there was inadequate research "on the determinants of anxiety over possible victimization".²⁵ As a result little is known about how to combat fear.

C. Green, in 1980, stated, "there will come a point where any further increase in safety of a situation means going without so many other things that an increase in safety is not worth having... ultimately the value of any increase in safety is a value judgment."²⁶ Because of crime people are paying the price of fear by having to forgo chances to employ and enjoy the opportunities created by urban life. They are staying home, away from parks, avoiding public transportation and public facilities, and spending millions of dollars for a sense of safety. The impact of crime and why this issue is important can be summarized by the following comments from a South Philadelphia Black woman which were printed in November 1976:

People used to sit on their steps in the evening, doors were open. How the streets are deserted early in the morning and after dark. My mother used to go to church every morning—she stopped doing it—she is afraid of having her purse snatched. Many church and social activities here have stopped—people won't go out at night.²⁷

Review of Theories

It is necessary at this time to discuss several theories which have had and are having an impact on fear of crime studies. Perhaps one of the most important theories is the Durkheim and Conklin conflict over the effect of crime and fear on a community. There are many theories that have surfaced with an attempt to explain why people are fearful. A

few of these theories will also be examined. The work by Wesley Skogan, J. Brooks, J. Henig and M. Maxfield on "stranger fear" will be examined. Additionally, social integration theory, social diversity, fear and victimization relationship, vulnerability and fear, and crime rate and fear will also be reviewed. And, because of the apparent interest in its use for reducing fear, the environmental design theory by Jane Jacobs and Oscar Newman will be discussed in relation to its recent impact in the area of fear reduction. Finally, a discussion will be offered about several key policy issues surrounding some of the works previously mentioned in this chapter.

Before any further discussion on the fear of victimization is presented, it is perhaps important to discuss Skogan's article concerning attitudes and behavior. Skogan identifies several important theories about what people think about crime, their reaction to coping with crime, and the fear that results.²⁸

Conflicting Sociological Models

There is some conflict in the Sociological Model between two well-known sociologists about the relationship between the fear of crime and individual responses to it. French sociologist, Emile Durkheim, and J. E. Conklin have two opposing views about the relationship. Durkheim states that crime can cause people to function integratively, to "do something" collectively or individually into a community of solidarity, and therefore strengthen the informal social control exercised in part through crime prevention by the collectivity.²⁹ Durkheim, therefore, views the positive effects of crime.

Conklin, on the other hand, views fear of crime as a means of eroding a community's ability to exercise social control. Specifically, Conklin feels, "fear of crime generates insecurity, suspicion, and withdrawal from community affairs".³⁰ Results of such behavior causes less interaction among neighbors, lack of confidence in police, less use of community facilities, and more importantly, a community is unable to control juveniles and strangers in their neighborhoods, all of which lead to an increase in crime. Therefore, Conklin emphasizes the negative consequences of crime. This results in individuals taking the opposite measures Durkheim mentioned and reacting accordingly--such as move from the area or develop personal precautionary measures. Currently empirical research has been found to favor Conklin's theory.³¹ The consistent view by most researchers is crime is not seen as a motivating force to positive responses but more the reverse.

Utilitarian Model of Behavior

This is an important theory when discussing the fear of crime because it identifies the fact that, "there is no such thing as cost-free crime avoidance".³² This behavior model signifies that individuals conduct a cost-benefit analysis against acceptable risk when deciding how much they are willing to spend to reduce the risk of victimization. The purchase of a security system or a handgun may be viewed as expensive to some but they are willing to spend this amount to reduce their felt risk of victimization. People living in a higher income bracket will be more likely to select the more expensive measures. For those unable to afford security systems and guns, the alternative is non-dollar costs such as isolation and withdrawal to avoid

victimization. Albert Biderman and others wrote, "what economists label opportunity costs for feeling safe probably are far greater economic burdens of crime for these citizens than the direct costs of victimization".³³ Paul Lavrakas, Furstenberg, Skogan and Maxfield all support this theory through their research. They found that people with money undertake higher-cost tactics regardless of their risk, and the poor remain in a high-risk, low-cost status.³⁴

Psychological Model

Psychologists have a theory about human prevention behavior that can be helpful in explaining people's reaction to the threat of crime. One model is labeled the "Health-Belief Model"(HBM). This model basically explains that people's reaction for protection is based on three factors: risk, seriousness, and efficacy.³⁵ These three factors work together to explain why people will be likely to take some action if they can prevent or reduce a problem, and if it appears feasible. The HBM believes people are rational therefore, they will have a desire to lower their risk, but will do so, only if they believe what they do has some benefit.

Opportunity Theory

This theory is a look at the political aspects of what people can do about crime based on the opportunity afforded.³⁶ Politics play an important part in determining what options people have available to them to feel safe in their neighborhoods. The political and economic opportunities, particularly in low income neighborhoods, are often nonexistent. The ability to get better police protection, safer public

transit, or eliminate street gangs is lacking without political support. Unless an important political representative is pushing for the improvement of a neighborhood, there is normally continued crime problems and no professional leadership. No matter how badly a neighborhood desires to improve it's situation, people feel continually constrained--knowing what they want, but unable to achieve it.

Causes of Fear

In presenting this issue it should be noted that throughout the literature review it was found that researchers are without disagreement on several key facts. Additionally, those same authors are quoted and cited by others. There does not appear to be too much disagreement between scholars, only personal opinion. Perhaps this is due to the fact reasearch on the fear of crime is relatively new.

The most fearful group of citizens is the elderly and women, followed by urban residents.³⁷ In general populations, a correlation between race and fear of crime was evident.³⁸ The size of the city and place of residence varies consistently and has had an impact on fear.³⁹ Although women and the elderly are the most fearful they are the least victimized. Characterized as, "the 'paradox of fear' this is one of the mostly widely cited facts about the fear of victimization".⁴⁰ This topic will be discussed in more detail later.

Perhaps one of the most popular issues in this area is how being a victim of crime has an impact on a person's fear level. Skogan and Maxfield assert that, "victims are more fearful than those who have not fallen prey".⁴¹ It has been documented that personal victimization, such as robbery--the offense most strongly related to fear--produces

more fear than that generated by perhaps a burglary. Surprisingly, researchers report this relationship is little affected by the number of victimizations.⁴² Skogan and Maxfield also found that fear generated by victimization has a tendency to affect the victim and can be transmitted to friends of a victim.⁴³

There are those who do not agree with Maxfield and Skogan's view that victimization causes fear. Robert S. Agnew supports the view that the relationship between fear and victimization is weak. Agnew argues: "victims often employ certain beliefs or 'techniques of neutralization' to convince themselves that their particular victimization was not harmful".⁴⁴ Some of Agnew's techniques include denial of injury, responsibility, vulnerability, belief in a just world, and appeal to high loyalties.⁴⁵

The issue of crime-rate impact on fear has been researched by many and the contention is: high or low crime rates do not necessarily result in corresponding levels of fear.⁴⁶ Garofalo contends there is a strong relationship between crime rates and fear, as measured by the Uniform Crime Reports; however, Skogan and Maxfield only found some correlations between fear of crime and crime rates in surveys comparing Chicago neighborhoods.⁴⁷ They contend there is stronger data to support the fact that incivility in a neighborhood affects fear levels more than actual crime statistics. There is still some discussion as to whether there is a substantial correlation between fear and crime rates, and whether or not they affect each other. Those disagreeing contend the issue remains debatable because there are too many other factors

influencing fear levels such as economic conditions, racial composition, incivility, etc.

The President's Commission and many other studies on the fear of crime have concluded that fear may be the result of xenophobia, the fear of strangers.⁴⁸ Merry expanded this idea to include neighborhoods, indicating that people are more likely to fear strangers.⁴⁹ Brooks contends "the man in the street is most afraid of being victimized by a criminal stranger".⁵⁰ Skogan clarified this point by stating:

The fear of crime is mixed up with a number of other fears and aggravations which plague the lives of big-city residents....Part of this has to do with the fear of strangers. Strangers are unpredictable: we do not understand their motives and we do not know what they may do. In this sense, people of a different race or class are stranger than those who are not. As a result, the fear of crime is intermingled with racial fears and class distinctions.⁵¹

Another theory explaining what makes people fearful, regardless of the incidence of crime, is the assumption that the amount of "incivility" in a neighborhood affects people's fear. Dan Lewis and Maxfield state their data supports the fact, "fear of crime is exacerbated by signs of disorder, or incivility, perceived by neighborhood residents; however, these various signs of incivility may have little to do with the actual amount of serious crime".⁵² Supporting their contention is the fact relatively few people are victims of serious crime, but they do witness behavior that is not criminal in nature such as loitering teenagers, abandoned buildings, skid row denizens, etc. These observations cause people to believe the social controls of the neighborhood, such as the police, are not working, therefore, the rationalization to be fearful is reinforced.

Biderman and others provide support to this theory and concludes that, "attitudes of citizens regarding crime are less affected by their past victimization than by their ideas about what is going on in their community--fears about a weakening of social controls on which they feel their safety".⁵³

Closely related to these issues on the cause of fear is the work conducted on "social diversity". Leslie W. Kennedy and Robert Silverman, two associate professors at the University of Alberta in Edmonton, Canada, conducted extensive research in influence of perceived social diversity on fear of crime among urban residents. Supported by reported findings of Hartnagel, Lee, Antunes and others, they contend that, "fear derives from uncertainty in the environment and from a perception of threat to personal safety".⁵⁴ They use the term "perception of social diversity" to mean that a person develops feelings about their neighborhood based on whether or not they feel the people who live there are different. Their hypothesis: that a socially-heterogeneous neighborhood would raise the level of fear. Their research examined two points: if there was a social benefit to forced integration in neighborhoods, and to clarify the fear of crime debate over whether the living environment, if heterogeneous, impacted fear of crime levels. They concluded from the result of their empirical study that, "perceived social mix has less to do with fear of crime than we had hypothesized".⁵⁵

At this time it appears appropriate to discuss Skogan's theory of vulnerability and fear in conjunction with the "paradox of fear". The paradox is the fact that women and the elderly are the most fearful

group in society, however they are the least victimized. Practically every scholar mentioned throughout this article has developed an explanation for this fact.

