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Analysis of blacks and fear of crime data in Atlanta and Washington, D.C. indicates that blacks in low income, high crime communities are less fearful of crime but still take protective measures when venturing into the community during the day and at night. Additional findings indicate that physical characteristics of neighborhood both within ones own neighborhood and adjacent to ones own neighborhood influence perceptions of crime.

These are some of the findings discovered upon a re-examination of data sets from projects completed in Atlanta and Washington, D.C. The two projects were "Research on Minority Neighborhoods: Toward an Understanding of the Relationship Between Race and Crime" completed by Debro et al. 1981 and "Safe and Secure Neighborhoods: Physical Characteristics and Informal Territorial Control in High and Low Neighborhoods" completed by Greenberg et al. 1980.

Questions were extracted from surveys of blacks in low income and middle income neighborhoods. The central
question of the thesis was to what extent blacks fear crime. If blacks do fear crime, do they take protective measures which constrained their behavior in their community?

The larger question which was not answered but which was always present was whether or not blacks feared crime more than whites. This question could not be answered because there was not a comparative sample of whites. Hopefully, this attempt will lead to additional studies.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study analyzes sub-sections of two data sets relating to fear of crime in two cities. The two cities are Atlanta, Georgia and Washington, D.C. The two data sets are the Debro study entitled "Research on Minority Neighborhoods: Toward an Understanding of the Relationship Between Race and Crime", and the Greenberg study entitled "Safe and Secure Neighborhoods: Physical Characteristics and Informal Territorial Control in High and Low Crime Neighborhoods". The study attempts to explore the unresolved issue of fear of crime and blacks. Essentially, the issue is whether or not blacks fear crime more than other groups. While these studies were not able to completely answer the question, they did provide additional information concerning fear of crime and blacks. Neither of the studies were specifically designed to answer the question of fear of crime, but they were the only studies that had substantial black population in their sample.

The Debro study had large black populations in both cities and had specific questions addressing fear of crime as well as questions addressing constrained behavior.

The Greenberg study looked at neighborhoods in pairs in the City of Atlanta. Upper and Lower Virginia Highland were deleted from the study because the black
populations were very small. Dixie Hill/Grove Park and Pittsburgh/Mechanicsville had a majority of blacks in their community.

Fear of crime in black communities has always been a major problem, but it has not been addressed as a specific issue. This is the first attempt to look at that problem in predominantly black communities.

Scope and Plan of the Study

The scope is limited to a comprehensive review of prior literature, especially those studies which have examined sociodemographic and physical characteristics and their relationship to fear of crime.

Within the two studies under analysis, the review is limited to the variables that pertain to fear of crime and reactions to fear of crime. The variables of primary concern are the sociodemographic characteristics (age, sex, race, income, marital status and residence), physical characteristics of the neighborhood (land use, building structure, and street design) and reactions to fear of crime (constraints on behavior and avoidance/protective mechanisms). The underlying notion here is that these characteristics/mechanisms do exert a determinate effect on the incidence of fear of crime and reactions to the fear of crime (Debro, 1981).
The procedures in analyzing the data included an exhaustive examination of both reports, a re-analysis of certain sections of the data, as well as discussions with one of the authors of the report concerning fear of crime.

Organization of the Study

This study consists of six sections. Following this introductory chapter, a review of the selected literature on fear of crime and its observed impacts will be presented in Chapter II. Chapter III consists of the research methodology which includes: the source of data, criteria for the selection of the sample, and measurement of variables. Chapter IV deals with data analysis. Chapter V summarizes the major findings of the research and also consist of the conclusion. Chapter VI discusses the policy implications and limitations of the study.
 CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This review of the literature is designed to provide a brief overview of prior studies dealing with the issue of "fear of crime" and also to explore the effects of that fear. For this study the abundance of research available is divided into the following categories:

A. Specific Sociodemographic Characteristics
B. Neighborhood Characteristics
C. Reactions to Crime.

A. Specific Sociodemographic Characteristics

Studies examining the causes of fear of crime, demonstrate that age, gender, marital status, income and race are the major contributing characteristics for fear of crime (Biderman, et al. (1967); Braungrat, et al. (1980); Smith (1976); Skogen and Maxfield (1981); Stafford and Galle (1984); Cook at al. (1978); Reppetto (1974); Clemente and Kleinman (1978); Furstenburg (1971); Hindeling et al. (1978); Lawton and Jaffee (1980); Yin (1985); Garofalo (1977), (1979); Akers et al. (1987); Sundeen and Mathieu, (1976), (1977); Mullen and Donnermeyer (1985); Hartnagel (1979); Liski et al. (1982); Janson and Ryder (1983); Taylor and Hale (1986); and Taub et al. (1984).

1. Age: The elderly fear crime more than any other group (Braungart et al. 1980; Hartnagel, 1979; and
Skogen and Maxfield, 1981). Middle-aged and elderly black men and women are more fearful of crime than their white counter-parts (Giles-Sims, 1984). Whether this fear is real, i.e., based on criminal victimization or imagined has a lot to do with the reactions to crime, but evidence seems to indicate that the criminal acts are imagined.

Research indicates that the elderly, with some exceptions, are less likely to be victimized than other age groups, but they are more fearful of victimization (Clemente and Kleinman, 1976; Harris, 1975); and, that fear is higher for those who have been victimized (Lawton and Jaffee, 1980). Analysis of victimization data in San Antonio, Texas reveal that:

...the elderly are less victimized than other age groups, except for the very young pre-teen and teen-age victims ... Women over age 50 and men of all ages are the least likely to be victims of rapists .... The only thing the elderly have to fear is crime itself (Lawton and Jaffee, 1980).

Another study by Conklin and Kleinman (1976) noted that:

... for the older people fear of crime is even more of a problem than crime itself.

Goldsmith and Thomas (1974) argued that perceived crimes against the elderly have reached crisis proportions, and that the increase in fear is due to media coverage (Lindquist 1982).
Several studies which examine the extent of fear among the elderly point out that it varies according to sex, income, race, education and city size (Clemente and Kleinman, 1976; Pope and Feyerherm, 1976).

2. Gender: Despite substantially lower victimization rates for women in most crime categories, gender consistently emerges as the most powerful predictor of fear of crime. Women of all ages are more fearful than men (Biderman et al. 1967; Braungart, et al. 1980; Lebowitz, 1975; Stafford and Galle, 1984; Carter and Beaulieu, 1984). This fear results in constraints on behavior.

Goodman in her article noted that:

Women have always felt vulnerable to crime and have monitored their behavior because of it. Many feel more resentment at crime-induced purdah. And the more they have refused to be shut in by fear of crime, the more they have also experienced that fear: the fear of walking home at night or getting into the car in a parking garage (1990).

The effect of age on fear is less consistent and considerably weaker than that for sex. Hindelang et al. (1978) reported that age had less effect on fear of crime among women than it did among men. When looking at race, Braungart et al. (1980) report that age effects are stronger for blacks than for white. Warr (1984) reported statistically significant gender-age interactions, but did not specify what form those interactions took.
3. Marital Status: Findings concerning marital status and fear of crime are inconsistent. Some studies indicate that unmarried persons express greater fear of crime than married persons. Other studies have noted just the opposite effect.

Lee (1980) found marital status to be the most important variable discriminating between fearful and non-fearful respondents. Braungart et al. (1980) stated that those unmarried are more fearful of crime than those who were married.

Differences in fear between married and unmarried reflect differences in ages as well as differences in lifestyles associated with different marital status.

4. Income: Income is also a predictor of fear of crime (Hindelang, 1976; Reiss, 1979; Harris, 1974; Lee, 1980; Skogen and Klecka, 1977). Higher levels of fear usually are associated with lower income levels (Baumer, 1978; Clemente and Kleinman, 1976, 1977; Reiss, 1979; Erskine, 1974; Mullen and Donnermeyer, 1985; Sundeen and Mathieu, 1976, 1977; and Hartnegal, 1979).

Hindelang, (1976) stated that victimization decreases as family income increases. People with greater financial resources are better able to protect themselves, and therefore, have less fear of being victimized (Biderman et al. 1967).

Hindelang, et al. (1978) found that within each income level blacks expressed more fear than whites.
Previous studies have indicated that income inequality is the primary determinant of variations in rates of fear.

5. Race: Blacks are more fearful than whites (Braungart et al. 1980; Clemente and Kleinman, 1976; 1977; Ragan, 1976). Urban blacks fear crime more than rural blacks (Balkin 1979; Garofalo, 1981; Janson and Ryder, 1983; Yin, 1980; Sundeen and Matheiu, 1976; Toseland, 1982; Erskine, 1974; Maxfield, 1984). Skogen and Maxfield (1981), hypothesize that race differences in fear of crime, stem in part, from differences in actual exposure to crime. Blacks of all ages suffer more exposure than whites and are more likely to live in high-crime neighborhoods than are whites. Liska (1982), indicates that racial composition indirectly affects fear. Fear among whites and non-whites is influenced by different structural characteristics of the cities. But fear of crime is directly affected by population size, segregation and percentages of non-whites.

