

**Document Title:** Fear and Control - The Effect of Age and Family Composition

**Author(s):** Ellen S. Cohn  
Northwestern University  
Center for Urban Affairs

**Document No.:** 82432

**Date Published:** 1976

**Award Title:** Reactions to Crime Project

**Award Number:** 78-NI-AX-0057

**This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.**

**Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.**

78-NF-AX-0057  
No MF  
DD  
1-21-83  
CR Sent  
7-14-82

WORKING PAPER: M - 6A

Fear and Control: The Effect of Age  
and Family Composition

REACTIONS TO CRIME PROJECT

CENTER FOR URBAN AFFAIRS

Ellen S. Cohn

December 16, 1976

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY  
2040 Sheridan Road  
Evanston, Illinois 60201

82432

11711

## The Effect of Age and Family Composition on Fear of Crime

Ellen Cohn et al

In recent years, the National Victimization surveys (first administered in July, 1972) have generated much interest in crime victimization of youths and the elderly by finding a negative correlation between age and victimization rates. This means that older persons report fewer crime incidents than younger persons (U.S. Department of Justice, 1975). This finding presents a paradox in light of the fact that some researchers (Cook, 1975; Cook and Cook, 1976; Skogan, 1976) have found a positive correlation between age and fear of crime, i.e. older persons have more fear of crime than younger persons.

Several explanations have been given for the paradox between elderly crime rates and the fear of crime. Skogan (1976) explains this finding for the elderly in terms of the short amount of time that the elderly spend outside of their residences in comparison to younger people. When the elderly do go out, they may have a greater risk of being victimized. Lawton, Nahemow, Yaffe, & Feldman (1976) contend that the belief that the elderly leave their homes less than other persons is based on mere speculation - not on empirical facts. In interviewing 622 elderly residents of 53 different low rent public housing projects in Philadelphia, Lawton et al found that 67% of the the respondents were afraid to go out of their homes at times (primarily at night), 69% never leave their residences at night, and 42% avoid certain locations because they are unsafe. Unfortunately Lawton et al had no comparison group of non-elderly. Instead of a paradox, Lawton et al feel that the fears of the elderly are justified. When one breaks down crime victimizations into kinds of crime, one finds that elderly victimization is as high or higher than that of younger people for robbery with injury, and for larceny with personal contact. This still does not explain the overall fear of crime among the elderly for all crimes.

Another explanation for the findings above is that the financial and psychological

impact of victimization may be worse for the elderly than for younger people (Cook, 1975; Cook and Cook, 1976). Recently Cook, Skogan, Cook, and Antunes (1976) have confirmed this hypothesis in some preliminary analysis of the LEAA Victimization survey in 1973 (U. S. Department of Justice, 1976). The mean value of stolen property (in dollars) for the elderly is 289; in contrast, the highest mean value for any other group (in dollars) is 159.1 for the 22 to 32 year old age group and 96.84 for all age groups except for the elderly. Therefore when the elderly are victimized, their financial loss is significantly worse than that of people who are younger. Cook et al (1976) also computed the financial cost of medical care by age after being victimized. The findings follow almost the same trend for total medical expenses (in dollars). While the total medical expenses for the elderly are 539.2, the highest total medical expenses for any other age group was 259.6 for the 33 to 49 year old group and 166.46 for all age groups but the elderly. Thus one can readily see that the medical expenses which the elderly incur when they are victimized are significantly higher than those of any other age group. In addition, five dollars stolen from an elderly person on a fixed income from Social Security is much worse than five dollars stolen from an auto mechanic who can work an hour to make up the loss.

Related to the direct effect of age on fear of crime is the vicarious experience of families living with the elderly and/or with youths. As noted above, elderly have a great fear of crime. This feeling may be transferred to the families living with the elderly. Thus an adult child's perception that his or her elderly parents are fearful of being victimized may make the adult child fearful also. This phenomenon is an extension of Lerner's (1976) notion of identification with the victim when one is perceived as similar to the victim. The similarity in this case is being related to the victim (or potential victim). Conklin (1971) states that the identification with the victim leads to a greater fear of crime. This phenomenon of identification with the victim may also be applied to the relationships be-

tween parents and youths. Although youths do not have a great fear of crime, they are victimized in great numbers (U. S. Department of Justice, 1973). Lalli and Savitz (1976) further support this by saying that parents' worries about the safety of their own children may be reflected in their own fears of crime and behaviors in response to this fear.