Maxfield and Skogan state there are two dimensions in explaining vulnerability to crime—that of physical and social.⁵⁶ Physical vulnerability includes such things as powerlessness to resist attack, risk of traumatic physical consequences if attacked, and openness to attack. Support for this explanation is found in S. Riger and M. Gordon's work where they found women and elderly felt physically vulnerable and were more fearful.⁵⁷ Skogan and Maxfield found, as did others, that people in more vulnerable categories report higher levels of fear. However as previously mentioned, women and elderly are consistently reported as having a low actual victimization rate. One explanation for this is the fact that increased fear causes people to take added precautions, resulting in lower exposure and low victimization rates. The elderly are more likely to stay home because of their fear, or take extra precautions such as travelling in company of others and only by the safest routes, avoiding crime areas.

Fear Reduction Strategies

Examination of current research being conducted in the fear of crime area has highlighted some prevalent theories and practical application of strategies to understand and reduce fear.

Jane Jacobs, author of Death and Life of Great American Cities, felt the "social integration" of a community played an important role in reducing fear. Jacobs argues, "peace and order do not derive from the activities of the police, but from an intricate, almost unconscious

network of voluntary controls and standards among the people themselves."⁵⁸ Her contention that social interactions will reduce fear has support from several scholars. In one study, Springer, Ley and Cybriwsky, found in communities where residents are engaged in street surveillance they are more likely to have lower crime, and residents are less fearful.⁵⁹ Additionally, fear of crime is lower where residents felt concerned about each other, were willing to help the police, and would report a crime if observed.⁶⁰ Jacob's work in physical design has led to considerable debate over the effectiveness of physical design.

Oscar Newman, author of Defensible Space, is perhaps the most quoted scholar in the area of crime prevention through environmental design. His work will be discussed here because of the impact it has had on programs which have reduced the fear of crime people experience. Newman's "defensible space theory" is based on three propositions. First, territoriality, popularized after Robert Ardey, presumes people feel certain areas of space, such as their home, is theirs to defend; second, that natural surveillance can be improved and used by communities; and based on image and milieu, and third, a neighborhood can either present an attractive or deterrent image to would-be criminals.⁶¹

Newman's theory gained much attention and resulted in the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) programs funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and were implemented in various spots throughout the United States to examine the practical application of his theory. Perhaps the most publicized project was the Asylum Hill project in Hartford, Connecticut.⁶²

In James Q. Wilson's book, Crime and Public Policy, an essay by Charles A. Murray provides an excellent summarization of the Newman's work, as evaluated by the American Institute For Research. The following was found:

1) Available evidence does suggest that changes in the physical environment (and especially combinations of changes) can reduce crime and fear of crime. This does not happen consistently; but it does occur.

2) The available evidence does not illuminate the dynamics. Except for simple, almost self-evident relationships (e.g., that stronger doors reduce the risk of burglary), the links remain obscure. Tests of the hypotheses that underlie the surveillance rationales (e.g., the "eyes on the street" hypothesis) have resulted in contradictory findings. The behavioral changes predicted by the community-building rationales (e.g., increase social cohesion) have consistently failed to appear.

3) Because of this lack of cause-effect information, the present knowledge base cannot be used to prescribe solutions. It does not tell whether a given strategy is likely to be effective in a given situation. It does not suggest the kinds or numbers of strategies to use. It does not identify the conditions (if any) under which a design strategy is cost-effective.⁶³

Murray concluded that there are still many unknowns about this theory. He also feels, "that the basic policy question is practical: is there reason to believe that physical design changes can significantly affect the crime problem?"⁶⁴ It must also be emphasized that the American Institute for Research reported, "we believe that changes in the physical environment are probably the fastest way of reducing fear of crime".⁶⁵

Policy Issues

The most obvious policy issue surfacing in the research conducted on fear of crime has to do with crime rates. Policy makers cannot

assume a decrease in fear will happen in conjunction with programs geared to reduce crime rates. James Garofalo is a strong advocate of fear reduction strategies independent of crime rate reduction strategies. His assertions are echoed by many, who contend, as he does, that "policy makers should not necessarily expect a major decrease in the amount of fear if crime is successfully reduced."⁶⁶ He also contends, as do many others, that efforts to reduce fear should be pursued regardless of the crime rates. Any effort to improve the quality of life seems justified. Programs such as increased police patrolling, street lighting projects, and police foot patrols, etc., which do not reduce crime rates, may be more effective in reducing fear.⁶⁷

Another important policy issue is one in which policy makers should utilize the available information about who are the most fearful and concentrate programs toward those groups. Every neighborhood is different and plagued by various fear-producing problems. Lewis and Maxfield found in their study of Chicago neighborhoods evidence that suggests, "there are specific neighborhood differences in the relationship between crime, perceptions of incivility, and concern about crime. Policy makers should focus on neighborhood-level approaches to reducing crime and fear."⁶⁸

The traditional criminal justice approach has been to promote programs such as increased police patrolling and strict drug enforcement to reduce crime. Most scholars are convinced that events causing fear in citizens may require other initiatives, activities which are different than the traditional criminal justice system methods. If

people are fearful because of neighborhood "incivility" efforts to rid the community of abandoned buildings, darkened streets, and loiterers would be an effective resolution.

Discussion of Previous Research

The National Crime Survey(NCS) was used to gather information to integrate public opinion into the planning process of the criminal justice program. The conceptual areas in which data was collected provides an overall preview of findings that will be used to evaluate this study on military members' fear. The results of a 1977 public opinion poll, conducted by the NCS, provides a general basis of information for developing the hypotheses to be used when evaluating military personnel's fear of crime. The findings were as follows:

1) Perceptions of crime trends: Although most respondents in the survey thought that their own chances of being victimized had gone up in recent years, more people perceived rising crime as a national, rather than neighborhood problem.

2) Fear of crime: Respondents in various age, sex, race, and income groups differ considerable in fear of crime, but whether or not one has been the victim of crime during the past year does not appear to have a major effect on fear. In addition, people tend to feel less threatened close to home than in other neighborhoods.

3) Attitudes about crime and respondent behaviors: There is a strong tendency for people to believe that the fear of crime affects other people more than it affects them. The fear of crime does not appear to be a major motivating factor involved in some of the specific behaviors respondents were asked about.

4) Evaluation of local police: Most respondents rated their local police rather highly, even while believing that police performance needed to be improved. Evaluations of the police were not strongly affected by actual experience with victimization, by the belief that crime is increasing, or by fear of crime, but there were major

differences⁶⁹ across race and age groups in the evaluations expressed.

The specific areas of research inquiry with regard to the military member's fear of crime are similiar to those inquiries conducted in the civilian sector. The research to be conducted in this study focuses on the differences in attitude expressed by military personnel in two distinct residential settings. The hypotheses to be evaluated will help determine if place of residence has an impact on military member's fear of crime. In fact, it may be possible to conclude from the research that a significant difference exists in the amount of fear people experience based on the environment in which they live.

The literature supports the fact that demographic factors affect fear levels and, with the increase in environmental studies such as the Hartford Project, the type of living environment may be of importance in evaluating the fear of crime people experience. As mentioned before, the military installation appears to provide an environment that promotes a sense of safety and security for those who live in the residential community of the installation.

Summary

There are no significant disagreements in the research conducted on the fear of crime. The elderly (over age 60), and females are undisputedly the most fearful groups affected by the fear of crime. Additionally, it has been determined through extensive research that a low crime rate does not necessarily provide for a low level of fear.⁷⁰ Although crime rates may account for some of the fear people experience, the signs of disorder and incivility in a neighborhood can have an

impact on residents of a neighborhood regardless of the crime rate. These signs of incivility may be abandoned buildings, teenagers loitering in the streets, and graffiti.⁷¹

Changes in environmental design have demonstrated the largest impact on building social cohesion in neighborhoods in order to reduce fear among residents. The most extensive project, in Hartford, Connecticut, proved that improvements in the physical design of a neighborhood can have a significant impact in controlling the fear level, regardless of the crime rates.

The review of literature on fear of crime and studies in the civilian community will serve as the basis for developing the concepts and methodology for studying fear amongst military members. Due to the already-existing environmental design of military installations, the results of this study should reflect a difference in the responses of military members living on base as opposed to those residing in nearby civilian communities.

Notes

¹ James Garofalo and John Laub, "The Fear of Crime: Broadening Our Perspective," Victimology 3 (1978): 242.

² Terry L. Baumer, "Research on Fear of Crime in U.S.," Victimology 3 (1979): 254.

³ Charles E. Silberman, Criminal Violence, Criminal Justice (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), p. 7.

⁴ Ibid., p. 8.

⁵ Ibid., p. 5.

⁶ Ibid., p. 28.

⁷ Ibid., p. 29.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Thomas A. Reppetto, Residential Crime (Mass: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1974), p. 1.

¹⁰ Dan Lewis, Reactions to Crime (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1981), p. 25.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid., p. 21.

¹³ Ibid., p. 23.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Wesley Skogan and Michael Maxfield, Coping With Crime (Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1981), p. 51.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 26.

¹⁷ Ibid.

- 18 Alan H. Clarke and Margaret J. Lewis, "Fear of Crime Among the Elderly," British Journal of Criminology 22 (January 1982): 51.
- 19 Ibid.
- 20 Ibid.
- 21 Skogan and Maxfield, p. 52.
- 22 D. Lewis, p. 27.
- 23 Frank Clemente and Michael B. Kleiman, "Fear of Crime in the United States: A Multivariate Analysis", Social Forces 56 (1977): 520.
- 24 Sanford H. Kadish, Encyclopedia of Crime and Justice (New York: The Free Press, 1984), p. 765.
- 25 Clemente and Kleiman, p. 520.
- 26 D. Lewis., p. 38.
- 27 Skogan and Maxfield, p. 48.
- 28 D. Lewis, pp. 19-43.
- 29 Ibid., p. 36.
- 30 Ibid.
- 31 Ibid., p. 37.
- 32 Ibid.
- 33 Ibid., p. 38.
- 34 Ibid., pp. 38-41.
- 35 Ibid. p. 40.
- 36 Ibid., pp. 41-42.
- 37 Terry L. Baumer, "Research on Fear of Crime in the United States," Victimology 3 (1978): 255.
- 38 Ibid., p. 256.