B. Neighborhood Characteristics

Recent studies have identified how characteristics of individuals and their experiences are associated with fear of crime, but it has also been noted that neighborhood - specific factors such as environmental cues and local communication networks are important (Skogen and Maxfield, 1981). Major studies have operationalized fear as feelings of being unsafe in
one's neighborhood (Skogen and Maxfield, 1981; Liska et al. 1982). Studies have found that the more the individual feels a part of the neighborhood, the less he/she fears crime (Baumer and Hunter 1979; Yancy, 1971).

Extensive research has been conducted analyzing the relationship between fear of crime and attitudes towards the neighborhood. Data has shown that people do perceive communities or neighborhoods in terms of sociodemographic variables, as well as several other factors.

The growing literature on fear of crime seeks to assess how individuals feel about crime in their city and in their neighborhood. Many factors associated with fear of crime vary across different neighborhoods (high crime/low income, low crime/high income) within large cities (Maxfield, 1984). Neighborhoods, may develop a reputation as being crime ridden and unsafe to the extent to which they are predominantly non-white. But, many people, though never direct victims of crime, feel unsafe in their neighborhoods (Brown, 1984; Furstenburg, 1971). As Clemente and Kleinman, (1976; 1977) indicated, elderly black people are more apprehensive about walking in their neighborhoods than elderly whites.

Greenberg et al. (1980) in their study focused on particular physical and social characteristics of
neighborhoods. Physical characteristics were associated with (a) structure of the buildings, (b) street design, and (c) land use. The characteristics of the neighborhoods are important as they exert determinant effects on crime and territorial control. Greenberg et al. (1980) mentioned three boundaries surrounding a neighborhood that may have impact on the crime rate in the area:

(1) areas having low crime rates surrounded by zones where nobody ventures into, i.e., railroads, expressways, etc.

(2) low crime neighborhoods being a transitional area between low income and middle income neighborhoods.

(3) two adjacent and similar neighborhoods having different crime rates.

Other sociodemographic characteristics affecting fear of crime in the neighborhood has been found to be associated with low income housing; neighborhood satisfaction; lower overall morale (Jirovee et al., 1984; Lawton and Jaffe, 1980), age-integrated housing (Lawton and Jaffee, 1980; Sherman et al. 1976) and age density of community (Akers et al. 1987).

Taub et al. (1984) in a study of Chicago neighborhood found that even in neighborhoods where crime rates were high fear was not a problem if neighborhood housing was appreciating, recreational amenities were available and steps were being taken to deal with crime.
Skogen and Maxfield (1981) incorporated measures of community integration and perceptions of neighborhood crime and disorder problems. They found an inverse relationship between fear and levels of crime.

Braungart et al. (1980) reported no association between fear and community size from a national probability sample of adults, but Smith (1976) stated that the size of the community influences the perception and fear within that community. Similar findings were reported by Clemente and Kleinman (1978), who found city-size to be a strong predictor of fear.

In the review of literature on fear of crime, we have indicated why people fear crime. This fear was based on sociodemographic and neighborhood characteristics. The following section of the review will concentrate on reactions to fear of crime by citizens.

C. Reactions to Fear of Crime: Constrained Behavior

Fear of crime and victimization have altered the lifestyles of countless individuals (Furstenburg, 1971). People of all races, ethnic groups, and the aged are known to stay behind locked doors, avoid public transportation, shun shopping, decline outside entertainment, avoid involvement with strangers because of fear of crime.

Research on behavioral responses to fear of crime indicate that fear affects victims in the following ways:
1. Negative Psychological Effects

People live in a state of constant anxiety, because of fear of crime. They avoid strangers, alter their daily living habits, curtail sociability, and refuse to trust others (Clemente and Kleinman, 1977; Toseland, 1982; Brooks, 1974; Conklin, 1971; Ennis, 1967; Holden, 1969).

2. Negative Social Effects

Fear of crime (and its consequences) are now considered to be a leading social problem (Lewis and Salem, 1986; Liska et al. 1988). As a social problem, several consequences of fear of crime are notable (i.e., constraining social interaction and promoting social isolation: generating psychological reactions and fear of possible victimization - feelings of anxiety, mistrust, alienation, and mental anguish - all are very well documented (Taylor and Hale, 1986; Lewis and Salem, 1986; Liska et al. 1988; Clemente and Kleinman, 1977; Conklin, 1971; Garofalo, 1979; Yin and Anderson, 1981).

We have allowed ourselves to degenerate to the point where we're living like animals. We live behind burglar bars and throw a collection of doorlocks at night and set an alarm and lay down with a loaded shotgun beside the bed and then try to get some rest (Johnson, 1981).

Previous researchers on personal behavioral responses to fear of crime have assumed that people who fear crime constrain their behaviors to safe areas and
streets at certain periods during the day and night, and avoid unsafe places. Those unable to practice these restraints remain at home because they are afraid to go out on the streets - even in some cases in their own neighborhoods. However, research demonstrates only a weak link between fear of crime and constrained social behavior (Clark and Lewis, 1982; Garofalo, 1979; Hartnagel, 1979; Skogen and Maxfield, 1981; Yin, 1985). Liska et al. (1988) suggest that these weak and inconsistent findings on the effect of fear on social behavior are attributable to two explanations. First, the effects underlying the relation between fear and social behavior may be reciprocal, rather than unidimensional, i.e., fear may constrain social behavior and thus, in turn, lead to protective behavior, which may in turn reduce the fear of crime (DeFronzo, 1979). Second, the effect of fear on behavior may vary with specific social statuses, i.e., different age, sex, and marital status categories may respond differently to fear of crime. Previous research assumes that the effect of fear on social behavior is the same for people of all social statuses.

Liska et al. (1987) in their analysis of the reciprocal relationship between fear of crime and constraints on social behavior suggest that both are part of a positive escalating loop - wherein fear constrains social behavior which in turn increases
fear. They found this looping effect escalates with age. That is, the elderly (65 years or over) are likely to have stronger loop effects (fear of crime increases constraints on social behavior which in turn increases fear of crime) than the non-elderly population (less than 65 years).

3. **Personal/Protective Measures**

In reaction to the spreading fear, Americans are arming themselves with guns as though they still lived in frontier days. They are buying guard dogs and supplies of mace. Locksmiths and burglar-alarm businesses are flourishing, as are classes in karate and target shooting. Many city sidewalks are a muggers' mecca at night; the elderly dread walking anywhere, even in broad day-light (Johnson, 1981).

The research on protective measures and property protective devices is inconclusive (DeFronzo, 1979; Lizotte and Bordue, 1980; Skogen and Maxfield, 1981). An attempt is made in this study to describe some of the protective measures adopted. They are categorized under two sections:

a. **Communities (collective) protective measures against crime**

The major response to the problem of unprotected, low-density neighborhoods has been the **Neighborhood Watch**—where the neighbors keep watch on one another's house or property (Sherman, 1985).
Leavvakas (1982); Levin (1983); Pennell (1978); Percy (1979) provided two other strategies—protective escorting and block watching. Neighborhood Watch strategy has gained positive responses not only from the community, but also from the law enforcement agencies. Other strategies include the National Sheriff's Association, Neighborhood Love Programs, Associated Federation of Women Clubs, Helping Hands Programs, Cop-of-the-Block and several youth preventions programs. The National Institute of Justice Crime file illustrated three general types of new programs: (1) Community organizing—mobilization of citizen involvement in local crime prevention, such as neighborhood watch, (2) Store-fronts—setting up of police facilities, and (3) Neighborhood foot patrol. But most the neighborhood watch programs are in urban communities.

b. Individual's protective measures against crime:
There is a wide range of individual protective measures against crime, ranging from participation in programs, property identification etc. The preventive measures adopted are: dead bolts, security for sliding glass, auxiliary locks for all doors, self analysis for home security, burglary alarms, night lighting for the home, pad locks for outside buildings.
When going out, more than six of 10 Americans keep their doors locked while riding or sitting in cars. More than six of 10 telephone a friend or a relative to advise that they have returned safely.

About half say that they plan their travel routes to avoid known dangerous places, and more than seven of 10, when going away for a weekend, ask someone to watch their homes.

More than eight out of 10 Americans protect their homes by always keeping doors locked and asking people to identify themselves permitting entry, and over half of the population maintain extra locks on their doors (The Figgie Report, 1980).

