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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between fear of victimization among the elderly and integration into their neighborhood, social support, activity and the effects of victimization.

Fear of victimization is a well researched phenomenon. Some of the findings have indicated that fear of victimization is a major social problem for the elderly. Little research has, however, examined the impact of integration into the neighborhood and the existence of a high level of social support, both inside and outside the neighborhood, on fear of victimization.

A literature review of the topic 'fear of victimization' was undertaken and the following hypotheses were derived. It was hypothesized that fear of victimization among the elderly would be inversely related to their degree of integration into the neighborhood, social support and social activity. Additionally, it was hypothesized that victimization, direct and indirect, would be related to fear.

In order to test these hypotheses a survey questionnaire was developed and pretested. The modified questionnaire was then administered to a sample of 70 elderly persons in New Westminster, a city outlying Vancouver.
Except in a few instances, there was not a significant relationship between the residential and social items and the fear of victimization items. Nor was there a significant relationship between direct and indirect victimization and fear. A large percentage (twenty-five percent) of the sample had been victimized, and/or knew someone who had been a victim, but this had little effect on their level of fear. It also appears that fear of victimization does not restrict the activity of the elderly, nor was there an indication that social support reduced their fear levels. The most significant, but not pervasive factor in the fear of victimization among those sampled, was that the elderly may be more inclined to stay home at night.
I would like to offer this work as a tribute to all elderly, but especially to my Grandmother, for she would have wanted this more than anyone.
Home is where one starts from. As we grow older
the world becomes stranger, the pattern more complicated...
There is time for the evening under starlight,
A time for the evening under lamplight...
Love is most nearly itself
When here and now cease to matter.
Old men ought to be explorers
Here and now does not matter
We must be still moving
Into another intensity
For a further union, a deeper communion
Through the dark cold and the empty desolation,
The wave cry, the wind cry, the vast water
Of the petrel and the porpoise. In the end is my beginning.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

"You progress not through improving what has been done but reaching toward what has yet to be done."

Gibran

Since the late 1960's the general question of public 'fear of crime' has received considerable attention from researchers. The elderly have been by far the most studied group and it is with this section of the community that the present research is concerned. This research will attempt to establish what produces different levels of fear from victimization among the elderly. More specifically, this study will investigate the relationship between fear of victimization among the elderly and the effects integration in the neighborhood, actual and indirect victimization, social support and activity have on their level of fear.

Why specifically study fear of criminal victimization among the elderly? Fear may be reflecting a more diffuse fear emerging from victimization at other levels (financial, social, political). Research indicates that the elderly are worried about all manner of problems that accompany urban life. Fear of victimization from crime may simply be one manifestation of general anxiety about threats to safety and well-being (Cook, F., Skogan, W., Cook T., & Antunes, G., 1983). Certainly the
elderly are more at risk from such things as serious injury due to road accidents or other misfortunes than from criminal victimization. As Silverman (1980) reports, the chances of being murdered are ten times less than being killed in an automobile accident and the risk of death from a fall is about three times as great as the chances of being murdered. Accidents also cause far more non-fatal injuries than do violent crimes. In terms of the actual chances of physical injury and the degree of physical injury, crime is a minor danger in the community. Yet the elderly fear crime to a much larger degree than any other danger or concern (Clarke and Lewis, 1982). Many studies cite crime as a serious personal problem to be dealt with in daily life and have found it to be the most pressing concern for the elderly, even surpassing problems with health and money (Hahn and Miller, 1980).

Before commencing with the discussion there are two concepts which require further elaboration and definition for this thesis. They are 'fear of victimization from crime' and 'elderly'.