- 39 Ibid., p. 257.
- 40 Mark Warr, "Fear of Victimization: Why Are Women and the Elderly More Afraid?" Social Science Quarterly 65 (1983): 681.
- 41 Skogan and Maxfield, p. 59.
- 42 Kadish, p. 765.
- 43 Terry L. Baumer, "Testing A General Model of Fear of Crime: Data From A National Sample," Journal of Crime and Delinquency 22 (August 1985): 242.
- 44 Robert S. Agnew, "Neutralizing the Impact of Crime," Criminal Justice and Behavior 12 (June 1985): 221.
- 45 Ibid., pp. 225-232.
- 46 Jeffrey Henig and Michael Maxfield, "Reducing Fear of Crime: Strategies for Intervention," Victimology 3 (1978): 298.
- 47 Kadish, p. 766.
- 48 Henig and Maxfield, p. 299.
- 49 Ibid.
- 50 James Brooks, "The Fear of Crime in the United States," Crime and Delinquency 20 (July 1974): 241.
- 51 James Garofalo and John Laub, "The Fear of Crime: Broadening Our Perspective," Victimology 3 (1978): 246.
- 52 Dan A. Lewis and Michael G. Maxfield, "Fear in the Neighborhoods: An Investigation of the Impact of Crime," The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 17 (July 1980): 161.
- 53 Ibid., p. 180.
- 54 Leslie W. Kennedy and Robert A. Silverman, "Perceptions of Social Diversity and Fear of Crime," Environment and Behavior 17 (May

1985): 275-276.

55 Ibid., p. 291.

56 Skogan and Maxfield, p. 69.

57 Ibid., p. 70.

58 Henig and Maxfield, p. 301.

59 Ibid.

60 Ibid.

61 James Q. Wilson, Crime and Public Policy (San Francisco: ICS Press, 1983), p. 109.

62 Ibid.

63 Ibid., pp. 110-111.

64 Ibid., p. 111.

65 Ibid., p. 116.

66 James Garofalo, "Victimization and The Fear of Crime," The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 16 (January 1979): 96.

67 Ibid.

68 Lewis and Maxfield, p. 187.

69 James Garofalo, Public Opinion About Crime: The Attitudes of Victims and Nonvictims in Selected Cities (U.S. Department of Justice Reference Service, SD-VAD-1, 1977), p. 11.

70 Jeffrey Henig and Michael Maxfield, "Reducing Fear of Crime: Strategies for Intervention." Victimology 3 (1978): 297-313.

71 Lewis, p. 96.

CHAPTER 3

Design of the Study

Introduction

In recent years research scientists have focused considerable attention upon the fear of crime experienced by civilian populations. However, research has not been focused on the military community environment as an important factor influencing variations in fear of crime. The objective of this study is gather data in order to examine the difference in fear of crime among military personnel living in different residential settings.

The major emphasis of this study will be to compare the perceptions and attitudes about crime held by military personnel using a measure that has been proven effective in previous research designs. The major emphasis of this study is to determine if, in fact, a significant difference exists in fear of crime levels based on the environment in which they live. Therefore, the study will be descriptive rather than explanatory. However, based on the results of the research logical assertions from the data seem possible.

The Sample

Permission was obtained from the commander of the 323 Air Base Group at Mather Air Force Base, California, to administer selected personnel the attached questionnaire.(See Appendix A) The sample

population consisted of military members living in on base military residential housing and military members living in the civilian community of Rancho Cordova, California. The sample frame consisted of two computer listings obtained at Mather AFB. One listing was obtained from the Consolidated Base Personnel Office (CBPO), and the other from the Base Housing Office. In order to obtain two samples--one of members living in the military housing, and one of military members living in Rancho Cordova--two separate listings were used. The Base Housing Office maintains a master list of all military members occupying base housing. This list does not contain a listing of off-base residents; therefore the latter information was obtained through the CBPO. A list of off base military personnel living in Rancho Cordova was identified by using the mailing zip code for that area. Only those members assigned to the base for at least six months were eligible. This time limit was necessary to ensure the members had time to form opinions about the area in which they live.

Two samples of 100 people each were selected employing a systematic sampling method. Stratified sampling was utilized in order to obtain an accurate representativeness of females.¹ The survey instrument was distributed to each individual in March 1986. A letter obtained from the 323 ABG Commander, soliciting respondent cooperation in replying to the survey was attached to each package to increase the percentage of returned surveys. A total of 133 questionnaires were returned; 55 from off base and 78 from on base residents. Instructions, along with a self-addressed return envelope accompanied each survey. It

should be noted, no generalizations will be made to other military bases and surrounding communities from the results of this study.

Measures

A 27-question, self-administered questionnaire was utilized to gather data pertaining to a wide range of attitudinal and perceptual indicators. (See Appendix A) Questions were taken directly from the National Crime Survey, Central Cities Sample Questionnaire, or, in some cases, used only as a model to develop other questions.² Several questions were developed in order to gather general demographic information about the respondents. Fear of crime will be operationalized by responses to questions about perceptions of personal safety based on the community in which military members reside. The place of residence is of primary interest in this study. Questions selected to use in this study have consistently been acceptable to assess perceptions about the fear of crime. Where necessary, military terminology replaced civilian terminology for clarification purposes. Ordinal measurement will be used to measure the different variables in this study. The primary type of questions used were close-ended, along with several contingency-type questions. The following series of questions will serve as the means to measure fear of crime based on several different perspectives:

A. Opinions about crime, in general, held by military personnel.

1. Within the past year do you think crime in the United States has increased, decreased, remained the same?
2. Within the past year do you think crime in your neighborhood has increased, decreased, remained the same?

3. How safe do you feel or would you feel being alone in your neighborhood at night?

4. How safe do you feel or would you feel being alone in your neighborhood during the day?

5. Is your neighborhood environment dangerous enough to make you think about moving somewhere else?

6. How do you think your neighborhood compares with others in terms of crime?

7. In general, have you limited or changed your activities in the past few years because you were afraid of crime?

B. Military personnel attitudes toward the police will be measured by two questions:

1. Would you say your local police are doing a(n) good, average, or poor job?

2. If you were the victim of any crime would you report it to the police?

C. General descriptive research of interest about the fear of crime will be measured by the following questions:

1. Which is the most important reason why you selected this particular neighborhood to live?

2. Is there anything you don't like about your neighborhood?

3. What would be the main reason you would choose to live in base housing?

4. Did you want to live in base housing when you arrived at this base?

5. Was base housing available when you arrived?

Design

The study was designed to measure and analyze the amount of fear military members are experiencing, in either a military residential or civilian community environment. Specifically, by the measurement of variables that have been proven reliable in previous research on fear of crime, this descriptive study will evaluate fear experienced by both groups for comparison purposes. The data gathered from the research questions will be analyzed using simple frequency responses. The unit of analysis for this study will be individuals. A one-time cross-sectional study will be conducted, due to the time constraints involved.

Testable Hypotheses

Based on the review of literature regarding fear of crime a series of testable hypotheses will be examined. The majority of hypotheses will be expressed as alternate, with a few exceptions where the null hypothesis will be retained when no significant difference between samples is expected. The following are the hypotheses to be examined through the research data:

A. Opinions about crime, in general, held by military personnel.

Hypothesis 1: No difference will be found between military respondents opinions about United States crime trends regardless of place of residence.

Hypothesis 2: No difference will be found between military respondents opinion about crime trends in their neighborhoods.

Hypothesis 3: Military members living on base will report lower levels of fear at night than personnel living off base.

Hypothesis 4: Military members living on the base will report lower levels of fear during the day than personnel living off the base.

Hypothesis 5: More military members living off base will report their neighborhood is dangerous enough to make them think about moving more than personnel living on base.

Hypothesis 6: Military personnel living on the base will report their neighborhood is less dangerous in terms of crime than personnel living off base.

Hypothesis 7: Females will report more fear than males regardless of where they live.

Hypothesis 8: More personnel living off base will indicate limitations or changes in behavior due to concern about crime, than personnel living on base.

B. Military personnel attitudes toward the police.

Hypothesis 9: Military personnel living on base will report being more favorable toward the local police than personnel living off base.

Hypothesis 10: No difference exists between personnel living on or off base as to whether or not they would report a crime to the police.

General Research Questions

There were several research questions utilized in order to obtain general interest information about concerns respondents may have about their neighborhood. Specifically, why people selected a certain neighborhood to live, what they do not like about their neighborhood, and why they would choose to live on a military installation.

Respondents were also asked if they desired to live on the base when they arrived, and if such housing was available. These questions were

Hypothesis No.3: Military members living on base will report lower levels of fear at night than personnel living off base.

Table 4.3

Fear of Crime and Perceived Safety at Night in Response to: "How safe do you feel or would you feel being alone in your neighborhood at night?"

Responses	OnBase	Rel%	OffBase	Rel%
Very Safe	49	62.8	5	9.1
Reasonably Safe	27	34.6	33	60.0
Somewhat Unsafe	0	0.0	14	25.5
Very Unsafe	2	2.6	3	5.5
Totals	78	100.0	55	100.0
(N=133)				

Chi square = 48.11326

Significance level = .0000

The difference in responses between on base and off base samples was significant therefore, the hypothesis is accepted. A total of 97.4 percent of the responses from on base personnel indicated feelings of very safe or reasonably safe. Personnel living off base indicated 69.1 percent felt the same way.

used to identify how significant fear of crime was in a person's choice of residence. Additionally, it is an assumption, based on review of literature, one of the reasons that military personnel would choose to live on a military installation is because it provides the type of environment that is less susceptible to crime, therefore people would be less fearful. The military installation and its restricted entry process allows on base entry only to military members, their families, or invited guests. In addition, routine police patrols are provided, housing areas are well maintained, and the residents are homogeneous by virtue of the fact the majority are active duty military. The exact questions that were utilized are as stated earlier in this chapter under measures.