Other measures are: watch dogs, doorknob locks, security alarms, monitors, security chains, window locks, and automatic timers. Most of the urban residents have several of the preventive/protective measures mentioned, but the rural residents mainly possess some type of firearms or have watch dogs, etc.

According to the literature released by the National Institute of Justice (1985) the comprehensive efforts to improve neighborhood safety will probably include both organizational and environmental elements.

Conclusion:

Although this review in no way exhausts the vast body of research on the fear of crime phenomenon, it does summarize the major findings in the field. Even though, there were variations in the relationship of various characteristics pertinent to the study of fear of crime, some of the consistent findings are:
* Older people are more likely to fear crime than younger people.

* Females fear crime more than males.

* Unmarried fear crime than married.

* People with lower income fear crime more than those with higher income.

* Blacks are more likely to fear crime than whites.

* People residing in high crime areas exhibited greater fear than residents of low crime areas.

* Residents in multi family dwellings fear crime more than those in single family dwellings.

* People residing in neighborhoods with major throughfares fear crime more than people residing in neighborhoods with one or two way neighborhood streets.

The relationship between fear of crime and reactions to fear of crime is not a simple one. In many cases, it is necessary to look beyond people's direct and personal experiences to understand what they think about crime and how they react to it. High levels of fear expressed in the present and related studies do not always go with what people do about crime. In particular, the rate at which incidences are reported to the police by victims is surprisingly low even in major crime categories (U. S. Department of Justice, 1979).

Many investigators have conducted research on the causes of fear of crime, but few investigators, have paid attention to the reactions of the fear of crime. As pointed out in "The Figgie Report in 1980", there is a wide discrepancy between the incidence of crime and fear of crime which needs serious attention.
The next chapter deals with the methodology and explains how data was obtained in different communities within the two cities of Washington, D.C. and Atlanta, Georgia to look at blacks fear of crime. The two studies utilized specific characteristics -- one dealing with sociodemographic characteristics and the other dealing with the physical characteristics of the neighborhoods towards fear of crime and its reactions to fear of crime. This review is a comprehensive examination of these two different aspects of fear of crime and reactions to fear of crime.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter sets forth the methodology adopted for the analysis of the data. This study analysis secondary data on individual's perceptions of crime in black neighborhoods in Washington, D.C. and Atlanta, Georgia. Data was obtained from two studies.

1. Research on Minority Neighborhoods: Toward an Understanding of the Relationship Between Race and Crime. This study focused on the community structures (social processes) relating to crime among blacks.

2. Safe and Secure Neighborhoods: Physical Characteristics and Informal Territorial Control in High and Low Crime Neighborhoods. The study focused on how some urban neighborhoods maintain a relatively low level of crime despite their close physical proximity and social similarity to high crime areas (Greenberg, et al., 1980).

The research design is adopted from both the studies and is formulated as follows:

Criteria for the selection of the research sites

Data collection methods

Selection of the research sites

Proposed analytical procedures

Survey results of both the studies.
Criteria for the Selection of the Research Sites

1. Racial Composition: Using local and regional census information, the racial composition of each tract was determined. Only tracts with a majority of black residents (60% or more) were selected for further consideration. Most tracts selected had approximately 90% blacks.

Greenberg selected three pairs of neighborhoods in Atlanta, Georgia (high crime and low crime). Those neighborhoods were defined on the basis of homogeneity and natural boundaries, i.e., whether an area selected as the research site was surrounded by high crime or low crime neighborhood or by railroads or expressways. The neighborhoods selected for the analysis had majority black populations.

2. Density: Density for the two cities was calculated differently. In Washington, D.C. the relative density was determined by a quartile distribution based upon population per acre. They were calculated as follows:

   (a) highest density: 42.5 persons per acre and over,
   (b) next highest density: 22 to 42.2 persons per acre,
   (c) next highest density: 13.4 to 21.9 persons per acre, and
   (d) lower density: .0 to 13.3 persons per acre.

   (a) and (d) quartiles of density were used as the criteria in the low income neighborhoods and middle income neighborhoods.

   In Atlanta for both studies, the relative density rate was based on person’s per acre which was 12.66.
The mean for the city was 8.46 per acre.

In the Debro study, four census tracts were selected within each city. These census tracts were differentiated by income and crime rates.

3. **Income:** The income level varied according to the city and was classified as per 1978 census figures on National Incomes in Washington, D.C.: (a) low-income was $11,500 or less, (b) middle-income was $11,000 - 20,000, and (c) high-income was $20,000 and more. In Atlanta (for both studies): (a) low-income was $8,000 or less, (b) middle-income was $8,100 to $25,000, and (c) high-income was $25,100 and above.

4. **Crime Rates:** In the Debro study the crime rate was based on the number or reported offenses "known to the police". The mean crime rate for all residential tracts was found to be 65.3 offenses per 1,000 population with a standard deviation of plus or minus 3.42.

In the Greenberg study the crime rates were based on: (1) criminal justice mapping by census blocks for the entire city, and (2) crime rates in the eight major categories. Analysis of crime rates by R.L. Polk "Profiles of Change" (1977/78) was utilized. This profile utilizes:

(a) Crimes per 100 households for residential burglary,

(b) crimes per 100 commercial establishments for commercial burglary, and
(c) crimes per 1,000 population for murder, rape, robbery, assault, larceny, auto theft, and total crimes.

Data Collection Methods

In the Debro study four communities within each of the two cities were selected. They were (1) low-income, high crime; (2) middle-income, high crime; (3) low-income, low crime; and (4) middle-income, low crime. These communities were selected based on census tracts. Each tract had to have a population range of 3,000 - 5,000 people. This range was selected for the following reasons:

1. it provided a workable number of people from which to select potential respondents,

2. most census tracts fall within the range of 3,000 - 5,000,

3. selecting census tracts with populations that exceeded that number would have made the random selection process too time consuming, and

4. selecting census tracts with populations less than that number would not have provided a sufficient number of potential respondents through random selection.

In order to insure representativeness, a total of 100 respondents, stratified by age per community (i.e., per census tract) were selected. The actual sampling involved a two-stage systematic procedure which may be summarized as follows:

1. A listing of all streets and households addresses in each of the chosen tracts was procured from local regional planning agencies.

2. From randomly generated numbers, each street was assigned a number.
3. Every third street within each tract was systematically chosen.

4. From the list of chosen streets, every fifth house was then systematically selected until a maximum of 300 addresses were reached.

5. Interviewers assigned to particular tracts were instructed to find their respondents from the list of the 300 addresses given to them.

A survey questionnaire was designed and contained some 111 items, data was collected on the following eight topics:

1. Crime and the fear of crime (31 items)
2. Community services (6 items)
3. Community cohesion (15 items)
4. Seriousness of crime definitions (7 items)
5. Perceptions of the community (8 items)
6. Perceptions of self-worth (9 items)
7. Education and school experience (9 items)
8. Sociodemographic data (26 items)

The following variables were the focus of this study:

1. Independent Variables -
   (a) Age, (b) gender, (c) marital status, (d) income, and (e) residence (high or low crime neighborhoods).

2. Dependent Variable -
   (a) fear of crime and (b) reactions to fear of crime.

In the Greenberg study, a sample of 100 responses from each neighborhood were sought (a sample of 132 households per neighborhood were selected). Simple random sampling of households involved stratified design procedure, which were as follows:

1. The sampling frame for each neighborhood consisting of a list of residential properties were located.
2. The sampling units were individual housing units.

3. Sample strafication was achieved by sorting the list of properties within a neighborhood by the number of housing units per property and by ID code.

4. A zoned selection procedure developed by Chromy (1979) was utilized to select one housing unit from each of 132 equal-sized zones for each neighborhood list.

5. Households in selected properties were then selected and a simple random sample of the specified number of households was identified.

6. One respondent from each household was randomly selected.

The sample size consisted of 523 respondents living in neighborhoods adjacent and matched by racial composition and economic status, but having different crime rates.

The instruments used to measure the various dimensions of territoriality were:

1. Spatial Identity
2. Local Ties
3. Social Cohesion and
4. Informal Social Control

Other items included reactions to crime (which were fear, avoidance, protection mechanisms), assessment of the amounts and kinds of neighborhood problems, victimization, and demographic characteristics.

The following variables were the focus of this study:

1. Independent Variables -
   (a) building structure, (b) street design, and
   (c) land use.
2. Dependent Variable -
(a) fear of crime and (b) reactions to fear of crime.

Selection of Research Sites

The Debrow study adopted the following criteria for the selection of the research sites: (a) income, (b) crime, (c) population and (d) density of the community. Table 1 indicates the census tracks that were selected.