_Fear of Victimization From Crime_

Traditional images of crime (this involves personal, property and white collar crime/victimization) and of 'fear of crime' have been reinforced by the literature and the media, but have little theoretical basis. This researcher suggests that the conceptualization 'fear of crime' is not adequate; what we are
Fear is an ambiguous concept. Fear of crime or fear of victimization is a term that has been used loosely by researchers, the public and the media; it is important to think critically about fear. Fear is the anticipation of a possibly risky situation—therefore 'potential fear' (Garofalo, 1981). Feelings of fear involve a threat to oneself, not a general concern for crime in society. Fear as a concept is also distinct from beliefs held about crime. A belief, for example, is the estimated probability of one's chances of becoming a victim. Fear may result even if the chances of becoming a victim are low (Garofalo, 1981). See Chapter IV for an extended discussion of fear and the methodological and conceptual problems surrounding it.

Fear of victimization will be taken to mean fear of personal, property and white collar victimization (for example, fraud). Specifically this research will focus on street crime (assault and robbery), household crime (burglary) and other types of crime that the elderly themselves consider important. To assess what other crimes the elderly may have felt were important, they were asked if they had been involved in any other criminal victimization, other than the ones mentioned above. Their responses to this question encompassed a variety of
crimes, including white collar crimes.

Fear of victimization from crime does not only refer to the above mentioned fear of personal, property or white collar crimes, but can also refer to other broader social crimes. However, this thesis will stay within the traditional image of crime held in the fear of crime literature. There are other interesting areas which future researchers should study, but due to the parameters of this thesis they will not be investigated.

Elderly

For the purpose of this research 'elderly' has been defined as fifty-five years of age and older. While in the literature sixty to sixty-five is taken as the beginning of old age, because of sampling difficulties fifty-five was selected for this study. However, other researchers have defined the 'period of aging' as being fifty to sixty (Thewis, 1941). These disagreements generally reflect the difficulty in utilizing physiological factors to define old age. There is no one specific time when all physical functions begin to decline and the process of aging begins. Therefore it was felt that the selection of fifty-five as a criterion was valid.

However, as a consequence, the results may not be totally comparable to previous research. Nevertheless, it was felt that the results cannot be ignored simply due to a decision concerning age. Moreover, as only fifteen percent of the sample were between fifty-five to sixty, it was not felt that this
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\textbf{Hypotheses and Discussion}

While the established level of fear of victimization among the elderly is of importance, the main focus of this research is to examine how integration in the neighborhood, victimization, social support and activity might influence the elderly's fear of victimization. The level of fear is not of primary concern, as we want to probe what effects these variables have on fear. Moreover, a straight comparison of the level of fear between age groups is not of fundamental importance when one is attempting to examine and probe the phenomenon more closely. Age is important, as the elderly generally have the highest level of fear, and the factors which influence fear might very well be different for other age groups, but that is not a concern of this thesis. This thesis will attempt to establish what perpetuates different levels of fear among the elderly.

Actual criminal victimization and the fear of criminal victimization are the two major themes of research conducted on the impact of crime on the elderly. There have been numerous surveys in the United States, and to a lesser extent in Canada and Europe, designed to estimate victimization rates among this group. However, the problem of criminal victimization of the elderly has been mired in controversy during the past decade. In the early 1970's, it was believed that the elderly were more
likely to be victimized than other age groups (Butler, 1975; Cunningham, 1975). This belief continues to exist in the media despite its systematic debunking in academic literature. Later work has even suggested that the elderly were under victimized in relation to other age groups (Cook and Cook, 1976; U.S. Department of Justice, 1979). Clemente and Kleiman (1976) have stated that victimization rates for crimes against the person are lower for the elderly than for any other age group. However, it has been concluded from an analysis of data taken from American national surveys that there is "...no indication that the elderly are special because they are victimized more frequently than others" (Antunes, Cook, Cook and Skogan, 1977, p.323).