Analysis

The collected data was recorded on optical scan sheets (General Purpose-NCS-Answer Sheet) to be analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), 2nd edition, at the California State University, Sacramento, Computer Center. Simple frequency responses were compiled on all research questions. Data comparisons were then made based on two separate residential settings: the civilian community and the military installation. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 9, was used for the calculation of the chi square test of independence for two samples. The level of significance was established at less than or equal to .05 level.

Summary

A 27-question survey was administered to 200 military personnel stationed at Mather Air Force Base, California. The survey was designed to measure the amount of fear military personnel experience based on where they lived. Samples were selected from personnel who resided in military housing on the installation, and an equal number who resided in the community of Rancho Cordova, California, adjacent to the base. Through the use of the California State University computer, using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), data was compiled and analyzed. Simple frequency responses using cross-tabulations were used. The chi square test for independent samples was used to test the level of significance. The next phase, Chapter 4, will depict the data analysis results.

Notes

- ¹ Earl Babbie, The Practice of Social Research, 3rd ed.
(California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1983), p. 181.
- ² Deirdre A. Gaquin, "Measuring Fear of Crime: The National Crime
Survey's Attitude Data," Victimology 3, nos. 3-4 (1978): 316-319.

CHAPTER 4

Analysis of Results

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an analysis of data obtained from the self-administered questionnaire. The first section of this chapter will be an interpretation of results. The research hypotheses will be restated, with the results of the data shown through cross-tabulation tables of frequency responses and percentages. Each table will include the research question used. Section I will also contain the results of the general research questions to be presented in a similar format. Section II will contain a discussion of the results and a summary of the data analysis.

SECTION I

Results of Research Hypotheses

When the responses from the two samples were obtained, it was the assumption that a statistical level of significance, (.05 or less) would exist between the on and off base samples for several of the questions, specifically, the alternate hypotheses 3,4,5,6,7,8, and 9. The null hypothesis was stated when no significant difference between samples was anticipated: hypotheses 1,2, and 10. The hypotheses will be stated in the same order as presented in Chapter 3. At this time, only results will be presented. The interpretation-of-results section of this

chapter will contain a more detailed analysis of the results.

A. Opinions about crime, in general, held by military personnel.

Hypothesis No.1: No difference will be found between military respondents opinions about United States crime trends regardless of place of residence.

Table 4.1

Perceived Crime Rate in the U.S in Response to: "Within the past year do you think crime in the U.S. has increased, decreased, or remained the same?"

Responses	OnBase	Rel%	OffBase	Rel%
Increased	57	73.1	36	65.5
Decreased	3	3.8	3	5.5
Remained Same	14	17.9	9	16.4
Don't Know	4	5.1	7	12.7
Totals	78	99.9*	55	100.1*
(N=133)				

Chi square = 2.75193

Significance level = .4315

*Totals do not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

The null hypothesis is accepted. The majority of military personnel, in both residential settings, indicated crime is on the increase.

Hypothesis No.2: No difference will be found between military respondents opinion about crime trends in their neighborhoods.

Table 4.2

Perceived Crime Rate in the Neighborhood in Response to: "Within the past year do you think crime in your neighborhood has increased, decreased, or remained the same?"

Responses	OnBase	Rel%	OffBase	Rel%
Increased	16	20.5	16	29.1
Decreased	9	11.5	6	10.9
Remained Same	36	46.2	20	36.4
Don't Know	17	21.8	13	23.6
Totals	78	100.0	55	100.0
(N=133)				

Chi square = 1.78057

Significance level = .6192

The null hypothesis is accepted. Military personnel in both residential settings indicated crime in their neighborhoods remained the same.

Hypothesis No.4: Military members living on base will report lower levels of fear during the day than personnel living off the base.

Table 4.4

Fear of Crime and Perceived Safety During Daytime in Response to: "How about during the day? How safe do you feel or would you feel being alone in your neighborhood?"

Responses	OnBase	Rel%	OffBase	Rel%
Very Safe	64	82.1	23	41.8
Reasonably Safe	12	15.4	27	49.1
Somewhat Unsafe	0	0.0	5	9.1
Very Unsafe	2	2.6	0	0.0
Totals	78	100.0	55	100.0
(N=133)				

Chi square = 28.98030

Significance level = .0000

The difference in responses between on and off base samples were significant, therefore the hypothesis is accepted. A total of 97.5 percent of the on base respondents felt very safe or reasonably safe, in comparison to 90.9 percent recorded by off base responses.

Hypothesis No.5: More military members living off base will report their neighborhood is dangerous enough to make them think about moving more than personnel living on base.

Table 4.5

Perceived Dangerousness of Neighborhood in Response to: "Is your neighborhood environment dangerous enough to make you think about moving somewhere else?"

Responses	OnBase	Rel%	OffBase	Rel%
Yes	1	1.3	18	32.7
No	76	97.4	37	67.3
Don't Know	1	1.3	0	0.0
Totals	78	100.0	55	100.0
(N=133)				

Chi square = 26.48532

Significance level = .0000

The difference in responses between on and off base were significant therefore, the hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis No.6: Military personnel living on the base will report their neighborhood is less dangerous in terms of crime than personnel living off base.

Table 4.6

Perceived Dangerousness of the Neighborhood in Response to: "How do you think your neighborhood compares with others in terms of crime?"

Responses	OnBase	Rel%	OffBase	Rel%
Much More Dangerous	0	0.0	1	1.8
More Dangerous	1	1.3	6	10.9
About Average	4	5.1	23	41.8
Less Dangerous	28	35.9	15	27.3
Much Less Dangerous	43	55.1	4	7.3
Don't Know	2	2.6	6	10.9
Totals	78	100.0	55	100.0
(N=133)				

Chi square = 53.86722

Significance level = .0000

The difference in responses between on base and off base samples were significant, therefore the hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis No.7: Females will report more fear than males, regardless of where they live.

In order to test this hypothesis a comparison between levels of fear will be made between male and females. The data will be compared based on where they live. Table 4.7 will show off base responses and Table 4.8 will show responses made by on base personnel.

Table 4.7

On Base Fear of Crime and Sex of Respondent in Response to: "How safe do you feel or would you feel being alone in your neighborhood at night?"

Responses	Male	Rel%	Female	Rel%
Very Safe	3	8.1	2	11.1
Reasonably Safe	22	59.5	11	61.1
Somewhat Unsafe	11	29.7	3	16.7
Very Unsafe	1	2.7	2	11.1
Totals	37	100.0	18	100.0
(N=55)				

Chi square = 2.50697

Significance level = .4740

Table 4.8

Off Base Fear of Crime and Sex of Respondent in Response to: "How safe do you feel or would you feel being alone in your neighborhood at night?"

Responses	Male	Rel%	Female	Rel%
Very Safe	45	62.5	4	66.7
Reasonably Safe	25	34.7	2	33.3
Somewhat Unsafe	0	0.0	0	0.0
Very Unsafe	2	2.8	0	0.0
Totals	72	100.0	6	100.0
(N=78)				

Chi square = .18506

Significance level = .9116

Table 4.7 and Table 4.8 indicate no significant difference between the responses of males and females. The hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis No.8: More personnel living off base will indicate limitations or changes in behavior due to concern about crime than personnel living on base.

Table 4.9

Limiting of Behavior in Response to: "In general, have you limited or changed your activities in the past few years because you were afraid of crime?"

Responses	OnBase	Rel%	OffBase	Rel%
Yes	24	30.8	31	56.4
No	54	69.2	24	43.6
Totals	78	100.0	55	100.0
(N=133)				

Chi square = 8.71248

Significance level = .0032

The difference in responses between the two samples was significant.

The hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis No.9: Military personnel living on base will report being more favorable toward the local police than personnel living off base.

Table 4.10

Evaluation of Police Performance in Response to. "Would you say your local police are doing a(n)____job?"

Responses	OnBase	Rel%	OffBase	Rel%
Good	44	56.4	12	21.8
Average	25	32.1	31	56.4
Poor	6	7.7	4	7.3
Don't Know	3	3.8	8	14.5
Totals	78	100.0	55	100.0
(N=133)				

Chi square = 18.16715

Significance level = .0004

The difference in sample responses are significant, therefore the hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis No.10: No difference exists between personnel living on or off base as to whether or not they would report a crime to the police.

Table 4.11

Reporting Crime to Police in Response to: "If you were the victim of any crime would you report it to the police?"

Responses	OnBase	Rel%	OffBase	Rel%
Yes	71	91.0	47	85.5
No	3	3.8	3	5.5
Don't Know	4	5.1	5	9.1
Totals	78	99.9	55	101.1
(N=133)				

Chi square = 1.04631

Significance level = .5926

*Totals do not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

The difference in the sample responses is not significant.

General Research Questions

The results of several questions used to obtain information about the impact of crime on respondents perception of their present living environment and base housing will be described in this section. The question used to gather the data will be listed in each table.

Table 4.12

Reason Neighborhood Chosen As Place to Live in Response to: "Which is the most important reason why you selected this particular neighborhood to live?"

Responses	OnBase	OffBase	* %
Like the Neighborhood	9	13	11.3
Good Schools	6	3	4.6
Safe from Crime	21	3	12.3
Only Housing Available	7	4	5.6
Location-Close to Work, Schools, Shopping	19	32	26.2
Price was Right	29	19	24.6
Other	28	2	15.4

Note: Respondents selected more than one response in some cases.

* Percentage is total of on base and off base responses.