Greenberg identified seven pairs of neighborhoods for study. They were: (1) Virginia Highland and Morningside Lenox, (2) Pittsburgh and Mechanicsville, (3) Dixie Hills and Grove Park, (4) Peoplestown and Summerhill, (5) Peachtree Height East and Garden Hills, (6) South Atlanta and Lakewood Heights, and (7) Thomasville and Leila Valley.

Only two pairs of neighborhoods were selected as research sites for further analysis, because of large black population.

(1) Dixie Hills and Grove Park (lower-middle income black neighborhoods)

(2) Pittsburgh and Mechanicsville (low-income black neighborhoods).

Figures 1 and 2 portray the characteristics of the two research sites.
Table 1

Criteria for the Selection of Research Sites
Washington, D.C and The City of Atlanta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Census Tract</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Income level</th>
<th>Crime rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income - High Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>$8,689 (1977)</td>
<td>80/1,000 (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,772</td>
<td>$8,192 (1979)</td>
<td>200/1,000 (1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income - Low Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>$15,434 (1977)</td>
<td>30/1,000 (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4,268</td>
<td>$24,018 (1979)</td>
<td>60/1,000 (1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income - Low Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>$9,426 (1977)</td>
<td>30/1,000 (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4,662</td>
<td>$9,684 (1979)</td>
<td>40/1,000 (1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Income - High Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>$15,051 (1977)</td>
<td>100/1,000 (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>82.02</td>
<td>4,183</td>
<td>$10,627 (1979)</td>
<td>180/1,000 (1979)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Location: Both the neighborhoods are approximately four miles west of the central business district. The northern border and eastern border of Dixie Hill is the four-lane collector street, railroad and expressway on the southern border and on the west is bordered by the expressway. Grove Park is surrounded by a creek on the north side, four-lane collector street on the south, two-lane collector's street on the east and by small neighborhood streets on the west. There are several parks scattered throughout the neighborhood.

Street Design: Curving drives and cul-de-sacs

Income: Lower middle income

Sociodemographic Status:

Multi-family - 96.5% in Dixie Hill and 96.6% in Grove dwellings Park

Single-family - 92.2% in Dixie Hill and 85.2% in Grove dwellings Park

Occupation - lower than the city's average in percentages of professional and managers

Home Ownership and vacancy - higher than the city's average in owner occupancy

Crime Rate: twice as higher in Grove Park than Dixie Hill, which was measured by crimes per block and crimes per 1,000 population for all major crimes
Characteristics of Pittsburgh and Mechanicsville

**Location:** Both the neighborhoods are surrounded by railroad lines, expressways, or major thoroughfares. Pittsburgh is south of Mechanicsville, which is south of the central business district. The two neighborhoods are separated by a railroad and an industrial strip. Both the neighborhoods have parks scattered throughout.

There were intra-neighborhood differences - The north and south section of Mechanicsville underwent a shift in population and housing characteristics. The southern half of Mechanicsville was more suitable for comparison than the northern half.

**Street Design:** Dense grid form

**Income:** Low income neighborhood

**Sociodemographic Status:**

Multi-family - 86.4% in Mechanicsville and 96.3% in dwellings Pittsburgh

Single-family - lower percentage of female headed household with children in Pittsburgh than Mechanicsville

Occupation - lower than the city’s average in percentage professional and managers

Home Ownership and vacancy - higher percentage in owner occupancy in Pittsburgh than Mechanicsville.

**Crime Rate:** twice higher in Mechanicsville than in Pittsburgh, in four out of the eight crime types
Proposed Analytical Procedures

Different techniques were utilized by the authors in analyzing the two data sets. Debro et al. analyzed their data by utilizing two multivariate techniques, i.e., factor analysis and Guttman scaling.

Greenberg et al. analyzed their data by utilizing T-test, a multivariate analysis of subjective reactions to crime. The data from the two sets could not be aggregated, which made the comparison difficult. It was possible to compare and contrast separate indicators from both sets, which were conceptually similar. The procedures employed in analyzing both sets were as follows:

1. Debro’s data set was analyzed by sociodemographic characteristics utilizing descriptive procedures for the total sample.
2. Greenberg’s data was analyzed utilizing questions based on physical characteristics of the neighborhood, i.e., land use, building structure, and street type in their relationship to fear of crime and reactions to fear of crime.

Major survey results of both studies

Debro et al. survey results indicated the following:

* No significant difference in results between the cities, in regards to any characteristics.

* Blacks in low-income, high-crime tracts have the greatest fear of crime. Those in middle-income, low-crime tract having the least fear.
* Low-income, high-crime tract residents perceive themselves as being the least safe during days or nights.

Greenberg results on the physical characteristics of the neighborhoods were the following:

* There was no significant differences in land use in low and high crime neighborhoods. Low crime neighborhoods have more residential properties, less commercial establishment, less vacant land and vice versa.

* Housing units per structure were highly significant for all three matched neighborhoods.

* There was a significant differences in the street type in low and high crime neighborhoods. Low crime neighborhoods have one or two-way neighborhood streets and the high crime neighborhoods have major throughfares.

* Residents in high crime neighborhoods were aware of dangers, but did not engage in avoidance or protective measures.

The following chapter deals with the presentation of the findings from the two data sets.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis is separated into two sections. Section I, consists of an analysis of the Debro data set utilizing descriptive procedures. Section II, discusses the findings from the Greenberg study. Each data set is analyzed based on questions in the survey which related to fear of crime, perceptions of crime and constraints utilized by the respondents.

Efforts were made to collapse categories, to review perceptions of increasing crime, to review attitudes of the police by respondents, to compare the effects of physical space and structure on perceptions of crime, but none of this analysis showed any significant difference in results thus the more convenient analysis was to follow the below three stages.

1. Describe the respondents by sociodemographic background and relating those variables to fear of crime.

2. Analyze perceptions of fear of crime based on the overall sample of respondents, and

3. Discuss the reactions to fear of crime by sociodemographic characteristics.

Section I

Description of the Respondents: Table 2

1. Neighborhood: Residents were separated according to low crime and high crime areas. Fifty-five percent of the residents lived in high crime areas and 45% lived in low crime areas.
In initial analysis, Debro found that blacks who lived in high crime areas expressed more fear of crime. Upon closer analysis, it seems that those blacks who live in high crime areas may not fear crime at the same rate as those who live in low crime areas.

2. Age: The majority of persons interviewed were in the 40-64 age group. In the initial sample design, respondents were supposed to be stratified by age group representation based on nationwide crime statistics for 1979. In the age group 15-18, 27 respondents per tract were needed; 19-24 year olds, 26 interviews were needed; 25 and over, 47 respondents per tract. These expectations were not reached in the survey.

Age groups were collapsed for this analysis into the following categories, i.e., 15-25 which represented 13% of the population; 20-39, which represented 21% and 40-64 which represented 46% of the respondents. The older age group represented those persons who owned homes in the census tracts.

3. Gender: Forty-one percent respondents were males 58% were females.

4. Marital Status: Thirty-four percent of the residents were "married", 41% were unmarried. The unmarried category was collapsed and included those persons who were divorced, separated, etc for further analysis.

5. Income: Twenty-six percent of the respondents were middle income, while 23% were low income category.
Table 2

Distribution of Respondent's By Sociodemographic Characteristics (N = 621)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Pct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Neighborhood Crime</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-25</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-39</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-64</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65 - above</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know/no answer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>40-64</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65 - above</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know/no answer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know/no answer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Income</td>
<td>$8,000 or less</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$8,001 - $18,000</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$18,001 - $25,000</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000 and over</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know/no answer</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Marital Status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separated,Divorced,</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living together</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know/no answer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fear of crime by sociodemographic characteristics as indicated in Table 3

1. Neighborhood

High Crime Neighborhoods: Eighteen percent in the high crime census tracks responded that they felt "very safe", and 4% responded being "very unsafe".

Low Crime Neighborhoods: Eighteen percent of the respondents reported being "very safe" with 1% of the residents reporting being "very unsafe" in low crime neighborhoods. This difference was significant at .0033.

This difference is unexpected because one would expect residents in high crime census tracks to express greater fear than those in low crime census tracks. The percentages of feeling very safe were identical in both neighborhoods. There is something that occurs in high crime neighborhoods that leads to a certain calmness of the community, despite the potential volatility of that neighborhood. It could be that people disregard the sudden violent acts that occur on daily basis, or it could be that people just pretend that violence just does not occur.

2. Age: The age specific rates indicate that the 15-19 age group is more likely to feel safer than the 64 and over age group, even though they are more victimized. Of the 621 respondents, 13 percent in the age group 15-25 years felt "very safe" while 5% in the age group 60 and above years felt "very safe". These
differences were statistically significant.

Teenagers see themselves as invincible, thus they do not feel threatened in most environments. If violence does occur on a regular basis, teenagers tend to forget and only remember the good times that had in the neighborhood.