In the present study, we did a secondary analysis of the Hartford Environmental Design Project surveys conducted in 1973 and 1975, looking at the effects of age and family composition (absence or presence of children and/or elderly living in the household). From the research cited above, the following two hypotheses are made:

H<sub>1</sub>: Elderly should have a greater fear of crime than younger persons.

H<sub>2</sub>: Families who have youths and/or elderly living in the household should have a greater fear of crime than those who do not.

## Method

Subjects. Respondents were randomly sampled from three areas of the city of Hartford (Connecticut): the target area, an area adjacent to the target area, and the remainder of the city of Hartford. 891 participants were interviewed in 1973 and 556 respondents in 1975.

General procedure. We did a secondary analysis of the 1973 and 1975 Hartford Crime Prevention through Environmental Design Program data archived at Northwestern University. Specifically we did a two-way analysis of variance of age by children absent or present in the household and a one-way analysis of variance of elderly absent or present in the household for the twenty questions which Baumer (1976) factor analyzed plus some additional questions (see Appendix 1). Two-way analyses of variance of age by elderly and elderly by children and a three-way analysis of variance of age by children by elderly were not possible, because there were so few respondents with both children and elderly living in the household.

Dependent variables. The dependent variables were taken from the 1973 and 1975 surveys (see Appendix 1). Of the 31 questions from the 1973 survey, one question was only asked in 1973 (but not in 1975). Five of the 35 questions asked in 1975 had not been asked in 1973. The items also used by Baumer (1976) are indicated in Appendix 1.

Independent variables. The three independent variables were age, children absent or present in the household, and elderly absent or present in the household. Age of the respondent was divided into the following seven categories according to the system used by Cook (1975) and Cook and Cook (1976): ages 1 through 20, ages 21 through 26, ages 27 through 32, ages 33 through 39, ages 40 through 49, ages 50 through 64, and ages 65 through 97. The dependent variables of children and elderly were dichotomized according to whether or not children or elderly were living in the household with the respondents.

## Results

A multivariate analysis of variance was done on all 31 dependent variables from the 1973 survey and all 35 dependent variables from the 1975 survey (see Appendix 1). The three independent variables are age, children absent or present in the household, and elderly absent or present in the household. As noted above, the only interaction that is considered is between age and children, because the other possible interactions (i.e. between elderly and children, elderly and age, and elderly, children, and age) could not be calculated with the available data. The means and multivariate analysis of variance results can be found in Tables one through three. There were no significant interactions between age and children on any of the dependent variables. Significant main effects were found for age, children, and elderly below.

-----  
 Insert Tables 1, 2, 3 here  
 -----

### Age

The dependent variable of age was divided into the following seven categories: ages 1 through 20, ages 21 through 26, ages 27 through 32, ages 33 through 39, ages 40 through 49, ages 50 through 64, and ages 65 through 97, according to the system used by Cook (1975) and Cook and Cook (1976). With the exception of the question about safety, fear was negatively related to age. Older persons had less fear than younger persons.

#### 1. Worry about crime

In 1973 and 1975, worry about burglary at night decreased with increasing age. Worry about burglary in the day decreased with increasing age only in 1975. Thus the elderly had less fear of burglary than younger persons.

#### 2. Safety and crime in the neighborhood

Contrary to all the other findings using age as the independent variable, elderly respondents felt less safe than younger persons when they were alone in their

neighborhood in 1975.

### 3. Perception of risk

In 1973 when no one was home, older respondents tended to feel less risk of someone breaking into their home/apartment than younger respondents.

### 4. Neighborhood problems

In 1973 and 1975, the following neighborhood problems were seen as bigger problems by younger respondents than by older respondents: people selling drugs, people using drugs, drunken men, and prostitution. This negative relationship between age and size of the problem also was found among the following problems in 1973: groups of teenagers, groups of men in streets and parks, stealing cars, burglary, robbery, and people being beaten up or hurt on the streets. Thus younger respondents saw these as bigger problems than older respondents.

### 5. Strangers and people on the street

There was a positive relationship between age and seeing strangers on the street. Older persons report more strangers than younger persons.