Safe from crime was selected 12.3 percent of the time. Three other reasons for selecting a particular neighborhood to live were selected

more than "safe from crime." On base residents selected "safe from crime" 21 times versus off base residents who selected it only three times.

Table 4.13

Perceived Problems in Neighborhood in Response to: "Is there anything you don't like about your neighborhood?"

Responses	OnBase	OffBase	* %
Traffic	13	14	25.2
Environmental Problems (Trash, Noise, etc.)	5	17	20.6
Crime	3	17	18.7
Inadequate Schools	1	0	.9
Inadequate Shopping, Facilities, etc.	6	1	6.5
Neighborhood Changing	8	6	13.1
Other	10	6	15.0
Total N=72			

Note: Respondents selected more than one response, 61 personnel had a negative reply to this question.

* Percentage is total of on and off base responses.

Crime was reported on base as a dislike only three times, while 17 living off base stated crime was a dislike about their neighborhood.

Traffic was selected most by on base personnel as a dislike, while crime and environmental problems were selected most by off base residents.

Table 4.14

Why People Would Choose To Reside on Base in Response to: "What would be the main reason you would choose to live in base housing?"

Responses	OnBase	OffBase	* %
Cost	53	34	47.0
Schools, Shopping, etc.	7	5	6.5
Safe Environment	24	17	22.2
Convenient to Work	18	12	16.2
Other	5	10	8.1
Total N=130			

Note: Respondents selected more than one response.

* Percentage is total of on and off base responses.

Safe environment was selected 22.2 percent as the reason people would choose to live on base, second only to cost.

Table 4.15

How Many People Wanted to Live On Base in Response to: "Did you want to live in base housing when you arrived at this base?"

Responses	OnBase	OffBase	* %
Yes	58	20	58.6
No	20	35	41.4
Total N=133			

* Percentage is total of on and off base responses.

Table 4.16

How Many Had Base Housing Available in Response to: "Was base housing available when you arrived?"

Responses	OnBase	OffBase	* %
Yes	20	11	23.3
No	57	43	75.2
No Reply	1	1	1.6
Total N=133			

* Percentage is total of on and off base responses.

SECTION II

Discussion of Results

The preceding pages contained the data, shown in table format, obtained from 133 respondents regarding their opinions, attitudes, and perceptions about fear of crime. This portion of the chapter is to interpret the results of the data. A summary of each of the hypothesis results will first be discussed followed by the general research questions. The major emphasis of the research was to determine if a significant difference does exist between responses from the two samples, on base and off base residents.

A. Discussion of Hypotheses

Hypothesis No.1: No difference will be found between military respondents opinions about United States crime trends regardless of place of residence.

Hypothesis No.2: No difference will be found between military respondents opinion about crime trends in their neighborhoods.

These two hypotheses were related. Their purpose was to evaluate military respondents perception of crime rates through comparison of perception of trends in the United States and their neighborhood. Previous research has consistently found that respondents are more likely to say that crime has been increasing in the United States, as a whole, than in their neighborhood. Table 4.1 and Table 4.2 data supports the information found in the literature review. In Table 4.1, 57 (73.1%) of the respondents who lived on base and 36 (65.5%) who resided off base stated crime rates were increasing in the United States. The significance level of .4315 indicates no significant difference exists

between the two samples. Table 4.2, Perceived Crime Rate in the Neighborhood, shows 26 (46.2%) of the respondents who live on base and 20 (36.4%) of respondents who live off base felt crime rates in their neighborhood remained the same during the time frame in which they felt crime in the United States was increasing. The majority did not feel crime rates were increasing in their neighborhood. Based on the significance level .6192, no significant level of difference was observed between on and off base samples. People are, in fact, more apt to view increases in crime rates as a national problem rather than a problem in their own neighborhood. This fact has consistently held true in other previous research and is also the case when comparing samples of military personnel.

Hypothesis No.3: Military members living on base will report lower levels of fear at night than personnel living off base.

Hypothesis No.4: Military members living on base will report lower levels of fear during the day than personnel living off the base.

Researchers in past studies and surveys, in order to identify the causes of fear associated with neighborhood residents, have compared the fear expressed by individuals living in different neighborhoods. The purpose of this research is not to identify the causes of fear, however, assumptions can be made as a result of the data.

As in most fear-of-crime research the same question of, "how safe do you feel or would you feel alone in your neighborhood at night or during the day," has been an adequate and consistent measurement of respondent's fear of crime. Table 4.3 and Table 4.4 indicate the level of fear for on base and off base respondents. First, Table 4.3, Fear of

Crime and Perceived Safety at Night, compares on and off base data. The hypothesis is that personnel living on base would feel safer and less fearful, than respondents living off base. This hypothesis was formed based on review of literature on causes of fear and a personal knowledge of the military base environment versus the civilian community. As mentioned earlier, the military base, in this instance Mather Air Force Base, housing area has restricted entry and routine police patrols. Additionally, no "signs of incivility" are present, homes are well maintained, (grass cut, no graffiti, or vacant buildings etc.). Crime is generally confined to minor offenses such as thefts and vandalism. The population is homogeneous by the fact residents are active duty military. As previously noted in the literature review, "signs of incivility" in a particular neighborhood has caused a sense of fear in residents.

Seventy-six of 78 respondents (97.4%) of on base residents felt very safe or reasonable safe where they lived. Only 38 of 55 (69.1%) respondents who lived off base felt very safe or reasonably safe. The significance level was .0000, indicating a significant difference existed between the two samples.

Table 4.4, Fear of Crime and Perceived Safety During the Daytime, provides similar results. Seventy-six of 78 (97.5%) of on base respondents felt very safe or reasonably safe during the daytime. Fifty of the 55 (90.9%) off base respondents felt very safe or reasonably safe during the daytime. A significance level of .0000 indicates a significant difference between the samples. It should be noted that

21.8 percent of the respondents living off base felt safer during the day than at night. The results of the data supports the hypothesis.

Hypothesis No. 5: More military members living off base will report their neighborhood is dangerous enough to make them think about moving more than personnel living on base.

It was assumed at the beginning of this research project that if military members living off base indicated higher levels of fear than on base personnel. They would also have a greater tendency to indicate their neighborhood would be dangerousness enough to make them want to move, more so, than people who feel safe in their neighborhood. Table 4.5, Perceived Dangerousness of Neighborhood, shows the results of this research. One individual of 78 (1.2%) living on base indicated the neighborhood was dangerous enough to make them think about moving. However, 18 of 55 (32.7%) off base residents indicated they thought about moving somewhere else. A significance level of .0000 indicates a significant difference between the two samples.

Hypothesis No.6: Military personnel living on the base will report their neighborhood is less dangerous in terms of crime than personnel living off base.

In support of the results of Hypothesis 5, respondents were asked to indicate how their neighborhood compares to others. The assumption was made that if personnel feel safe in their neighborhood they should indicate their neighborhood is less dangerous than others. Table 4.6, Dangerousness of Our Neighborhood, show the results of the on and off base responses for comparison purposes. Seventy-one of 78 (91.0%) of on base respondents indicated their neighborhood was less or much less

dangerous. Nineteen of 55 (34.6%) off base residents felt their neighborhood was less or much less dangerous. Twenty-three (42.8%) felt their neighborhoods were about average. Seven respondents (12.7%) indicated their neighborhood was more dangerous or much more dangerous. On base residents who felt safe in their neighborhood have also indicated, as hypothesized, that they would perceive their neighborhood as less dangerous. The difference in the two samples was significant at .0000.

Hypothesis No. 7: Females will report more fear than males, regardless of where they live.

Based on previous research it was assumed that females in the military would indicate being more fearful than their male counterparts regardless of where they lived. Tables 4.7, On Base Fear Of Crime and Sex of Respondent, and Table 4.8, Off Base Fear of Crime and Sex of Respondent, contain the resulting responses to the question, "how safe do you feel or would you feel alone in your neighborhood at night." Table 4.7 results indicate no significant difference in on base male and female responses. Twenty-five of 37 (67.6%) on base males reported feeling very safe or reasonably safe compared to 13 of 18 (72.2%) females who felt the same way.

Table 4.8 indicates 70 of 72 (97.2%) males felt very safe or reasonably safe. All the females felt very safe or reasonably safe. The significance level was .9116 indicating no significant difference between the two samples. The hypothesis was rejected, females were not more fearful than males according to this research. It should be noted

the lack of significance may be in part due to the extremely low number of females in the two samples.

Hypothesis No. 8: More personnel living off base will indicate limitations or changes in behavior due to concern about crime than personnel living on base.

Based on previous research the assumption was made that if people felt safe in their living environment they would not be apt to limit or restrict their behavior due to concern about crime. Twenty-four of 78 (30.8%) respondents living on base stated they have limited or changed their activities in the past few years because they were afraid of crime. Fifty-four (69.2%) respondents did not feel they have limited their activities. Thirty-one of 55 (54.4%) off base residents indicated they had, while 24 (43.6%) said they did not limit activities. The difference in the responses was found to be significant at .0032. Again, the assumption that the safer groups, in this case on base residents, would be less likely to limit their activities, was confirmed.

Hypothesis No. 9: Military personnel living on base will report being more favorable toward the local police than personnel living off base.

During the review of literature it was noted that people who perceive crime as a problem in their neighborhood lose confidence in the police. Based on this information the hypothesis was developed. If the respondents felt safe from crime in their neighborhood, they would tend to be more favorable toward the the police. This hypothesis was tested by asking the question regarding the type of job the local police were

doing. Based on the results of previous data it was anticipated the results of this data would indicate personnel living on base would give the police a more favorable rating. Forty-four of 78 (56.4%) on base residents stated the police were doing a good job, the highest rating possible. Twelve of 55 (21.8%) off base residents gave police the same rating. The majority, 56.4 percent, of off base personnel thought the police were doing an average job. The difference in the responses of the two samples was significant at .0004.

Hypothesis No.10: No difference exists between personnel living on or off base as to whether or not they would report a crime to the police.