Evidence indicate that the elderly feel more threatened and are much more fearful than any other age group. Black elderly utilize constraining measures such as bars on windows, numerous locks on doors, dogs, alarm systems, etc. There is evidence to indicate that black elderly are treated "special" in low and middle income communities regardless of income. This evidence tends to indicate that black elderly are given much more respect and are victimized less often. This "respect" is magnified in black church within the community. Additional studies are needed to further verify this assumption.

3. Gender: There is a significant difference between fear of crime and gender, with females being more fearful than males. Twenty-one percent of the males reported being "very safe", with 15% of the females reporting feeling "very safe". Four percent of the females and .3% of the males reported being "very unsafe".

4. Income: A very significant difference was noted between income and fear of crime. The lower the income,
the more fear.

5. Marital Status: Thirty-five percent of unmarried and 60% of the married persons responded being "very safe", "reasonably safe", and "somewhat unsafe" respectively. This finding is consistent with the general finding that being married is safer.
Table 3

Perception of Fear of Crime by Sociodemographic Characteristics (N = 621)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VS</th>
<th></th>
<th>RS</th>
<th></th>
<th>SW US</th>
<th></th>
<th>VUS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Crime</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Crime</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.73328</td>
<td>p = .0033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Observations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-25 yrs</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-39 yrs</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-64 yrs</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - above</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.15286</td>
<td>p = .1558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Observations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.33306</td>
<td>p = .0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Observations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Income:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.08620</td>
<td>p = .0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Observations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Marital Status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.11647</td>
<td>p = .1061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Observations</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VS - Very Safe
RS - Reasonably Safe
SW US - Somewhat Safe
VUS - Very Unsafe
Perception of Fear of Crime During the Day and During the Night as Indicated in Table 4 for the Total Sample

Table 4 explains fear of crime, during the day and during the night.

(a) Seventy percent stated that they felt "very safe", while 21% replied being "reasonably safe". Three percent felt "somewhat unsafe" and 3% felt "very unsafe" during the day.

(b) Thirty-four percent of the residents felt "very safe," 26% "reasonably safe", 18% felt "somewhat unsafe" and 18% felt "very unsafe" at night.

Findings are consistent with the literature indicating that people are safer during the day than at night.

Most of the respondents felt safe at night which is contrary to most of the literature which indicates that most persons in large urban communities feel unsafe when walking in their community or when walking in the city at night. The findings seem to indicate that in the two predominantly black cities, respondents who are black feel quite comfortable in that environment regardless of income or social status.
Table 4

Perception of Fear of Crime During the Day and During the Night (N = 621)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Pct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Crime During Day</td>
<td>Very Safe</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonably Safe</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Unsafe</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Unsafe</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know/no answer</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Crime During Night</td>
<td>Very Safe</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonably Safe</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Unsafe</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Unsafe</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know/no answer</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perception of Crime by Community Crime Rate and Income

Table 5 is concerned with whether or not crime is a problem in the community. Seventeen percent of the residents in low income, high crime census tracks saw crime as a problem. In the middle income, high crime census tracks, only 8% reported that crime was a "big problem".

Perception of Fear of Crime During the Day by Crime and Income

Table 6 requested the respondents to answer whether or not they felt safe during the day. Most felt safe, with only 5% of the middle income, high crime census tracks reporting being "unsafe". Within the low income, high crime census tracks only 3% felt "unsafe".

The middle income, high crime are more fearful during the day. While the difference between middle income, high crime and low income, high crime census tracks are not large, it does indicate that persons in middle income, high crime are somewhat more fearful than persons in low income, high crime areas. This difference may be attributed to a tolerance of crime in low income areas.

Perception of Fear of Crime at Night by Crime and Income

Table 7 Blacks seem to perceive themselves as being much safer within their communities regardless of income.
Table 5
Perception of Crime by Community Crime Rate and Income (N = 621)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N P</th>
<th></th>
<th>SW P</th>
<th></th>
<th>B P</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M I - L C</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L I - L C</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M I - H C</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L I - H C</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N P - Not a Problem
SW P - Somewhat a Problem
B P - Big Problem

Missing Observation = 12

M I - L C = Middle Income - low Crime Neighborhoods
L I - L C = Low Income - Low Crime Neighborhoods
M I - H C = Middle Income - High Crime Neighborhoods
L I - H C = Low Income - High Crime Neighborhoods
Table 6

Perception of Fear of Crime During the Day by Community Crime Rate and Income
(N = 621)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VS</th>
<th></th>
<th>RS</th>
<th></th>
<th>SW US</th>
<th>VUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M I - L C</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L I - L C</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M I - H C</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L I - H C</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VS - Very Safe
RS - Reasonably Safe
SW US - Somewhat Unsafe
VUS - Very Unsafe

Missing Observation = 5

M I - L C = Middle Income - low Crime Neighborhoods
L I - L C = Low Income - Low Crime Neighborhoods
M I - H C = Middle Income - High Crime Neighborhoods
L I - H C = Low Income - High Crime Neighborhoods
Table 7

Perception of Fear of Crime During the Night by Community Crime Rate and Income
(N = 621)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VS</th>
<th></th>
<th>RS</th>
<th></th>
<th>SW US</th>
<th></th>
<th>VUS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M I - L C</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L I - L C</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M I - H C</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L I - H C</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VS - Very Safe
RS - Reasonably Safe
SW US - Somewhat Unsafe
VUS - Very Unsafe

Missing Observation = 112

M I - L C = Middle Income - low Crime Neighborhoods
L I - L C = Low Income - Low Crime Neighborhoods
M I - H C = Middle Income - High Crime Neighborhoods
L I - H C = Low Income - High Crime Neighborhoods
3) **Reactions to Fear of Crime by Sociodemographic Characteristics as Indicated in Table 8**

Table 8 is concerned with constraints on behavior because of fear of crime. Respondents were asked if they constrained their behavior in two census tracks (high and low crime). Age, gender, income and marital status were the other variables utilized in this table.

While blacks indicated that they felt safe in their neighborhoods, they also indicated that they constrained their behavior at a high level. This constrained behavior may be related to why they feel safe.

1. **Neighborhood**: Forty percent of the population in the high crime tracks and 27% in the low crime census tracks replied that they had constrained their behavior due to fear.

2. **Age**: Younger people constrained their behavior more than older. In all categories (15-25, 26-39, 40-64 yrs), behavior was constrained at a higher level than the elderly. This finding is not consistent with the Debro study nor with the literature. This finding may be somewhat flawed because the data represents the total sample of 621 respondents across all income levels.

3. **Gender**: A very significant difference was found with more females (37%) constraining their behavior than males (23%).
4. **Income**: There is a significant difference between income and constrained behavior due to fear of crime. Low income people constrain behavior at a higher rate than people with high income. Twenty-five percent in the middle income category and 36% in the low income category responded that they had constrained their behavior.

5. **Marital Status**: Marital status tends to have a sobering effect upon individuals. People tend not to be in single bars, not to be on the streets, out late at night, not to hang out in places that are crime infested. Constrained behavior becomes much more important to couples because they have to worry about the future. A majority of the married constrained their behavior.
Table 8

Constraints on Behavior by Sociodemographic Variables (N = 621)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Neighborhood
   Crime:
     High Crime 206 33.2 126 20.3
     Low Crime 162 26.1 113 18.2

Chi-Square = 12.30682, p = .0007
Missing Observations = 4

2. Age:
   15-25 yrs 139 22.3 105 16.9
   26-39 yrs 69 11.1 37 5.9
   40-64 yrs 96 15.4 69 11.1
   65 - above 64 10.3 28 4.5

Chi-Square = 15.74766, p = .0124
Missing Observations = 14

3. Gender:
   Male 140 22.5 111 17.9
   Female 222 35.7 126 20.3

Chi-Square = 3.91887, p = .0477
Missing Observations = 22

4. Income:
   Middle 150 24.1 142 22.9
   Low 217 34.9 97 15.6

Chi-Square = 20.59402, p = .0000
Missing Observations = 15

5. Marital Status:
   Married 233 37.5 147 23.7
   Unmarried 129 20.7 85 13.7

Chi-Square = 0.06166, p = .8039
Missing Observations = 27
Discussion

The Debro data looked at the relationship between Race and Crime in eight neighborhoods. Four neighborhoods in Washington, D.C. and four in Atlanta, Georgia. All of the neighborhoods were predominantly black with populations in excess of 5,000 persons. Neighborhoods were classified by income and crime rates. Two middle income, two low income and two low crime, two high crime neighborhoods.

Selective variables were taken from the study to analyze fear of crime among blacks. Most of the questions related to safeness, avoidance and protective measures.

In high crime, low income census tracks, Debro found that the elderly were much more fearful, that married people constrained their behavior, that women were much more fearful than men and that single people feared crime less than all other groups.