## Children

The dependent variable of children was dichotomized according to whether or not people had children living in the household. It was found across items that the presence of children resulted in greater fear in both the 1973 and 1975 questionnaires. Thus respondents who had children living in the household were more afraid than those who did not.

### 1. Worry about crime

In 1973 and 1975, people with children living in the household were more worried about burglary in the day and at night than people who did not have children.

### 2. Perception of risk

Respondents with children living in the household perceived a greater risk of burglary than those without children in both 1973 and 1975. Thus there was a negative relationship between perceived risk and children in the household.

### 3. Neighborhood problems

The following neighborhood problems were considered to be worse by respondents who had children living in the household: people selling drugs, people using drugs, drunken men, and burglary in 1973 and 1975. In 1975 groups of men in the streets or parks were seen as a worse problem by respondents who had children in the household. Thus there is a positive relationship between the presence of children in the household and considering neighborhood problems to be worse.

### 4. People and strangers on the street

In 1975, respondents with children living in the household recognized strangers on the street more often than respondents without children. These respondents perceived more people on the street in the day and at night than respondents who did not have children in the household.

### 5. Street safety

Respondents with children living in the household were more likely not to ever walk in the neighborhood at night than respondents who did not have children in the household.

### 6. Reliance on neighbors

There was a negative relationship between having children in the household and perceiving the neighbors as helping each other. Respondents with children living in the household were less likely to perceive their neighbors as helping each other than respondents who did not have children living in the household.

## Elderly

### 1. Worry about crime

Respondents with elderly living in the household in 1973 and 1975 did not worry about burglary in the daytime as much as respondents who did not have elderly living in the household. The same finding occurred for burglary at night for respondents with elderly living in the household in the 1973 survey. In contrast, respondents with elderly in the household in 1973 worried about crime in the day more than respondents who did not have elderly in the household.

## 2. Safety and crime in the neighborhood

In the 1975 survey, respondents with elderly living in the household did not feel as safe alone in their neighborhoods as respondents without elderly living in the household.

## 3. Perception of risk

There was a negative relationship between having elderly in the household and perceiving that there was a risk of burglary. Respondents with elderly in the household perceived less risk of burglary than respondents who did not have elderly living in the household.

## 4. Neighborhood problems

Neighborhood problems were seen as worse by respondents who did not have elderly living in the household than by respondents who did have elderly living in the household. This effect was found for the following problems in 1973 and 1975: people using drugs, drunken men, and burglary. In 1975 respondents with elderly living in the household found the following problems not to be as serious as respondents with elderly in the household: people selling drugs, teenagers, groups of men, and prostitution.

## 5. People and strangers on the street

Respondents with elderly living in the household saw strangers more often than respondents without elderly in 1973 and 1975. They also saw more people on the street at night than respondents without elderly in the household.

## Discussion

The findings did not confirm the hypotheses fully. Age was negatively related to levels of fear. The elderly were less afraid of crime than younger persons. Levels of fear were positively related to having children living in the household and negatively related to having elderly living in the household. This means that respondents who did have children in the household had more fear than respondents who did not and respondents who did have elderly in the household had less fear than respondents who did not. Since we were unable to look at the interactions between variables (except between age and children in the household), we examined the implications of the findings separately.

### Age.

The findings that older persons report lower levels of fear than younger persons did not agree with many previous studies (Cook, 1975; Cook and Cook, 1976; U. S. Dept. of Justice, 1976) which found higher fear levels among the elderly. Kim found the same negative relationship between age and fear level using the fear factor scores computed by Baumer (1976) from the Hartford data. We thought that we might find some support for previous findings of a positive relationship between age and fear if we used the individual items instead of the factor scores. Instead across items, fear of crime decreased with increasing age. This suggests that in Hartford, people's perceptions of their chances of being victimized may be consistent with their actual chances of being victimized. Thus younger people are victimized more and have a greater fear of crime; the elderly are not victimized as much and have a lower fear of crime. This would discount the importance of Cook, Skogan, Cook, & Antunes' (1976) analysis of the impact of victimization by age. They found that when the elderly are victimized, their losses are greater financially than younger people. This data suggested that financial losses were not as important as the actual chance of victimization. The only exception to this result was that in 1975, the elderly reported feeling less safe alone in their neighborhood than younger

persons.