This hypothesis was formed on the assumption that if people feel confident in the police, regardless of where they live, they would not hesitate about notifying the police if victimized. The results of Table 4.10 shows that although the majority of off base personnel did not give the police the most favorable rating, they did indicate the police were doing an average job, indicating confidence. If police were rated as doing a job above the rating of poor, it was hypothesized that regardless of where personnel lived they would feel confident enough to report a crime. Table 4.11 indicates that 71 (91.0%) on base residents and 47 of 55 (85.5%) off base residents would report a crime to the police. Those indicating they would not report a crime was very low, 3.8 percent and 5.5 percent. A significance level of .5926 indicates no significant difference between the responses of the two samples.

B. Discussion of General Research Questions

In order to measure the impact fear of crime may have on people overall, the respondents were asked several general research questions. Although no hypotheses were stated regarding the results of this data, it is assumed that responses will be closely related to the previously discussed results.

Question No. 1: What is the most important reason why you selected this particular neighborhood to live?

The intent of this question was to measure how significant the sense of a safe environment impacts upon people's selection of a place to live. It should be noted that some respondents did chose more than one answer. The data in Table 4.12 indicates 29 people selected "cost" as the most important reason why they chose to live on base. Closely behind "safe from crime" ranked third with 21 people selecting it as a response. Off base residents felt location was the most important reason, followed by price. Safe from crime was selected only three times, indicating people were not as concerned about the crime problem as much as location and price. The 21 to three selection rate between on and off base personel on the safe-from-crime selection does tend to indicate people on base feel the base provides a safer environment.

Question No. 2: Is there anything you don't like about your neighborhood?

Based on the results of question 1 it could be assumed that the fear of crime indicator in this question, "crime", would be selected more often by off base residents then on base personnel. Table 4.13 supports this assumption. Seventeen off base residents selected crime

as a problem in their neighborhood, while only three people on base thought it was a problem. The most often selected dislike for on base residents was traffic problems, while crime and environmental problems were the most frequent dislikes for off base residents.

Question No. 3: What would be the main reason you would choose to live in base housing?

This question was asked to measure how important a safe environment is to military members. The majority of personnel, 47.0 percent, selected cost as the main reason they would choose to live on base. The second reason selected was safe environment, which received 22.2 percent of the responses. This data indicates that a safe environment does concern people when deciding on a place to live.

Question 4: Did you want to live in base housing when you arrived at this base?

Question 5: Was base housing available when you arrived?

Based on the results of the data it can be assumed military members do feel base housing provides a safe environment. Next to cost, a safe environment would be the second reason for selecting to live there. Questions 4 and 5 were asked in order to determine how many military members out of the samples actually wanted to live on base when they arrived at the base, and how many had housing available to them. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents indicated they wanted to live on base, and 41.4% indicated they did not wish to live on base. Out of the 58 percent who chose to live on base, only 23.3 percent had housing available to them at that time, 75.2 percent did not.

Summary

The primary purpose of this chapter was to provide an analysis of results of data collected. Only one of ten hypothesis was rejected. The majority of hypotheses were developed based on the results of previous research conducted strictly in civilian communities. It was assumed these same results should be replicated when measured using only military personnel living in two distinct residential settings. The results of this data confirmed previous research with the exception of hypothesis 7. Females did not indicate more fear than their male counterparts. However, consideration must be given to the fact the military population does not have an equal proportion of females to males. A very small number of females were included in the samples.

The remaining hypotheses were all accepted. The following facts can be concluded from the results of hypotheses testing:

1. The majority of military personnel feel crime is on the increase in the United States.
2. The majority of military personnel feel crime has remained about the same in their own neighborhood, regardless of the national crime rates.
3. Military members who live on Mather AFB feel safer in that environment at night than military members living in Rancho Cordova, California.
4. Military members who live on Mather AFB feel safer in that environment during the daytime than military members living in Rancho Cordova.

5. More military members living in Rancho Cordova feel their neighborhood environment is dangerous enough to make them think about moving than military members living on Mather AFB.

6. Military members living on Mather AFB feel their neighborhood is less dangerous in terms of crime than military members living in Rancho Cordova.

7. Females living on Mather AFB and in Rancho Cordova feel as safe as their male counterparts.

8. Military personnel living in Rancho Cordova indicated they limited or changed their behavior due to concern about crime more than military members living on Mather AFB.

9. Military personnel living on Mather AFB feel more favorable toward the local police than military members living in Rancho Cordova.

10. Regardless of whether or not the military member lives on Mather AFB or in Rancho Cordova, they would report a crime to the local police.

In addition to the hypotheses testing, several general research questions were asked of the military personnel. The emphasis of these questions was to gather data on respondents' opinions about why they would select a particular neighborhood to live, what they disliked about their neighborhood, why they would choose to live in military housing, and if such housing was available to them.

The results of that data is as follows:

1. The most important reason why military members chose to live on base was because of the cost, safety from crime was the third reason.

Military personnel wanted to live in Rancho Cordova because of the location. Safety from crime was the second from last reason of choice.

2. The majority of military personnel living on Mather AFB most dislike the traffic problems in their neighborhood. Crime was not indicated as a major dislike. A majority of personnel living in Rancho Cordova most dislike environmental (trash, noise, etc.) and crime problems.

3. The majority of military personnel would choose to live on Mather AFB because of cost. The second reason would be because it provides a safe environment.

4. The majority of personnel want to live on Mather AFB when they arrive to the base.

5. Base housing was not available to the majority of personnel who desired to live on base when they first arrived.

Chapter 5, the final segment of this thesis will contain a summary and the conclusions that were reached as a result of this research. Implications for further research will also be included.

CHAPTER 5

Summary

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the fear of crime affecting military personnel by comparing attitudes of personnel residing in two different residential settings: a civilian community and the military installation residential community. First, a review of literature pertaining to fear of crime was conducted. Second, the research conducted was directed toward establishing the amount of fear military personnel were experiencing, based on the environment in which they live. The intent of the research was to gather data which, if utilized by enlightened and better informed Department of Defense personnel, might ensure military members are provided a safe environment in which to live; and to make recommendations for future research.

Literature Review

A review of literature found that fear of crime has been a major topic of concern among residents and researchers in the United States since the mid-1960's. Millions of people throughout the U.S. are afraid of becoming victims of criminal violence. Visable reactions to fear can be observed everyday: locked doors, steel bars on windows, increased gun sales, and empty streets in civilian communities. Everyone is affected differently by fear and for different reasons. Evidence has shown a link between varying psychological states and fear

of crime, which can cause anxiety, mistrust, dissatisfaction with life and a break down in social cohesion within neighborhoods.¹

A review of literature has concluded that the causes of fear of crime are varied, but assumptions about fear levels in certain type neighborhoods can be made based on findings found in previous research. Lewis and Maxfield's extensive research of the effects of incivility in a neighborhood has lead to the conclusion that if a neighborhood is free of signs of incivility, people may tend to be less fearful.² Furthermore, the rate of crime in a particular area does not necessarily affect the level of fear people are experiencing. Based on these facts and others discussed more fully in Chapter 2, it was assumed a difference in attitudes between military personnel living in the two environments under study would reflect significant differences in responses. The military installation provides an environment which tends to provide a greater sense of safety and security to the residents. The mere presence of controlled entry into the installation, well-maintained buildings and grounds are features not found in most civilian neighborhoods.

Overall, the findings in the literature review supports the fact that military personnel living in military base housing should feel safer within the base environment than the military members, some of whom have no choice, who live in the civilian community.

Design of Study

This study was designed to determine how safe military personnel felt living on Mather Air Force Base in comparison to military members

living in the adjacent civilian community of Rancho Cordova, California. In March 1986, a total of 200 military personnel, 100 living on base and 100 living off base were asked to respond to a self-administered survey. A total of 133 responded to the 27-question survey. Questions were designed to measure each individual's sense of safety and security in the neighborhood in which they lived.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences program was used to process the data using scan sheets at the California State University, Sacramento computer center. The chi square test for independent samples was used to evaluate the data. A level of significance of less than or equal to .05 was pre-established. A total of 10 hypotheses were tested, in addition to five general research questions. These questions were designed to analyze, for general information, people's attitudes about fear of crime.

Results of Analysis

A. Of the 10 hypotheses used to test the difference between the responses of the two samples nine were accepted and one was rejected. The hypotheses and results were as follows:

Hypothesis No. 1: Accepted.

No difference will be found between military respondents opinions about United States crime trends regardless of place of residence.

Hypothesis No. 2: Accepted.

No difference will be found between military respondents opinion about crime trends in their neighborhoods.

Hypothesis No.3: Accepted.

Military members living on base will report lower levels of fear at night than personnel living off base.

Hypothesis No. 4: Accepted.

Military members living on base will report lower levels of fear during the day than personnel living off the base.

Hypothesis No. 5: Accepted.

More military members living off base will report their neighborhood is dangerous enough to make them think about moving more than personnel living on base.

Hypothesis No. 6: Accepted.

Military personnel living on the base will report their neighborhood is less dangerous in terms of crime than personnel living off base.

Hypothesis No. 7: Rejected.

Females will report more fear than males, regardless of where they live.

Hypothesis No. 8: Accepted.

More personnel living off base will indicate limitations or changes in behavior due to concern about crime than personnel living on base.

Hypothesis No. 9: Accepted.

Military personnel living on base will report being more favorable toward the local police than personnel living off base.

Hypothesis No. 10: Accepted.

No difference exists between personnel living on or off base as to whether or not they would report a crime to the police.

B. To gather data regarding respondents attitudes as to why they chose to live in a particular neighborhood several questions were asked. The results of the general research questions were as follows:

Question No. 1: What is the most important reason why you selected this particular neighborhood to live? The most important reason why military members chose to live on base was because of the cost; safety from crime was the second most important. Military personnel wanted to live in Rancho Cordova because of its location, proximity to work, schools and shopping.