In low crime census tracks, whether middle or low income, less people were fearful, but people took protective measures. They constrained behavior did not go out alone at night.

Contrary to Debro’s findings, my findings indicated the following:

1. Younger adults did not fear crime, but they did constrain their behavior more than the elderly.
2. A slight difference existed between middle income, high crime and low income, high crime census tracks in relation to perception of crime and fear of crime.

3. The unmarried constrained their behavior more than the married.

Specific constraints on behavior included more locks, closer watch over children, not carrying large amounts of money, established neighborhood watch, travelling in groups, use of additional bright lights, more burglary alarms, avoiding high crime risk areas at night etc.

Section II

This section analyzes the Greenberg study. The data are analyzed in three stages:

1. Sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents in high and low crime neighborhoods

2. Physical characteristics of the neighborhoods and crime, and

3. Reactions to fear of crime (avoidance and protective measures).

Discussion of the Analysis

Three pairs of neighborhoods were selected by Greenberg as the survey sample, but two pairs of black neighborhoods were utilized for this study. These pairs were adjacent and similar in racial composition and economic status but different in crime levels. Table 9 indicates the distribution of the respondents in each of the two neighborhoods along with their crime
descriptives.

(1) **Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Respondents in High and Low Crime Neighborhoods; Table 10**

Greenberg et al. (1980) conducted a comparative analysis between respondents in the two pairs of low and high crime neighborhoods. No significant difference was found for the following variables: Age, gender and race among the residents of Grove Park/Dixie Hill and Mechanicsville/Pittsburgh.

The only variable that showed a significant difference was income of the respondents. The income level of the residents in Grove Park (high crime) was higher than the residents in Dixie Hill (low crime).
Table 9

Distribution of the Respondents in Six Neighborhoods and High and Low neighborhoods (N=523)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grove Park (HCN)</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>16.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Hill (LCN)</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>17.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanicsville (HCN)</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>16.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh (LCN)</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>17.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HCN - High Crime Neighborhoods
LCN - Low Crime Neighborhoods
Table 10

Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Respondents in High and Low Crime Neighborhoods (N = 523)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhoods</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grove Park (HCN)</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Hill (LCN)</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p = &lt;.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanicsville (HCN)</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh (LCN)</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p = NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HCN - High Crime Neighborhood  
LCN - Low Crime Neighborhood  
M - Male Respondents  

Significance level = .05 or above  

Source: Household Survey/Greenberg et al. (1980).
(2) **Physical characteristics of the neighborhoods and crime rates**

Greenberg et al. (1980) compared the type and distribution of (a) land use, (b) housing type, (c) street type and (d) characteristics of neighborhood boundaries between matched, adjacent high and low crime neighborhoods.

(a) **Land use**: Land use is one of the most important variables in determining crime and non crime neighborhoods. Vacant apartments, vacant lots increase crime. Table 11 indicates significant differences in land use between high and low crime neighborhoods. However, land use in the selected pairs varied by neighborhood crime and income level.

Grove Park (high crime) had more commercial establishments (4%) and more vacant land (16%) than Dixie Hill (low crime) with 2% of commercial establishment and a lesser percentage of vacant land (12%). Both had more residential properties with 79% and 84% respectively. This distribution was similar to the two pairs of selected neighborhoods.

High income and low crime neighborhoods had more residential properties, less commercial establishments and less vacant land. For example: Dixie Hill and Pittsburgh had more residential properties with 84% and 72%, less commercial land use (2% and 6%), and less vacant land (12% and 19%) respectively.
Low income, high crime neighborhoods had more
residential properties, more vacant land. Grove Park
and Mechanicsville had more residential properties (79% and 52%), more vacant land with 16% and 38%
respectively.

Residential properties and vacant land acted as
criteria for differentiation in the low and high crime
neighborhoods in the selected pairs of the neighborhood
(Grove Park/Dixie Hills and Mechanicsville/Pittsburgh).

(b) Housing Type: The two neighborhood pairs had
significant differences in the number of housing units
per structure.

Table 12 indicates the housing characteristics in
low and high crime neighborhoods. Age, gender, race and
income did not vary. The only variable which showed any
variation was the neighborhood.

Dixie Hills and Pittsburgh (low crime neighbor-
hoods) had more single family dwellings (92% and 71%)
than Grove Park and Mechanicsville (high crime
neighborhoods) with 85% and 54% respectively.

Greenberg found a strong relationship between
single family dwellings and low crime neighborhoods,
i.e., the more residential properties, the lower the
crime rate.
Table 11

Percentage Distribution of Land Use Between High and Low Crime Neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Properties</th>
<th>GP (HCN)</th>
<th>DH (LNC)</th>
<th>MV (HCN)</th>
<th>PB (LCN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Resi.</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/recre.</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscell.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = <.01  p = <.01

GP - Grove Park  
DH - Dixie Hills  
MV - Mechanicsville  
PB - Pittsburgh

LCN - Lower crime neighborhoods  
HCN - High crime neighborhoods

Significance level = .05 or above

Source: Greenberg et al. (1980)/Atlanta Bureau of Planning, Plan File.
Table 12

Percentage Distribution of Housing Characteristics in Low and High Crime Neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Residential Properties</th>
<th>GP (HCN)</th>
<th>DH (LNC)</th>
<th>MV (HCN)</th>
<th>PB (LCN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,856</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>1,318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing Structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>DH</th>
<th>MV</th>
<th>PB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-three</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Nine</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten or more</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = < .01

GP - Grove Park
DH - Dixie Hills
MV - Mechanicsville
PB - Pittsburgh

LCN - Lower crime neighborhoods
HCN - High crime neighborhoods

Significance level = .05 or above

Source: Greenberg et al. (1980)/Atlanta Bureau of Planning, Plan File.
(c) **Street Type:** The way the streets are designed is another indicator of high and low crime. The more lanes, the more crime. Street use is referred to as street type. Table 14 indicates the distribution of street types in low and high crime neighborhoods. Grove Park and Mechanicsville (high crime) had 29% and 67% of major throughfares, and Dixie Hill and Pittsburgh (low crime) had 2% and 32% respectively.

High crime neighborhoods tended to have major throughfares causing a great deal of movement within and around the neighborhood more so than the low crime neighborhoods. Street type and residential land use systematically made a difference between low and high crime neighborhoods.

(d) **Boundary Characteristics:**

External characteristics (rail-roads, expressways, etc) were considered as important as internal characteristics (street type, building structure, land use) in distinguishing between high and low crime neighborhoods. Expressways, railroads etc, influenced or attracted outsiders to the neighborhood.

Table 14 indicates the percentage distribution of boundaries of the neighborhood. Dixie Hill and Pittsburgh (low crime) had 50% and 58% of the railroads in the area as the boundary. Grove Park and Mechanicsville (high crime) had 22% and 69% of the major streets passing through the area.
Table 13

Percentage Distribution of Street Type in High and Low Crime Neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Blocks</th>
<th>GP (HCN)</th>
<th>DH (LNC)</th>
<th>MV (HCN)</th>
<th>PB (LCN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Street Characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Throughfare</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>DH</th>
<th>MV</th>
<th>PB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = &lt;.01</td>
<td>p = .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = &lt;.01</td>
<td>p = .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GP - Grove Park
DH - Dixie Hills
MV - Mechanicsville
PB - Pittsburgh

LCN - Lower crime neighborhoods
HCN - High crime neighborhoods

Significance level = .05 or above

Source: Greenberg et al. (1980)/Street type - Atlanta Bureau of Planning, Major thoroughfare Plan File/Land use - Atlanta Bureau of Planning, Plan File.

This table does not include the distribution of commercial land use and residential composition.
### Table 14

Percentage Distribution of Boundaries of the Neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Characteristics:</th>
<th>GP (HCN)</th>
<th>DH (LNC)</th>
<th>MV (HCN)</th>
<th>PB (LCN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Boundary Blocks</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Throughfare</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Neighborhood Street</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressway</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% or more Commercial land use</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GP - Grove Park
DH - Dixie Hills
MV - Mechanicsville
PB - Pittsburgh

LCN - Lower crime neighborhoods
HCN - High crime neighborhoods

Significance level = .05 or above

Source: Greenberg et al. (1980)/Street type - Atlanta Bureau of Planning, Major thoroughfare Plan File/Land use - Atlanta Bureau of Planning, Plan File.
Neighborhood surrounded by railroads, expressways etc., act as shields from outsiders, while commercial developments and major streets through neighborhoods attract outsiders.

Discussion

Crime Rates:

Crime rates in two adjacent and similar neighborhoods may or may not be affected by the characteristics of high crime neighborhoods on their borders. High crime neighborhoods are characterized by low income, transient residents who victimize people from nearby neighborhoods.