An interesting question then to pose is, if the elderly are characterized by an overall low degree of victimization, why have they been singled out as a profiled group in research on the impact of crime? One possible answer may lie in the finding, that, irrespective of age, those most concerned with the problem of crime and who express a greater fear of crime are not necessarily those most likely to have experienced victimization (Thomas and Hyman, 1977). Studies measuring fear of crime in both the United States and England suggest that elderly persons' fear of crime is great (Braungart, Hoyer and Braungart, 1980; Clarke and Lewis, 1982; Clemente and Kleiman, 1976; Cook, Skogan, Cook and Antunes, 1983; Goldsmith and Goldsmith, 1976; Maxfield, 1984; Skogan and Maxfield, 1981).
In the face of such evidence of low victimization rates, the problem of victimization/crime and the elderly has been redefined as a problem involving fear or concern with victimization or crime, rather than victimization itself (Clemente and Kleiman, 1976; Goldsmith and Goldsmith, 1976). Indeed surveys have demonstrated surprisingly high fear levels among the old. A widely-cited study reported that 23% of those over 65 said that crime was a serious personal problem (Harris, 1975). More recent surveys cite even higher fear levels. Godbey, Patterson and Brown (1980) found widespread fear among the old. Similarly, Hahn and Miller (1980) found fear of victimization to be the single most pressing concern among elderly residents of Cincinnati, even surpassing problems associated with health and money. Maxfield (1984) found persons in England and Wales, over the age of 60, to be considerably fearful. So compelling is this evidence regarding high fear levels among the old that recent research focuses almost exclusively on the fear of crime and its impact on older people (Braungart, et al, 1980; Clarke and Lewis, 1982; Clemente and Kleiman, 1976, 1977; Cook, et. al., 1983; Cutler, 1980; Hahn and Miller, 1980; Jaycox, 1978; Lawton, Nahemow, Yaffe and Feldman, 1976; Linguist and Duke, 1982; Sundeen and Mathieu, 1976a,b; Yin 1980; 1982).

But just as we might ask if actual victimization of the elderly is a problem, the next logical question is whether fear of crime really is a problem for the elderly? If so, what are the specific negative consequences of that fear? Recent reviews
of the literature (Baumer, 1978; Lawton, 1981; Yin, 1980) indicate that researchers have focused mainly on the demographic factors that may affect fear of crime but have paid little attention to anything else. The exceptions are Hartnagel (1979), Lawton and Yaffe (1980), Yin (1982) and Riger, LeBailly and Gordon (1981). Yet only Yin (1982) and Lawton and Yaffe (1980) have discussed other determinants/consequences of fear in relation to the elderly. For example, Yin analyzed survey data to discover how fear of crime affects the elderly and he found no evidence that emotional support reduces the negative effects of fear. However he did find that fear is related to neighborhood dissatisfaction and involuntary isolation. Riger et al., (1981) examined community involvement among women living in three American cities. It was found that neighborhood bonds were inversely related to fear levels. Residential ties to the community were also related to lower levels of fear. However, social interaction with neighbors was not associated with fear levels. Lawton and Yaffe (1980) and Hartnagel (1979) both found that fear of crime reduces the satisfaction to be gained from living in a particular neighborhood. Neither study, however, found a relationship between fear of crime and levels of social interaction.

Research in other areas does document the stress buffering nature of social ties in protecting both the physical and emotional health of people of all ages (Cobb, 1976; Dean and Lin, 1977; Gottlieb, 1979; Kaplan, Cassel and Gore, 1977).
Buffers are "conditional variables which weaken or strengthen the inverse relationship between fear of crime and well being" (Yin, 1982, p. 110). Integration into a mutually supportive network may result in a psychological sense of neighborhood that is critical to an individual's well-being (Sarason, 1974). Ties to others in one's own neighborhood and involvement in local community life could provide the support that is needed to eliminate, reduce or prevent fear of victimization among the elderly. Therefore, even if fear of victimization lowers the sense of well being in the elderly, integration in the neighborhood may serve as a buffer which can act to minimize the negative effect(s) of this fear.

One objective of this thesis was to investigate whether integration in the neighborhood (residential and social), and a supportive social network outside the neighborhood (both to be defined further in this chapter) affected the response of the elderly urbanite to fear of victimization, and whether these variables provided a buffer against the impact of fear on the elderly's quality of life. Another aspect of the neighborhood to be examined in this context, which is considered an important variable in the attempt to ascertain fear of victimization among the elderly, was termed 'signs of disorder' or 'incivilities'. The way in which the neighborhood is viewed on a physical level by the elderly person may have a direct bearing on his or her fear level. It was therefore hypothesized that the degree of integration in the neighborhood, and the degree of social
support, both inside and outside the respondent's neighborhood would be inversely related to fear of victimization among the elderly. It was also hypothesized that as signs of incivilities increased so would fear.