Question No. 2: Is there anything you don't like about your neighborhood? The majority of military personnel living on Mather AFB dislike the traffic problems in their neighborhood the most. Crime was not indicated as a major dislike. The majority of military personnel living in Rancho Cordova disliked the environmental and crime problem within their neighborhood.

Question No. 3: What would be the main reason you would choose to live in base housing? The majority of military personnel chose to live on Mather AFB because of cost. The second reason was because it provides a safe environment.

Question No. 4: Did you want to live in base housing when you arrived at the base? The majority of personnel wanted to live on Mather AFB when they arrived at the base.

Question No. 5: Was base housing available when you arrived? Base housing was not available to the majority of personnel who wanted to live on base when they first arrived.

Conclusions

Based on the analysis of data several conclusions were reached. The majority of military personnel feel crime is on the increase in the United States, but feel it has remained about the same in their own neighborhood, regardless of the national crime rates. This data supports the previous research and the fact that people feel crime in the United States is increasing; however, they do not consider crime in their own neighborhood to be the problem it is in other neighborhoods, when in fact it may be the same or worse. Based on the results of previous research in civilian communities, it was assumed that because of the design of the military installation, people who reside in this environment would feel safer. In fact, research showed a significant difference in responses by military members. The personnel who live on Mather AFB feel safer during the day and at night than military members living in Rancho Cordova.

It was assumed that since people residing in Rancho Cordova felt less safe they would be more likely to feel their neighborhood more dangerous. Data showed more military members living in Rancho Cordova felt their neighborhood environment dangerous enough to make them think about moving than military members living on Mather AFB. To further confirm this assumption, data showed the obvious: military members living on Mather AFB felt their neighborhood is less dangerous, in terms of crime, than military members living in Rancho Cordova.

One aspect of this research which was not consistent with previous research conducted in the civilian community was the amount of fear females indicated. According to previous research findings, females, in

addition to the elderly, are the most fearful group of citizens. No significant difference was found in the responses between the amount of fear felt by females and males in the military. The lack of difference in the results between the two groups may be due to the extremely low sample of females in this study.

If in fact military personnel living on base felt safer, further conclusions from the data should, and did, indicate that military personnel living in Rancho Cordova limited or changed their behavior due to concern about crime more than military members living on Mather AFB. Also, a more favorable feeling toward the police was indicated by the on base personnel.

The result of research clearly indicates military personnel living on Mather AFB feel very safe in their environment and although it is not the most important reason, it is a major reason, they chose to reside there, versus the civilian community. Military personnel living in Rancho Cordova do not feel as safe in the community in which they live. It was also found that the majority of personnel, 58 percent, who arrived at Mather AFB, wanted to live on base. However only 23.3 percent had housing immediately available on base.

Implications for Future Research

Studies in the civilian communities have been conducted in order for criminal justice programs to be developed to reduce crime and the fear of crime. It is equally important for military officials to be aware of the amount of fear military members are experiencing in the environments in which they live. The military member's vital role in

this nation's defense requires that they not be troubled by concerns that may jeopardize a high sense of reliability.

Fear of crime studies are being conducted more readily in civilian communities in order to aid in criminal justice programs to reduce crime and the fear of crime. Public opinion about crime and the fear engendered by a population are becoming critical issues. This is due to the impact fear of crime can play on individual freedom and quality of life. This research project was directed at only one military base and a community adjacent to the base where a large portion of military personnel live. The results concluded that people who have the opportunity to live on Mather AFB feel safer than their counterparts who reside in Rancho Cordova, California. Although the general environment of most military installations are similar, not all bases are alike. Some, in fact, do not have housing available on the main base where tighter security is evident. It is recommended that future studies should either replicate this study or parts of it in an attempt to determine if location of the base in various parts of the country has an impact on people's level of fear. Specifically, housing areas not on the base proper may have residents who are experiencing more serious fear of crime problems. Such serious problems may include concern for the safety of one's self and family--which, in turn could affect job performance and add stressful factors not dealt with in this study. The fact these areas were not addressed for this study doesn't negate the importance of such issues--issues which should carefully be investigated, reviewed and researched by the Department of Defense officials who can provide input with regard to housing construction and

"people" programs within the military. Further research may disclose how much fear of crime may be affecting military members job performance, human relations, and retainability. With the knowledge and insight into this type of information, officials may want to consider more construction of on-base family housing as well as making more housing available to a larger variety of military personnel--including low ranking and single personnel.

In addition to surveying the impact of fear based on geographic location, studies should also survey individuals specifically about their thoughts on crime in local communities as well as on base and does that knowledge or thought affect their job performance, anxiety, stress, etc. If they lived off-base, would their lives be better or worse when considering the various restrictions and requirements of living on base. In turn the same type of survey could address what life would be like on base after living in the civilian community and would a "safer" more restricted type of environment make any difference in job performance. Family members could also be surveyed too so that their opinions and thoughts could be made known and available to those military and government officials concerned with the quality of life in the military. Family members concern for safety and the problems which may be occurring in the home of a military person because of fear may be more easily detected and accessible through family members being queried rather than only the military person.

The effectiveness of crime prevention programs can perhaps be more thoroughly evaluated by fear of crime studies at individual bases to determine the value of certain programs. As the crime problem continues

to rise in the civilian community, the military community should also be ready to meet the challenge.

Perhaps the key objective of this study was to identify the fact that military personnel who desire and have the benefit of residing on the military installation are not as likely confronted with the fears regarding crime that plague many civilians in off base neighborhoods. The quality of life is not hampered, therefore morale and job performance should be unaffected by the fear associated with crime. The opportunity for military members to reside in an environment in which they feel secure, should not be eliminated.

The results of this study confirmed all of the early assumptions, except one. Perhaps it can be used as a guide for more research into the causes of fear of crime in the military population as a whole. If military personnel indicate a significant level of fear, identifying the cause can enable base officials to develop programs geared toward reducing fear, especially if fear is being caused independent of the crime rate.

Notes

¹ Allen E. Liska and William F. Baccaglioni, "Fear of Crime," Encyclopedia of Crime and Justice, ed. Sanford H. Kadish, vol. 2 (New York: The Free Press, 1984), p. 765.

² Dan A. Lewis and Michael G. Maxfield, "Fear in the Neighborhoods: An Investigation of the Impact of Crime," The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 17 (July 1980): 161.

APPENDIX A - SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

CC

Survey

Military Member

1. You are being asked to participate in a very important independent study currently being conducted at Mather Air Force Base.
2. The attached questionnaire is designed to evaluate how safe military members feel in their neighborhoods. It is important that you answer the questions based on the neighborhood in which you live, whether it be on base or in the civilian community. The survey data collected will provide the basis for formulating recommendations in a written master's thesis.
3. Do not put your name on the survey—you are to remain strictly anonymous. You were randomly selected to participate in this survey, and it is voluntary; however, your prompt and honest response is critical to the completion of the project.
4. Please read the instructions carefully, complete the questionnaire, and return it through base distribution using the enclosed self-addressed envelope not later than _____.

BRUCE R. JOHNSON, Colonel, USAF
Commander

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Please place an (X) in the space that best explains your attitude toward each question. Mark only one answer unless a specific question asks for more than one answer. You may use pen or pencil.

1. Within the past year do you think crime in the U.S. has increased, decreased, or remained the same?

☐ Increased ☐ Remained the same (Skip to Question 3)

☐ Decreased ☐ Don't Know (Skip to Question 3)

2. What types of crime were you considering when you said crime in the U.S. has (increased/decreased)?

☐ Personal crimes (murder, rape, robbery, assault, etc.)

☐ Property crimes (burglary, thefts, etc.)

☐ Drugs

☐ Acts of vandalism

☐ Other-Specify _____.

3. Within the past year do you think crime in YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD has increased, decreased, or remained the same?

☐ Increased ☐ Remained the same (Skip to Question 5)

☐ Decreased ☐ Don't Know (Skip to Question 5)

4. What types of crime were you considering when you said crime in your neighborhood has (increased/decreased)?

☐ Personal crimes (murder, rape, robbery, assault, etc.)

☐ Property crimes (burglary, thefts, etc.)

☐ Drugs

☐ Acts of vandalism

☐ Other-Specify _____.

5. How safe do you feel or would you feel being alone in your neighborhood at NIGHT?

- ☐ Very Safe ☐ Somewhat Unsafe
☐ Reasonably Safe ☐ Very Unsafe

6. How about during the DAY? How safe do you feel or would you feel being alone in your neighborhood?

- ☐ Very Safe ☐ Somewhat Unsafe
☐ Reasonably Safe ☐ Very Unsafe

7. Has anyone living at your residence called the police in the past year to report an alleged crime?

- ☐ Yes, once ☐ No
☐ Yes, more than once

8. In general, do you think most PEOPLE have limited or changed their activities in the past few years because they are afraid of crime?

- ☐ Yes ☐ Don't Know
☐ No

9. Do you think most PEOPLE IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD have limited or changed their activities in the past few years because they are afraid of crime?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't Know

10. In general, have YOU limited or changed your activities in the past few years because you were afraid of crime?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

11. How do you think your neighborhood compares with others in terms of crime?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Much more dangerous | <input type="checkbox"/> Less dangerous |
| <input type="checkbox"/> More dangerous | <input type="checkbox"/> Much less dangerous |
| <input type="checkbox"/> About average | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know |

12. Would you say your local police are doing a(n) _____ job.

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Good | <input type="checkbox"/> Poor |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Average | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know |

13. If you were the victim of any crime would you report it to the police?

- | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|

14. How long have you lived at this address?

- ☐ Less than one year
- ☐ 1 but less than 3 years
- ☐ 3 but less than 5 years
- ☐ 5 or more years

15. Which is the most important reason why you selected this particular neighborhood to live?

- a. ☐ Like the neighborhood
- b. ☐ Good schools
- c. ☐ Safe from crime
- d. ☐ Only area where housing could be found
- e. ☐ Location - close to work, schools, shopping
- f. ☐ Price was right
- g. ☐ Other-Specify _____.