Table 14 indicates the boundary characteristics. The two pairs of neighborhood boundaries, Grove Park and Mechanicsville (high crime neighborhood) consisted of high commercial land use (18% and 37%), major thoroughfares (22% and 69%), which offered no restriction on the movement of the outsiders into the neighborhood. Both the low crime neighborhood (Dixie Hill and Pittsburgh) boundaries had a higher proportion of railroads (50% and 58%) and expressways (39% and 16%).

As shown in Table 11 and 12, high and low crime neighborhoods differ systematically. In the pairs of neighborhoods that Greenberg et al. (1980) selected for the study, they hypothesized that each of the pairs of neighborhoods would have a higher crime rate within the boundaries than the surrounding neighborhoods. However,
Table 15

Percentage Distribution of Index Crimes Per Block in Neighborhoods Adjacent to Study Neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Blocks</th>
<th>GP (HCN)</th>
<th>DH (LNC)</th>
<th>MV (HCN)</th>
<th>PB (LCN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Index Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>DH</th>
<th>MV</th>
<th>PB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Burglary</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Burglary</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GP - Grove Park  
DH - Dixie Hills  
MV - Mechanicsville  
PB - Pittsburgh  

LCN - Lower crime neighborhoods  
HCN - High crime neighborhoods

Significance level = .05 or above

Source: Tape of reported crimes in 1978, Atlanta Bureau of Police/Greenberg et al. (1980).
data indicated that areas surrounding the high crime areas had a higher crime rate than the neighborhood itself and vice versa.

This suggests that crime from nearby areas may have increased the crime level in the high crime area of the pair under study. It also suggests that the differences in crime rates within the neighborhood pairs do not appear to be a function of crime levels in surrounding areas.

Table 15 indicates the differences in crime rates between the matched neighborhoods. These differences may or may not be attributed to crime differences in the boundaries. The only pair of neighborhoods, Grove Park and Dixie Hills were influenced by the high crime rate in the boundaries.

Low crime neighborhoods are more affluent, have a higher rate of home-owner occupancy, and a lower rate of joblessness. The opposite is true for high crime neighborhoods. Areas with high unemployment and lower rates of home owner occupancy have been found to attract criminal elements.

Greenberg et al. put forth six models which would predict reactions to crime (within the neighborhood). Those models are:

(1) Objective; (2) Ecological; (3) Local ties; (4) Social cohesion; (5) Social control; and (6) Neighborhood problems.
(3) **Reactions to Crime**

Reactions to crime were measured as follows:

(a) **Sources of Information about Neighborhood Crime** - this was based on where residents obtained their information about neighborhood crime, was it from the media, neighbors, or by personal observation. There were more residents reporting that the media was the most important source of information than any other source.

(b) **Assessment of Severity of Neighborhood Crime** - was measured on the basis of the response to the question of "how much crime was within two blocks of home and in the rest of the neighborhood". Residents from the high and low crime neighborhoods reported that there was little or no crime (respectively). They also reported that whatever crime in the neighborhood was committed was committed by outsiders.

(c) **Fear of Neighborhood Crime**: was based on two items - lack of security and worry of being victimized (see appendix B for the measurement of these items). The study reported that there was no significant differences between the residents of any matched neighborhood in relation to the fear of crime and its reactions. But the residents in the selected pair of neighborhoods reported being fearful and worried about crime.
(d) Avoidance and Protective Measures Against Neighborhood Crime:

Behavior was analyzed based on what the residents had done to avoid crime and protect themselves in the neighborhood (see appendix B for the measurement).

The avoidance measures were: avoid using public transportation in the neighborhood, having someone accompany you while going out, staying home at night. There was no significant difference in the avoidance index i.e., residents in the selected pair of the neighborhoods engaged in avoidance behavior.

The protective measures were timers, bars, neighborhood watch, burglar alarms, joining crime prevention programs, possession of guns and other weapons etc. There was a significant differences in protective measures in one of the matched neighborhoods (Grove Park/Dixie Hill). Preventive measures were higher in low crime neighborhoods than in high crime neighborhoods.
Greenberg’s major finding -

Residents in high crime neighborhoods were aware of the dangers, but did not engage in avoidance or protective measures.

The six models that was suggested by Greenberg are:

1. **Objective Crime Model**: included three measures of crime (a) high/low crime neighborhood, (b) reported index crimes per 100 dwelling units, (c) whether or not the respondent or a household member had been victimized in the last year.

Demographic aspects (age, sex, race) and victimization exhibited a significant relationship to the reactions to crime.

**Specific reactions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear of neighborhood crime</th>
<th>Worry over crime (fear)</th>
<th>Avoidance measures</th>
<th>Protection measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females, females, blacks,</td>
<td>females, blacks,</td>
<td>elderly, females,</td>
<td>not * blacks *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victimized *</td>
<td>victimized *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R2 = .01

2. **Ecological Model**: (land use) includes the following variables: presence of commercial properties, major throughfare, vacant land, residential, single dwellings.

Demographic aspects (age, sex, race) indicated a significant relationship to the reactions to crime. This model exhibits similar results as the objective crime model. It also indicates that as the number of
commercial establishments increases, so does the fear of crime among the residents.

3. Local Ties Model: (local ties refers to the involvement of the residents with community associations). The variables involved are number of years in the neighborhood, the number of good friends in the neighborhood, variety of neighborhood facilities used, membership in voluntary associations.

Visiting friends/relatives in neighborhood and the use of the neighborhood facilities increases concern about crime, there is an exchange of information about crime which leads to adoption of protection measures.

4. Social Cohesion Model: (social cohesion consists of three dimensions - information exchange, emotional attachment, and shared norms and values). The variables are: whether the respondents feels a sense of control over what goes on in the neighborhood, and feels the neighborhood as being a real home.

A feeling of control over the neighborhood events lessens both fear and the worry over crime, but the information exchange increases the fear and the concern about crime. This concern also leads to adoption of avoidance and protective measures.

5. Social Control Model: (social control involves informal surveillance, movement governing rules, and direct interventions). The variables are: whether respondents watch for suspicious looking people in the
neighborhood, avoidance of areas in the neighborhood, problems in the neighborhood.

Social control is significantly related to fear and worry about crime. Fear, worry over crime, avoidance and protective measures were positively associated with watching suspicious people and avoiding areas in the neighborhood.

6. Neighborhood Problems Model: variables included - whether the respondents felt the neighborhood had gotten better in the last year, number of disturbances seen or heard in the neighborhood within the last year, number of big problems (noisy neighbors, poor care of property).

Fear, worry over crime and avoidance measures was positively related to the number of problems and disturbances in the neighborhood, while protection measures was negatively related in high crime neighborhoods.

The analysis indicated that the physical characteristics of the neighborhood along with its crime rates were significantly related to the residents fear of crime, and adoption of avoidance/protective measures.
Conclusion

This analysis, did not exhaust the many facets or concerns about crime and fear of crime, but it did provide some information on fear of crime among blacks.

Greenberg’s data indicates that differences in physical characteristics of the neighborhood determined whether or not the area would be high crime or low crime. Within high crime neighborhoods, she found more traffic both foot or car. More vacant land, less residential dwellings, more major arteries, etc. The above physical characteristics in the black neighborhoods contributed to the fear of crime and to persons utilizing constraints to prevent victimization.

Her findings suggest that one can reduce crime in black neighborhoods by maintaining residential properties. While this may be true, this does not occur in low income neighborhoods and does not subject itself to community planning. Churches, liquor stores, bars, pool halls are quite often located next door to residential facilities. Black children grow up in these neighborhoods watching violence. These neighborhoods create a atmosphere for violence which continuous throughout their growth. This leads to fear of crime, which is not something someone thinks about everyday, but is ever present. If fear of crime is to be reduced in black neighborhoods in low income urban communities,
land use must be changed.

It is clear from the above analysis of both the studies, that the findings provide partial answers to the complex issue of fear of crime in black communities, hence the need for additional studies.

Chapter V will give an overall summary and conclusion to this study.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

One of the purpose of this study was to analyze fear of crime and reactions to fear of crime by sociodemographic and physical characteristics within black communities. The study utilized two data sets by Debro (1981) and Greenberg (1980).

The analysis revealed that certain characteristics did have a significant impact on the individual’s perception of fear of crime along with safety measures that they adopted in reaction towards that fear of crime. That daily lives are dictated by how we perceive and react to acts of criminal behavior. Whether we go out at night, walk the streets in the day, run in the park are all dictated by the concept "fear of crime".

While we can’t generalize fear of crime and its reactions to the entire population, we can indicate that within these two cities with a large proportion of blacks, the fear of crime was quite high.