In addition to the above stated objective, this study hoped to indicate whether victimization, direct or indirect, affected the elderly's level of fear. Specifically, it was hypothesized that previous victimization and the knowledge of victims would increase the elderly's level of fear.

Much of the literature on patterns of victimization of the elderly suggests that even though the absolute level of crime against them may be lower, the fact that they are victimized has greater significance for them. This in turn may mean that previous victimization is a significant fact relative to fear of future victimization.

It is generally assumed that crime represents a special problem for those groups most vulnerable to certain types or patterns of victimization. This has been suggested for the elderly in cases where their vulnerability has been associated with a range of physical, social and economic factors which define their position in our society. Because the elderly are vulnerable to the impact of victimization because of these factors, they may also be vulnerable to increased fear after victimization (Lawton and Yaffe, 1980; Reynolds and Blyth, 1976; Sundeen, 1977).
The specific hypotheses are as follows:

1. Those elderly who have high levels of integration into their neighborhoods (social and residential) will have lower fear of victimization.

2. Those elderly who have been victimized, or know victims, will have increased fear of victimization.

3. Those elderly with intense social support networks and high activity levels will have a lower fear of victimization.

Before proceeding to investigate the various relationships mentioned in the above hypotheses, this chapter will define all the terms used in the hypotheses. In addition, an analysis of the actual findings on the extent of victimization among the elderly will be given and compared to research on the level of fear of victimization among that subgroup. Finally, a summary of the explanations put forward to explain the paradox between the elderly's low victimization rates and their high fear levels will be offered in this chapter.

In Chapter II, the major demographic, physical, psychological and environmental determinants of fear of victimization among the elderly will be pinpointed. Previous research has indicated that such factors as demographic, physical, psychological and environmental factors appear to influence this fear, therefore the study begins by considering the perspective of nonsocial determinants as they impact upon the phenomenon. After having outlined these studies and evaluated their validity, Chapter III will proceed to examine
the various social processes at work in a neighborhood which could affect fear of victimization; it will also examine the social determinants of fear of victimization among the elderly and the consequences of fear of victimization in terms of decreased activity and decreased social support.

Perhaps the nonsocial determinents are not adequate in themselves to explain the level of fear evidenced among the elderly. It is not unreasonable to hypothesize that, as the elderly disengage from society, because of decreased social support, they may feel more vulnerable and limit their activities because of this fear. Therefore, the literature presented in both Chapter II and Chapter III is necessary to provide the framework and context from which the actual study was derived. This study involved attempts to directly test the results of these earlier studies.

Chapter IV will discuss the general conceptual and methodological concerns associated with the term 'fear of victimization'. Here we find that varying definitions and their nonspecificity have made consistent interpretations difficult, if not impossible. An original contribution of this thesis, therefore, and one of its strengths, lies in the honing and fine delineation of the meaning of the phrase 'fear of victimization'. It is clear that much of the earlier research did not conceptualize the phrase in any standard manner. In order to empirically study the phenomena, however, it is essential to have an operationalized definition for
clarification, as well as for future replication purposes. Chapter IV will also discuss the details of the actual study. More specifically, it will describe the research process, which involved the questionnaire design, the sample area, the respondents, and the data analysis.

Chapter V will give details of the results and findings of the study; and Chapter VI will conclude with the limitations of the study, the concerns of the study and new directions for research. It is hoped that the discussion will have illuminated the topic as outlined in the hypotheses in Chapter I. While the thesis will have focussed on one specified sample of elderly in New Westminster, the findings do have importance for fear of victimization literature among the elderly generally.

It should be noted that there is little literature on fear of victimization among the elderly in Canada. This is surprising. Judging from the available American literature, one would expect Canadian researchers to investigate fear of victimization among the elderly to some degree as well.