Looking at the items which were significant in both 1973 and 1975, one is left with: worry about burglary at night and problems of people selling drugs, people using drugs, drunken men, and prostitution. All of these crimes are victimless crimes. With burglary, the elderly are probably less worried, because they leave their apartments less often than younger persons. Therefore they would have fewer worries about burglary. If the elderly are out less frequently than younger persons, they would probably not perceive these victimless crimes to be as big a problem as younger people who are out more do. Respondents were only asked how safe they felt alone in their neighborhood in the day in 1975. Contrary to the other findings, elderly reported feeling less safe alone in their neighborhoods in the day than younger people. One reason may be that younger persons leave their neighborhoods in the day, while elderly do not leave. Thus it seems that younger people are worried about specific crime-related activities, while older people have a general feeling of being less safe in their neighborhoods in the day.

### Children

The finding that respondents with children living in the household reported higher levels of fear supported the hypothesis. It suggests that people are affected by their vicarious experiences with victims or potential victims. Since parents know that children have a great chance of being victimized, they are fearful for their safety and thus increase their own fear of crime. Thus parents identify with their children, the victims or potential victims.

The following items demonstrated more fear among respondents with children than among respondents without children in 1973 and 1975: worry about burglary in the day and at night, risk of burglary, problems with people selling drugs, people using drugs, drunken men, teenagers, and burglary. It is interesting that all four burglary questions showed more worry among respondents with children than respondents without children. It could be that parents are so worried, because they have young children who they leave with a babysitter or older children who are never home. In the case of young children, they are worried that someone

will try to burglarize the home with the baby sitter there alone with the children. With older children, parents may be worried that the house will be burglarized when both parents and the children are not home.

The problems of selling and using drugs, drunken men, and teenagers are ones which respondents with children in the household were facing or will face, depending on the age of the children. Respondents are probably so concerned with these problems, because they were fearful that their own children were or would be involved in and be part of the problem.

The following two questions were only asked in 1975: people on the street at night and walking in the neighborhood at night. Respondents with children in the household reported more people on the street and were more likely never to walk in the neighborhood at night. They do not walk on the street at night, because they are afraid that either they or their children will be victimized.

#### Elderly

Contrary to the predictions, respondents with elderly living in the household had less fear of crime than respondents without elderly. This finding may be explained by the fact that elderly respondents in the Hartford sample had less fear than younger respondents. Since the elderly had less fear, the adult children living with the elderly may also have had less fear. In addition, the adult children may have been aware that the elderly were not victimized in large numbers. Thus respondents in Hartford had two good reasons for not being fearful of victimization.

In 1973 and 1975 respondents with elderly living in the household had less fear than respondents without elderly for the following items: worry about burglary in the day, risk of burglary, and problems with people using drugs, drunken men, and burglary. Three of the four burglary questions differed significantly between respondents with and without elderly in the household. One reason that respondents with elderly living in the household may not have been as fearful of burglary is because the elderly were usually home; therefore burglary was more unlikely. If the elderly do stay in more, there would be little chance that they would be exposed to

people using drugs and drunken men. Therefore their children did not have to be worried about them.

Only in 1975 were respondents asked about people on the street at night and how safe they felt alone in their neighborhoods at night. Respondents with elderly living in the household reported more people on the street at night and felt safer alone in their neighborhoods at night. Thus knowing that there were more people around made respondents with elderly feel safer in the neighborhood than respondents without elderly.

Examining the three findings together, one sees that the effect of living with elderly who have a low fear of crime is for respondents to also have a low fear of crime. Conversely the effect of living with children who have a high fear of crime is for respondents to also have a high fear of crime. One finding that did not fit this pattern was that elderly respondents felt less safe alone in their neighborhoods in the day than younger respondents, but respondents with elderly living in the household felt more safe alone in their neighborhoods at night. An explanation might be that elderly respondents did not feel as safe in the day, because the rest of the household might have been away at work or school. At night the adult children felt safe, knowing that the elderly were usually home, when more crimes were committed.

There are several limitations which should be kept in mind in looking at the results. Age had the opposite effect that it had on the National Victimization surveys. Elderly in these two Hartford surveys reported less fear of crime than younger respondents, with the exception of feeling safe alone in the neighborhood in the day. Given this problem with the data, it is hard to know what the effect of having children and the elderly in the household would have been in the other surveys. Since the youngest respondents were 19 years old, one does not know what younger respondents would have said. Family composition was narrowly defined to mean the absence or presence of children and/or elderly in the household. Traditionally family composition

has included such factors as number, sex, and age of household members and sex, age, and occupation of household head. A final problem was that there were too few respondents with both children and elderly living in the household to study the interaction of having children and elderly in the household on fear of crime.