The major findings indicate that blacks have the same fears as others in terms of crime and that they also take protective measures to prevent victimization. The most interesting finding is that blacks in low income/high crime areas feel safer than blacks in low crime/middle income areas, and Greenberg’s most important finding was that in low income neighborhood, residents do not take any precautionary measures to
protect themselves. This lack of taking precautionary measures may be due to a "toleration of violence" that develops within the low income communities over time. Adolescents and little children grow up in low income communities seeing and experiencing violence every day. This finding may reflect what Wolfgang refers to as the "subculture of violence", i.e., violence becomes a way of life—it is expected in low income neighborhoods, so why take precautionary measures. Lack of precautionary measures may also be due to lack of empowerment within the community. Low income residents have so little power, so nothing is done to ensure that violence be reduced within the community. Finally, resources may not be available to take precautionary measures, such as purchasing more locks, better lighting, etc.

Other findings are:

1. **Fear of crime during the day and during the night:**
   
   Respondents felt safer during the day than at night.

2. **Fear of Crime by sociodemographic characteristics:**

   **Age:** There are variations in the perception of fear in different age groups.

   **Gender:** Females were more fearful than males.

   **Income:** Residents of low income neighborhoods expressed more fear than did middle-income respondents.
3. **Physical Characteristics and Crime:**

**Land Use:** The more the land is used commercially, the more crime.

**Housing Type:** Single family dwellings exhibited more crime than multiple family dwellings.

**Street Design:** High crime neighborhoods had more major throughfares, more vacant land, more commercial establishments than low crime neighborhoods.

**Crime Rates:** Crime rate within neighborhoods was not necessarily influenced by crime rates surrounding the neighborhood.

**Boundary Characteristics:** The boundaries of low crime neighborhoods tended to have fewer major throughfares, and no commercial land use. The boundaries of high crime neighborhoods tended to have more railroads and expressways.

4. **Reactions to crime: (Constraints on behavior)**

By sociodemographic characteristics: females, married persons, respondents residing in high crime - low income neighborhoods constrained their behavior more than persons living in other areas.

**Avoidance and Protection Measures:**

By sociodemographic characteristics - older, females, blacks and those who had witnessed disturbances in the neighborhood were more likely to avoid public places, stay in at night, avoid going out alone.

Residents belonging to various community associations adopted protective measures.

Residents in high crime neighborhoods did not adopt any kind of protective or avoidance behavior.

Findings from the two studies reveal that past research on fear of crime remains consistent with the Debro and Greenberg studies. Racial identity is not an important variable in determining fear. Blacks are just as fearful as whites, regardless of income, age, gender
or marital status.

Both studies did indicate that residents in low income neighborhoods feared crime more than any other group. Greenberg did find that residents in low income areas did not take any precautionary measures, even though they were aware of the dangers within the community.
CHAPTER IV
POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

I. Policy Implications from the Study

A. Increase cohesion in neighborhoods.
B. Encourage people to participate in community organizations such as church, schools, clubs, recreational activities etc.
C. Redesigning and re-route streets to inhibit the flow of traffic.
D. Look at specific physical design features that affect crime at each spatial level of the residential area.
E. Change design if necessary.

II. Limitations of the Study

A. The Debro study sample was not broken down by cities.
B. The Greenberg data focused only on a few of the fear of crime variables.
C. Limited prior research on the black population.
D. As of now, we just have two studies conducted in the south. Since these studies were completed in the early 80s, the trends over time are not known. Longitudinal research on fear of crime would provide us a better insights into the issue of fear of crime.
E. Comparative studies are needed.

III. FUTURE RESEARCH ISSUES AND DIRECTIONS FOR 1990S:

A. Land use

a) Residential properties should be single-family dwellings, rather than multi-family dwellings, particularly in the areas of public housing.

b) Cities must look to the zoning board to reduce the kinds of commercial establishments that are located in the low income - high crime neighborhoods.

c) Bars, pool halls, liquor stores should not be located next to residential facilities.

d) The vacant land in the area should be put to a better use, which would help the community (set up some recreational activities, playground for children, basket ball court etc).

B. Crime Reduction:

a) Cities needs to put together programs and policies which will create funds to support a widespread system of security in low income, high crime neighborhoods.

b) Provide more police surveillance.

C. Awareness of Neighborhood Crime:

a) Residents in low income neighborhoods need to be made aware of neighborhood crime. Monthly releases of newsletters or tenant meetings
should be scheduled regularly.

b) Residents should be provided with opportunities for social, economic and cultural enrichment, so that they become more sociable and less suspicious.

D. Provide more employment opportunities in low income-high crime neighborhoods.

E. Local governments must provide more resources to improve the environment within the poor communities: more parks, more lighting, more police surveillance, more input from the community. Communities must be empowered to make decisions for themselves if we are going to reduce fear of crime.
APPENDIX

Samples of Questionnaires

The following questions were extracted from both studies for the analysis

Crime or Fear of Crime?

(a) Not a problem, (b) somewhat a problem, (c) big problem, and (d) don’t know.

A. How safe do you feel (or would you feel) being out alone in your community during the DAY or at NIGHT?
   (a) very safe, (b) reasonably safe, (c) somewhat unsafe, (d) very unsafe, and (e) don’t know.

B. How safe do you feel your neighborhood is compared to the rest of Atlanta? Would you say it is (a) more safe, (b) less safe, or, (c) about the same.

C. Are there certain areas within two blocks of your home and also within the neighborhood that you avoid because you feel they are dangerous? (a) yes, (b) no, and (c) don’t know.

D. How safe is the neighborhoods that borders this neighborhood? Would you say that any of them are less safe than this neighborhood? (a) yes, (b) no, and (c) don’t know.

E. How worried are you about your home being broken into or entered illegally when no one is home? Would you say you are (a) very worried, (b) somewhat worried, (c) just a little worried, (d) or not at all worried?

F. How worried are you about being held up on the street, threatened, beaten up, or anything of that sort within two blocks of your home or within the rest of the neighborhood? Would you say you are (a) very worried, (b) somewhat worried, (c) just a little worried, (d) or not at all worried?
Reactions to Fear of Crime:

A. In general, have you limited or changed your activities in the past few years because of crime? 
(a) yes, (b) no, and (c) don’t know.

B. If yes, give examples of those changes in your activities?

C. How often do you walk around in your neighborhood? Is it...
(a) every day, (b) several times a week, (c) once a week, (d) less than once a week, or (e) never.

D. On these walks do you make a point of looking out for suspicious people or activities? 
(a) yes, (b) no, and (c) don’t know.

E. When you are in the two block area around your home or in the rest of the neighborhoods, do you make a habit of watching out for suspicious looking people? 
(a) yes, (b) no, and (c) don’t know.

F. During the last year, have you done any of the following to avoid crime in this neighborhood? Have you ...
1. avoided using local public transportation in this neighborhood?
2. stayed in at night?
3. arranged to have someone go with you when going somewhere in the neighborhood? 
(a) yes, (b) no, and (c) haven’t lived here a year.

G. In order to protect you and your belongings, have you done any of the following things while living in your present residence? Have you ...
(a) had a neighbor pick up your mail and newspapers while you were away?
(b) had a neighbor keep a watch on your home while you were away?
(c) engraved identification on valuables?
(d) installed a burglar alarm in your home?
(e) taken other security measures, such as using timers on your lights, putting bars on your windows, or adding new locks?
(f) kept a watch dog?
(g) kept a gun or other weapon at home?
(h) taken a course in self-defense?
(i) joined a program going on in the neighborhood to prevent or reduce crime,
such as neighborhood watch, citizen alert, block parent, business watch, or a citizen patrol?

Reactions by some people of their neighbors when troubles occur is measured by the responses to the following statements:

A. Neighbors should scold neighborhood children for fighting,
B. Neighbors should keep an eye out for suspicious people or events,
C. Neighbors should call the police if a neighbor's property or home is being vandalized,
D. Neighbors should use physical force to assist a neighbor being mugged.
(a) agree, (b) disagree, (c) don't know.

Reactions of trouble in the neighborhood is measured by the responses to the following statements:

Have you witnessed any kind trouble in your neighborhood in the last year. Have you seen or heard:
A. Young people using foul language in the streets,
B. Young people destroying property,
C. Young people fighting,
D. Suspicious people hanging around,
E. Someone trying to break into a house or car,
F. A mugging or purse snatching?
(a) yes, (b) no, (c) don't know, (d) specify any other kind of trouble.

Reactions towards trouble (each of the trouble mentioned above) is measured by the responses to following question:

When you saw, which of the following did you do?
Keep an eye on it; call a neighbor; call police; take some other direct action; do something else; decide it was none of your business?
Each of the response for each of the trouble is coded as -
(a) yes, (b) no (c) specify (other direct action, something else).
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