The possibility exists that criminal victimization of the elderly and their fear of victimization are such rare events in Canada that public, political and academic notice is rarely taken of them. That this is not the case, however, should be obvious. When one considers that about 18.5% of the Canadian population (in 1981) is over 55 years old, the proportion of elderly who are either victims of crime or who suffer from fear
of victimization from crime probably is not inordinantly small (Census Canada, 1981). Canadian data on the subject, however, are limited. Therefore most of the literature discussed in this thesis will be of American origin with some European studies included.

Definitions

The following section will define the terms to be employed in the study more specifically.

Fear of Victimization: Fear of victimization is defined as an emotional reaction produced by the threat of an emotional or physical harm, in this case brought on by the threat or the anticipated threat of a criminal victimization (Garofalo, 1981).

Neighborhood: The term neighborhood refers to the home base at the collective level; it is a geographic space in which one feels at home. In this thesis it specifically refers to one or two blocks around the respondent's home (Porteous, 1977). Urban sociologists have found that people tend to define their neighborhood as an area within a few blocks of their own home (Baumer and Dubow, 1977).


Residential integration refers to residential commitment and a belonging to an area. It refers specifically to attachment, familiarity and satisfaction with the neighborhood (Riger and Lavarkas, 1981; Skogan and Maxfield, 1981).
Social integration refers to local social involvement and interaction with neighbors (Riger and Lavarkas, 1981; Skogan and Maxfield, 1981).

Incivilities: Incivilities are such behaviours that threaten the "right and seemly standards of human life" (Wilson, 1968, p. 29). They include such behaviours as vandalism, the use of alcohol, and drugs and teenagers loitering on the streets (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981).

Social Interaction: Social interaction refers to the frequency and intensity of social contacts with individuals other than neighbors.

Activity: Activity refers to a flow of activities during some specified period of time (Chapin and Brail, 1969).

Social Support: Social support refers to a cohesive and supportive network of family and friends (Sundeen and Mathieu, 1976).

Victimization: Victimization refers to both direct and indirect victimization.

Indirect victimization refers to the knowledge of others victimization experiences (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981).

Direct victimization refers to actual victimization experience.
As indicated earlier, many believe that the elderly are especially vulnerable to crime; that they are the preferred targets of criminals (Butler, 1975; Cunningham, 1975; Hahn, 1976). The main rationale appears to be that:

...because of so many factors within the elderly person himself, such as the physical, mental and emotional, and because of innumerable factors operating outside of the elderly person, but inherent in our competitive economic system and culture, it seems indisputable that the elderly are indeed especially vulnerable to predatory activities both against their person and their property (Hahn, 1976, p.47).

The major purpose of this section is to briefly examine if, in fact, the elderly have a higher criminal victimization rate than the rest of the population, and whether they do make up a disproportionately large number of the overall group of victims. This is of crucial significance in relation to this thesis as actual victimization may have an effect on fear.

Concern about criminal victimization of the elderly first surfaced in 1971 when it became a focus of study for the White House Conference on Aging and the Congressional Hearing of the Senate Special Committee on Aging (Cook 1981). By 1975, with a few exceptions (Cook, 1975; Gubrium, 1974; Sykes, 1976) there was considerable similarity of thinking and a picture of the elderly as an especially victimized group emerged. The profile of the problem had four key elements (Cook, 1981, p.136):

1. The elderly are more likely than other age groups to be victims of crime (See, for example, Butler, 1975;
2. The elderly suffer more severely—physically, economically, and psychologically—from criminal victimization (See, for example, Goldsmith and Thomas, 1974);
3. The elderly are more fearful of crime than other age groups (See Harris, 1975); and
4. Fear of crime is causing elderly persons to imprison themselves in their homes (See, for example, Williams in U.S. Congress, 1972a, p. 481).