Future research should try to replicate the findings on another victimization survey. Family composition should be expanded to include at least some of the factors traditionally associated with it. Younger respondents and respondents with both elderly and children living in the household should be interviewed.

The implications of the research are that fear of crime is directly contingent on being a potential victim or living with a potential victim. Younger respondents and respondents living with children in the household had a higher fear of crime. Older respondents and respondents living with elderly in the household had a lower fear of crime. Thus identification with the victim (Conklin, 1971; Lerner, 1974) had a direct effect on fear of crime.

TABLE 1

## MEAN SCORES FOR AGE

		Age Groups							
		1-20	21-26	27-32	33-39	40-49	50-64	65-97	
3.	Worry about burglary in day	1973*	2.43	2.62	2.48	2.61	2.55	2.86	3.22
4.	Worry about burglary at night	1973*	2.14	2.58	2.51	2.58	2.55	2.68	3.11
		1975	2.43	2.58	2.64	2.03	2.76	2.16	2.30
5.	Safety alone in nbhd. in day	1975	2.43	2.58	2.63	2.62	3.05	2.89	3.13
8.	Risk of burglary	1973	5.77	4.72	4.98	4.77	4.90	4.22	3.26
3.	Prob: people selling drugs	1973*	1.97	2.05	2.13	2.07	1.95	2.44	2.28
		1975	2.17	1.84	1.92	1.83	1.76	1.64	1.49
4.	Prob: people using drugs	1973*	1.69	1.97	2.12	1.96	1.87	1.59	2.35
		1975	2.13	1.85	2.02	1.86	1.81	1.69	1.52
5.	Prob: teenagers	1973*	2.00	2.19	2.05	2.05	1.93	2.31	2.27
6.	Prob: groups of men	1973*	2.11	2.34	2.36	2.41	2.29	2.57	2.52
7.	Prob: drunken men	1973*	1.97	2.36	2.43	2.46	2.33	2.62	2.59
		1975	1.87	1.82	1.79	1.67	1.51	1.55	1.36
8.	Prob: prostitution	1973	2.37	2.52	2.42	2.61	2.48	2.73	2.65
		1975	1.48	1.70	1.63	1.43	1.71	1.35	1.31
9.	Prob: stealing cars	1973*	2.09	2.31	2.31	2.34	2.25	2.57	2.43
10.	Prob: burglary	1973*	1.80	2.08	2.12	2.20	1.99	2.36	2.39
11.	Prob: robbery	1973*	2.06	2.32	2.31	2.27	2.15	2.45	2.19
13.	Prob: people beaten up or hurt on the streets	1973*	2.29	2.45	2.47	2.48	2.29	2.63	2.48
16.	How often see strangers on the street	1975	39.00	26.88	17.42	17.52	19.15	38.97	57.52

\* The lower the score, the higher the fear level.