AD-A171 913 FEAR OF CRIME AMONG MILITARY PERSONNEL IN DIFFERENT
RESIDENTIAL SETTINGS(U) AIR FORCE INST OF TECH
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB OH J K FIEDOR 1986
UNCLASSIFIED AFIT/CI/NR-86-142T

2/2

F/G 5/18

NL





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

16. Is there anything you don't like about your neighborhood?

() No (Skip to Question 18)

() Yes What?

a. () Traffic

b. () Environmental problems - trash, noise, etc.

c. () Crime

d. () Inadequate schools

e. () Inadequate shopping, facilities, etc.

f. () Neighborhood changing

g. () Other-Specify _____.

17. Of those problems listed in Question 16, which is the most serious?
_____ (a-g).

18. Is your neighborhood environment dangerous enough to make you think about moving somewhere else?

() Yes

() No

19. Did you want to live in base housing when you arrived at this base?

() Yes

() No

20. Was base housing available when you arrived?

() Yes (Skip to 22)

() No

21. Did you move on base when housing became available?

() Yes

() No

22. What would be the main reason you would choose to live in base housing?

- ☐ Cost
- ☐ Schools, shopping, etc.
- ☐ Safe environment
- ☐ Convenient to work
- ☐ Other-Specify _____.

23. What is your sex?

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

24. What is your marital status?

- ☐ Single, no children
- ☐ Single, with children living in household
- ☐ Married, no children
- ☐ Married, with children living in household

25. Where do you currently live?

- ☐ On Base
- ☐ Off Base - Apartment/Duplex/Condominium
- ☐ Off Base - Mobile home/House

26. What is your age?

- ☐ 18-29
- ☐ 30-40
- ☐ 40 plus

27. To which grade grouping do you belong?

- ☐ Amn - TSgt
- ☐ 2d Lt - Capt
- ☐ MSgt - CMSgt
- ☐ Maj - Col

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Babbie, Earl. The Practice of Social Research. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1983.

Curtis, Lynn A. American Violence and Public Policy. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Encyclopedia of Crime and Justice. Ed. Sanford H. Kadish. vol. 2. New York: The Free Press, 1984.

Figgie Report on Fear of Crime: America Afraid, Part I and II. New York: Research and Forecasts, Inc., 1980.

Fowler, Floyd J.; Mary E. McCalla; and Thomas W. Mangione. Reducing Residential Crime and Fear: The Hartford Neighborhood Prevention Program. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, 1979.

-----, and Thomas W. Manigione. Neighborhood Crime, Fear and Social Control: A Second Look at the Hartford Program. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, 1982.

Friedberg, Ardy. America Afraid. New York: New American Library, 1983.

Garofalo, James. Public Opinion About Crime: The Attitudes of Victims and Nonvictims in Selected Cities. U.S. Department of Justice Reference Service, SD-VAD-1, 1977.

Harris, Richard. The Fear of Crime. New York: Fredrick A. Praeger, 1968.

Hindelang, M.J.; M. Gottfredson; and J. Garofalo. Victims of Personal Crime: An Empirical Foundation For A Theory of Personal Victimization. Cambridge, Mass: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1978.

Jeffery, C. Ray. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc., 1977.

Lewis, Dan A. Reactions to Crime. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1981.

Repetto, Thomas A. Residential Crime. Cambridge, Mass: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1974.

Skogan, Wesley G., and Michael G. Maxfield. Coping With Crime. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1981.

Tedrick, Raymond E. Fear of Crime in Older People. Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1982.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Victimization, Fear of Crime and Altered Behavior. Baltimore, Maryland: William Brill Associates, Inc. 1977.

Wilson, James Q. Crime and Public Policy. San Francisco: ICS Press, 1983.

Periodicals

Agnew, Robert S. "Neutralizing the Impact of Crime." Criminal Justice and Behavior 12, no. 2 (1985): 221-239.

Allatt, Patricia. "Fear of Crime: The Effect of Improved Residential Security on a Difficult to Let Estate." The Howard Journal 23, no. 3 (1984): 170-181.

Baker, Mary, et al. "The Impact of a Crime Wave: Perceptions, Fear, and Confidence in the Police." Law and Society Review 17 (1983): 319-332.

Balkin, Steven. "Victimization Rates, Safety, and Fear of Crime." Social Problems 26 (February 1979): 343-357.

-----; and Pauline Houlden. "Reducing Fear of Crime Through Occupational Presence." Criminal Justice and Behavior 10 (March 1983): 13-33.

Baumer, Terry L. "Testing A General Model of Fear of Crime: Data From a National Sample." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 22 (August 1985): 239-255.

-----, "Research on Fear of Crime in U.S." Victimology 3 (1979): 254-264.

Block, Richard L. "Fear of Crime and Fear of the Police." Social Problems 19 (June 1971): 91-101.

Brooks, James. "The Fear of Crime in the U.S." Crime and Delinquency 20 (July 1974): 241-244.

- Bynum, Timothy S.; and Dan M. Purri. "Crime and Architectural Style: An Examination of the Environmental Design Hypothesis." Criminal Justice and Behavior 11, no. 2 (1984): 179-196.
- Clarke, Alan H.; and Margaret J. Lewis. "Fear of Crime Among the Elderly." British Journal of Criminology 22, no.1 (1982): 49-62.
- Clarke, Ronald; Paul Ekblom; Mike Hough; and Pat Mayhew. "Elderly Victims of Crime and Exposure to Risk." The Howard Journal 24, no. 1 (1985): 1-9.
- Clemente, Frank; and Michael B. Kleiman. "Fear of Crime in the United States: A Multivariate Analysis." Social Forces 56 (December 1977): 519-531.
- Erskine, Hazel. "The Polls: Fear of Violence and Crime." Public Opinion Quarterly 38 (Spring 1984): 131-132.
- Garofalo, James. "The Fear of Crime: Causes and Consequences." The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 72 (1981): 839-857.
- , "Victimization and the Fear of Crime." The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 16 (Jan 1979): 80-97.
- ; and John Laub. "The Fear of Crime: Broadening Our Perspective." Victimology 3 (1978): 242-253.
- Gaquin, Deidre A. "Measuring Fear of Crime: The National Crime Survey's Attitude Data." Victimology 3 (1978): 314-347.
- Greenberg, Martin S.; and Barry Ruback. "Criminal Victimization: Introduction and Overview." Journal of Social Issues 40 (1984): 1-8.
- Greenberg, Stephanie W.; and William M. Rohe. "Neighborhood Design and Crime." American Planning Association Journal 50 (1984): 48-61.
- Henig, Jeffrey; and Michael Maxfield. "Reducing Fear of Crime: Strategies for Intervention." Victimology 3 (1978): 297-313.
- Hunter, Albert; and T.L. Baumer. "Street Traffic, Social Integration, and Fear of Crime." Sociological Inquiry 52, no. 2 (1982): 122-130.
- Jeffords, Charles R. "The Situational Relationship Between Age and the Fear of Crime." International Journal Aging and Human Development 17 (1983): 103-109.
- Kail, Barbara L.; and Paula H. Kleinman. "Fear, Crime, Community Organization and Limitations on Daily Routines." Urban Affairs Quarterly 20, no. 3 (1985): 400-408.

- Kennedy, Leslie W.; and Robert A. Silverman. "Perception of Social Diversity and Fear of Crime." Environment and Behavior 17 (May 1985): 275-295.
- Krannich, Richard S., Thomas Greider, and Ronald L. Little. "Rapid Growth and Fear of Crime: A Four-Community Comparison." Rural Sociology 50, no. 2 (1985): 193-209.
- Lavrakas, Paul J.; Dennis P. Rosenbaum; and Frank Kaminski. "Transmitting Information About Crime and Crime Prevention to Citizens: The Evanston Newsletter Quasi-Experiment." Journal of Police Science and Administration 11 (December 1983): 463-473.
- Lewis, Dan A.; and Michael G. Maxfield. "Fear in the Neighborhoods and Investigation of the Impact of Crime." The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 17 (July 1980): 160-189.
- Liska, Allen E.; J. Lawrence; and A. Sanchirico. "Fear of Crime as a Social Fact." Social Forces 60 (March 1982): 760-769.
- Maxfield, Michael G. "The Limits of Vulnerability in Explaining Fear of Crime: A Comparative Neighborhood Analysis." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 21 (August 1984): 233-250.
- McDermott, Joan. "Crime in the School and in the Community: Offenders, Victims, and Fearful Youths." Crime and Delinquency 29 (April 1983): 270-282.
- Normoyle, Janice; and Paul J. Lavrakas. "Fear of Crime in Elderly Women: Perceptions of Control, Predictability, and Territoriality." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 10 (June 1984): 191-202.
- Shotland, R.; and Lynne Goodstein. "The Role of Bystanders in Crime Control." Journal Of Social Issues 40 (1984): 9-26.
- Shotland, R., et al. "Fear of Crime in Residential Communities." Criminology 17, no. 1 (1979): 34-45.
- Stafford, Mark C.; and Omer R. Galle. "Victimization Rates, Exposure to Risk, and Fear of Crime." Criminology 22 (May 1984): 173-185.
- Taylor, Ralph; S. Gottfredson; and S. Brower. "Block Crime and Fear: Defensible Space, Local Social Ties, and Territorial Functioning." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 21 (November 1984): 303-331.
- Tyler, Tom R. "Assessing the Risk of Crime Victimization: The Integration of Personal Victimization Experience and Socially Transmitted Information." Journal of Social Issues 40 (1984): 27-38.

Warr, Mark, and Mark Stafford. "Fear of Victimization: A Look at the Proximate Causes." Social Forces 61 (June 1983): 1033-1043.

Warr, Mark. "Fear of Victimization: Why Are Women and The Elderly More Afraid?" Social Science Quarterly 65, no. 3 (1984): 681-702.

-----". "Fear of Rape Among Urban Women." Social Problems 32, no. 3 (1985): 238-248.

END

DTIC

10-86