However, as Cook (1981) indicates, the conclusion that was arrived at after further research was that, with categories of crime, the elderly had substantially lower victimization rates than did younger people. Further research however, indicates that, except for purse snatching and pocket picking, victimization rates for the elderly are not lower than the rest of the population, but are about the same as for the rest of the population (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Bulletin: Victims of Crime, November, 1981). Data gathered by the National Crime Survey in the United States over an eight-year period (1973-1980) show that younger persons (under the age of 65 and especially 12 to 25) make up a disproportionately larger number of the victims in the United States. The victimization rate of the elderly (age 65 and older) is comparatively lower.

While there has been ample research in the United States which calls attention to the issue of elderly victimization,
little research has been conducted in Canada. The conclusion that one is led to by an analysis of officially recorded police data and victim surveys of crime in Canada is that, with the exception of a few crimes, elderly do not constitute a group which are likely to be disproportionally victimized.

The Greater Vancouver Victimization Survey (1979) was the first attempt in Canada to gain information from the general population about victimization and other issues. This survey suggested that, compared to the rest of the Vancouver population, the elderly (defined as 60 and above) were not at a greater risk of personal or household victimization (Roesch and Leger, 1981). Following this survey, a victimization survey of seven major cities in Canada was conducted. Consistent with the findings of other studies, it found that elderly people were relatively unlikely to be victimized by crime (Canadian Urban Victimization Survey; Victims of Crime, 1983). In 1983, the Department of Justice published a review of crime and the elderly (Canada, Department of Justice, 1983). The paper indicated that the elderly are victims of a restricted range of reported crimes; they are burglary, personal larceny with contact, fraud, harassment and vandalism. This paper, moreover, indicated that the focus of concern in the victimization of the elderly should be shifted from street crimes to white collar crimes. The conclusion that the working paper came to was that victimization of the elderly was more a function of the area in which they live rather than a function of their personal
characteristics. The elderly do not become victims only because they are old, they become victims because they are exposed to the risk of victimization.

Thus, real victimization is only one of two major aspects of the crime problem among the elderly. The second is fear of victimization from crime. Many people point out that fear and its behavioral impact may be a greater problem than is actual victimization (Patterson, 1978; Smith, 1979). The following section will consider the subject in depth by looking at the available research on the extent of fear of victimization among the elderly.
Patterson (1978) makes the point that while victimization will never touch all aged citizens, fear may touch each one, and it is likely to have negative effects on the behaviour and morale of elderly persons. Although Patterson noted that, until recently, there was little data on fear of crime among the elderly, we now have access to many studies that document the pervasive presence of such fear in this age group. According to Erskine (1974), fear of crime is not only rising in all segments of the population but is also increasing among the aged. Surveys conducted in the United States seem to indicate that the fear of crime is a very serious concern for the elderly (Braungart, Hoyer and Braungart, 1979; Dubose, 1977; Feyerham and Pope, 1976; Harris, 1975; Kahana, Liang, Felton, Fairchild and Harel, 1977). The Louis Harris survey (1975), conducted on a national sample of people 65 years of age and older, notes that almost 25% of the aged stated that fear of crime was a major social problem and more of a problem for them than ill health, loneliness and lack of sufficient money. Studies undertaken since the Harris poll confirm these findings. Researchers who have examined the issue agree that high fear levels are more often reported by, and appear to have a greater effect on, the elderly (Antunes, Cook, Cook and Skogan, 1977; Berg and Johnson, 1975; Braungart et al., 1979; Clemente and Kleiman, 1976, 1977; 

'Note again, both the term 'fear of crime' and 'fear of victimization' will be utilized, depending on the term used by the various researchers.
Lawton, 1981; Linquest and Duke, 1982; Maxfield, 1983; Maxfield, 1984; Sundeen and Mathieu, 1976). Some researchers believe that fear of crime among the elderly is a greater problem than crime itself (Cook and Cook, 1976). The National Crime Survey (United States Department of Justice, 1977) reported relationships between age and fear of crime in a sample of all age groups in eight cities. The 65 and older age group experienced higher levels of fear than the rest of the population. The Canadian Urban Victimization Survey (1983) and the Greater Vancouver Victimization Survey (1981) replicated the U.S. survey results.