TABLE 2

MEAN SCORE FOR RESPONDENTS WITH  
CHILDREN OR ELDERLY PRESENT OR ABSENT IN THE HOUSEHOLD

	Children				Elderly			
	1973		1975		1973		1975	
	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Worry about crime in day					3.30 <sup>1</sup>	3.10 <sup>1</sup>		
Worry about burglary in day	2.85 <sup>1</sup>	2.53 <sup>1</sup>	2.16	2.53	2.66 <sup>1</sup>	3.10 <sup>1</sup>	2.35	2.05
Worry about burglary at night	2.81 <sup>1</sup>	2.41 <sup>1</sup>	2.31	2.58	2.57 <sup>1</sup>	3.03 <sup>1</sup>		
Safety alone in nbhd. at night							2.73	3.07
Risk of burglary	4.04	5.20	4.12	5.72	4.72	3.65	4.95	3.61
Prob: people selling drugs	2.27 <sup>1</sup>	2.00 <sup>1</sup>	1.70	1.88			1.82	1.50
Prob: people using drugs	2.23 <sup>1</sup>	1.94 <sup>1</sup>	1.74	1.94	2.09 <sup>1</sup>	2.29 <sup>1</sup>	1.87	1.53
Prob: teenagers	2.20 <sup>1</sup>	2.06 <sup>1</sup>	1.76	2.03			1.90	1.70
Prob; groups of men			1.52	1.76			1.66	1.33
Prob: drunken men	2.52 <sup>1</sup>	2.34 <sup>1</sup>	1.54	1.78	2.43 <sup>1</sup>	2.59 <sup>1</sup>	1.69	1.37
Prob: prostitution							1.50	1.30
Prob: burglary	2.23 <sup>1</sup>	2.10 <sup>1</sup>	1.94	2.15	2.15 <sup>1</sup>	2.36 <sup>1</sup>	2.04	1.79
Recognize strangers			1.69 <sup>3</sup>	1.53 <sup>3</sup>				
How often see strangers on street							24.46	56.75
Do neighbors help each other	1.47 <sup>1</sup>	1.85 <sup>1</sup>						
People on street in day			1.93 <sup>2</sup>	2.35 <sup>2</sup>				
People on street at night			2.83 <sup>2</sup>	2.30 <sup>2</sup>			2.53 <sup>2</sup>	3.17 <sup>2</sup>
Walk in neighborhood at night			3.78 <sup>4</sup>	4.30 <sup>4</sup>				

1 the lower the score, the higher the fear

2 the higher the score, the fewer people

3 high score means not recognize strangers

4 high score means never

TABLE 3

## RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

	AGE			CHILDREN			ELDERLY			
	df	F	P	df	F	P	df	F	P	
Worry about crime in day	1973						1,697	4.05	.044	
	1975									
Worry about burglary in day	1973	6,661	3.58	.002	1,661	13.62	.000	1,697	15.55	.000
	1975				1,430	11.21	.000	1,449	4.04	.045
Worry about burglary at nite	1973	6,661	2.47	.023	1,661	19.67	.000	1,697	15.46	.000
	1975	6,430	3.14	.005	1,430	5.48	.020			
Safety alone in neighborhood	1973									
	1975	6,430	4.04	.001				1,449	6.79	.009
Risk of burglary	1973	6,661	2.08	.053	1,661	20.18	.000	1,697	9.76	.002
	1975				1,430	22.01	.000	1,449	9.00	.003
3. Prob: people selling drugs	1973	6,661	3.00	.007	1,661	17.59	.000			
	1975	6,430	2.23	.040	1,430	5.25	.022	1,449	9.40	.002
4. Prob: people using drugs	1973	6,661	6.18	.000	1,661	19.94	.000	1,697	5.62	.018
	1975	6,430	2.23	.040	1,430	6.31	.012	1,449	11.22	.001
5. Prob: teenagers	1973	6,661	2.32	.032	1,661	4.42	.036			
	1975				1,430	10.57	.001	1,449	3.49	.062
6. Prob: groups of men	1973	6,661	2.39	.027						
	1975				1,430	10.51	.001	1,449	11.38	.001
7. Prob: drunken men	1973	6,661	3.63	.001	1,661	9.92	.002	1,697	4.75	.030
	1975	6,430	2.34	.031	1,430	9.65	.002	1,449	10.46	.001
8. Prob: prostitution	1973	6,661	2.28	.035						
	1975	6,430	2.94	.008				1,449	4.57	.033
9. Prob: stealing cars	1973	6,661	2.81	.010						
	1975									
10. Prob: burglary	1973	6,661	4.60	.000	1,661	4.32	.036	1,697	7.16	.008
	1975				1,430	10.69	.001	1,449	6.72	.010
11. Prob: robbery	1973	6,661	2.50	.021						
	1975									
12. Prob: people beaten up or hurt on the street	1973	6,661	2,63	.016						
	1975									

- continued on next page -

		AGE			CHILDREN			ELDERLY		
		df	F	P	df	F	P	df	F	P
4. Recognize strangers	1973									
	1975				1,163	4.53	.035			
6. How often see strangers on the street	1973									
	1975	6,163	2.80	.013				1,176	13.76	.000
7. Do neighbors help each other	1973				1,46	6.60	.014			
	1975									
10. People on street in day	1973									
	1975				1,163	4.48	.036			
12. People on street at night	1973									
	1975				1,163	8.26	.005	1,176	5.79	.017
16. Walk in neighborhood at night	1973									
	1975				1,163	6.23	.014			