Two fairly recent studies in the United States demonstrate how widespread the fear of victimization is among the elderly. The first, a study of a number of large east-coast cities, found a pervasive fear of crime among the elderly populations (70 percent) (Godbey et al., 1980). The samples surveyed were not representative of the urban elderly population. The majority were white, in better health, and better educated. They were also more affluent and more actively involved in outside activities than the average senior citizen. The high levels of fear this study uncovered become significant in light of findings of other surveys, which found that among older persons, blacks and the lower-income elderly are more afraid of crime than are whites and the more affluent (Clemente and Kleiman, 1976; Cook, Skogan, Cook, and Antunes, 1983).

Another recent study (Hahn and Miller, 1980) showed fear of crime to be the number one concern of approximately half of the
elderly residents of Cincinnati, Ohio. It found that more than 51% of the older city residents surveyed cited "safety against crime" as their most pressing concern out of a list of eleven problems. City residents rated crime as more worrisome than inflation and money problems, health care, transportation, or loneliness.

Adams and Smith (1976) and Lawton et. al., (1976) noted that the elderly are more fearful than the rest of the population they studied, and are more likely to fear going out at night. Another study found that as many as 50% of the elderly are fearful of walking in their own neighborhood (Braungart et. al., 1979). Sparks, Genn and Dodd (1977) found English respondents over the age of 61 were more likely to view the streets as unsafe. Clearly, older people are fearful of crime in their neighborhoods. Lester (1981) found that while the overwhelming majority of people over 64 did not feel threatened when out in their neighborhood in the daytime, almost one in five did feel threatened.

In a study of people's expectations of victimization, Rosenfeld (1981) found that 59% of those over 64 years of age reported that their chance of being attacked or robbed had risen in the past few years. This is similar to the study's overall average of 64%. In the same study 88% of those 64 years of age and older reported thinking that people in general have changed their activities in relation to fear of crime. It has been shown that the elderly, more than any other age group, actually have
limited their activities because of their fear of victimization. Rosenfeld (1981) gives two explanations for this. First, the elderly, having a greater fear of victimization, would be more likely than other groups to change their behaviour in response to that fear. Secondly, older people have been initially socialized at a time when crime rates were lower and victimization less of a concern. It seems probable that when they were developing a lifestyle, the avoidance of victimization was not a consideration. Increases in crime rates and increases in perceptions of the threat of victimization require either cognitive responses or physical responses, or both. Younger people, who have been brought up to expect crime to occur, have developed a defensive lifestyle that does not allow or require further change in the face of an increased probability of victimization. The elderly have changed their lifestyles, they no longer want to go out at night, and they no longer do go out at night (Rosenfeld, 1981).
While an understanding of the scope and nature of the elderly's fear of victimization is important, one question still must be addressed; what accounts for the discordance between the elderly's low victimization rates and their high levels of fear of victimization? Many researchers have concluded, after studying victimization rates amongst older people, that the elderly's fear of crime is unrealistic or irrational (Cook and Cook, 1976; Hindelang and Richardson, 1978). However, a closer analysis of victimization rates undermines this conclusion.

One way to examine actual victimization rates is to study the extent of victimization as compared to an individual's exposure to the risk of victimization. Because of many age-related factors and a high fear of victimization, older people do not venture out much, which reduces their risk of being victimized from a number of crimes. A review of national big-city survey data from this perspective suggests that personal victimization for the elderly is much higher than the level of exposure would lead one to expect. In other words, in comparison with how often they leave home, they seem disproportionately victimized (Cook et. al., 1983). For example, Lawton et. al., (1976) speculate that the presently low rates of victimization among the old result from adaptive responses to high crime rates which reduce the amount of exposure to criminal victimization. Some argue that fear related activity restriction
is as serious a problem as victimization itself (Conklin, 1976; Goldsmith and Thomas, 1974; Sundeen, 1977). In one of the most interesting elaborations of the fear-risk relationship, Balkin (1979) used published tabulations to demonstrate significantly higher associations between fear and various victimization rates after they were corrected for the extent to which people (the general population, not specifically the elderly) expose themselves to such victimization. This has clear relevance to the aged precisely because their behaviour patterns are often more restricted than younger people's. High fear among the elderly could also produce lower victimization rates because people with high fear may use a greater number of precautions, which if effective, would keep them from being victimized (Balkin, 1979).