## Appendix 1

Dependent Variables: Items from 1973 and 1975 Hartford Surveys

### Worry

1. In the daytime, how worried are you about being held up on the street, threatened, beaten up, or anything of that sort in your neighborhood?<sup>1</sup>
2. And how about<sup>1</sup> at night, how worried are you about that sort of thing in your neighborhood?
3. And, how worried are you about your<sup>1</sup> home being broken into or entered illegally in the daytime when no one is home?
4. And how about at night, how worried are you about your home being broken into when you're not at home?<sup>1</sup>

### Safety and crime environment

5. During the day<sup>2</sup>, how safe do you feel or would you feel being out alone in your neighborhood?
6. How about after dark<sup>2</sup> how safe do you feel or would you feel being out alone in your neighborhood?
7. Over the past year, would you say that crime in this neighborhood has gone up, gone down, or stayed about the same?

### Perception of risk

8. During the course of a year, how likely is it that someone would break into your (house/apartment) when no one is home?<sup>1</sup>
9. During the course of a year, how likely is it that someone would break into your (house/apartment) when someone is home?<sup>1,3</sup>
10. During the course of a year, how likely is it that your purse/wallet would be snatched in your neighborhood?<sup>1</sup>
11. During the course of a year, how likely is it that someone would take something from you on the street by force or threat in your neighborhood?<sup>1</sup>
12. During the course of a year, how likely is it that someone would beat you up or hurt you on the street in your neighborhood?<sup>1</sup>

### Neighborhood Problems

13. I want you to tell me whether people selling illegal drugs is a big problem, some problem, or almost no problem in your neighborhood.<sup>1</sup>
14. I want you to tell me whether people using illegal drugs<sup>1</sup> is a big problem, some problem, or almost no problem in your neighborhood.
15. I want you to tell me whether groups of teenagers around in the streets or parks is<sup>1</sup> a big problem, some problem, or almost no problem in your neighborhood.

16. I want you to tell me whether groups of men in the streets or parks is a big problem, some problem, or almost no problem in your neighborhood.
17. I want you to tell me whether drunken men is a big problem, some problem, or almost no problem in your neighborhood.
18. I want you to tell me whether prostitution is a big problem, some problem, or almost no problem in your neighborhood.
19. How about stealing cars? Is that a big problem, some problem, or almost no problem?
20. How about burglary - breaking into people's homes? Is that a big problem, some problem, or almost no problem?
21. How about robbing people on the street? Is that a big problem, some problem, or almost no problem?
22. How about holding up and robbing small stores or businesses? Is that a big problem, some problem, or almost no problem?
23. How about people being beaten up or hurt on the streets? Is that a big problem, some problem, or almost no problem?

#### Strangers and people on the street

24. In general, is it pretty easy for you to tell a stranger from someone who lives in this area, or is it pretty hard to know a stranger when you see one?
25. In the past year, do you remember seeing any strangers in your neighborhood whose behavior made you suspicious?
26. Did this happen to you once or more than once?
27. In some neighborhoods, people mostly go their own ways. In general, what kind of neighborhood would you say this is mostly - one where people help each other or one where people go their own ways?
28. Would you say you really feel a part of the neighborhood here, or do you think of it more as just a place you live?
29. In general, in the past year or so, do you think this neighborhood has gotten to be a better place to live, a worse place to live, or has it stayed about the same?
30. How many people, both adults and children, would you say are usually on the street in front of your home during the daytime - a lot, some, a few, or almost none?
31. Do most of the people you see on the streets live around here, about half and half, or do most of them come from outside of the neighborhood?
32. How about after dark, how many people would you say are usually on the street in front of your house - a lot, some, a few, or almost none?
33. When you think about cars, motorcycles, and buses, that pass in front of your home during the daytime, would you describe the traffic as very busy, busy, moderate, light, or very light?

34. And at night, how would you describe the traffic in front of your home - very busy, busy, moderate, light, or very light?
35. How often would you say you walk to some place in this neighborhood during the day - would you say almost every day, a few times a week, once a week, less often, or never?<sup>2</sup>
36. And after dark, about how often do you walk someplace in this neighborhood<sup>2</sup> - almost every night, a few times a week, once a week, less often, or never?

<sup>1</sup> included in Baumer (1976)

<sup>2</sup> not included in the 1973 Hartford survey

<sup>3</sup> not included in the 1975 Hartford survey