Stafford and Galle (1984) also examined the relationship among population groups (including the elderly) between victimization rates and fear of crime. Their data also cast doubt on the conclusion of previous research that fear is related inversely to objective risks of victimization. They indicate that the issue centres on the measurement of victimization rates. Previous research has relied on conventional rates, which may be incorrect because they do not take into account the differential exposure to the risk of victimization by different groups of the population. Thus, some groups with fairly low victimization rates, for example the elderly, may have fairly high victimization rates when the
exposure to the actual risk of victimization is taken into account. Inferring exposure from lifestyle routine activities, Stafford and Galle (1978) show that fear of crime is more strongly and positively related to adjusted (for risk and exposure) rather than conventional victimization rates.

In addition, the discrepancy between fear and victimization rates for the elderly could be a methodological artifact (Riger and Gordon, 1981). This discrepancy appears when data are aggregated by demographic characteristics of people. When place of residence rather than characteristics of people are used as the basis for aggregating crime statistics, fear levels do appear to correlate with rates of local crime. McPherson (1978) found that residents' perceptions of the seriousness of crime problems in their neighborhoods accurately reflected the rates of reported local crime (with the exception of vandalism), and that citizens were fearful in proportion to local rates of personal (but not property) crime. Jaycox (1978) found a similar correspondence between fear levels and local victimization rates.

Even though there are conflicting views as to whether victimization rates are realistic, overall, the major generalization from the research is that the aged do experience substantial fear of crime, though, of course, the diversity and the heterogeneity among the elderly are also important to keep
in mind (Clemente and Kleiman, 1976). There are a number of explanations which may account for this finding. They will be discussed in the following two chapters.
In a discussion of the general (demographic, physical and psychological) and social determinants of fear of victimization among the elderly it is necessary to investigate the literature on fear of crime/victimization generally, as it will provide a framework for the specific discussion of fear of victimization among the elderly, and, more importantly, the determinants of that fear.

**Introduction**

It is hypothesized for this thesis that lower fear among the elderly will be related to high integration in the neighborhood and a high level of social support, both inside and outside the neighborhood. In addition to this hypothesis, selected demographic and residential factors will be discussed. These factors were selected from a review of the literature dealing with the determinants of fear of victimization. This literature will be discussed in detail in this chapter.

Integration in the neighborhood, a supportive social network both inside and outside the neighborhood, signs of disorder, activity levels, and the effects of direct and indirect
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1There are conceptual and operational problems concerning the term 'fear of victimization'. For a detailed critique refer to Chapter IV.
victimization have been examined primarily within the context of the general population. Again, while it is widely assumed that these factors may have an effect on fear among the general population, there has been little systematic research involving fear among the elderly using these variables. Therefore, this review of the literature will, in many instances, involve a review of the literature of fear among the general population as well as a discussion of fear among the elderly.

**Demographic Determinants**

**Age**

As noted previously a large number of surveys found a relationship between age and fear of victimization/crime (Antunes et al., 1977; Baumer, 1978; Canadian Urban Victimization Survey, 1983; Clarke and Lewis, 1982; Clemente and Kleimen, 1976, 1977; Cook et al., 1983; Garofalo, 1977a; Greater Vancouver Victimization Survey, 1981; Hindelang, Gottfredson and Garofalo, 1978; Hough and Mayhew, 1983; Lawton, 1981; Leibowitz, 1975; Maxfield, 1983, 1984; Skogan and Maxfield, 1981; Sundeen and Mathieu, 1976,a,b; Yin, 1980; 1982). However, other surveys have reported only minor differences between age groups (Biderman, Johnson, McIntyre and Weir, 1967; Fowler and Mangione, 1974). Yin (1980) offers two explanations for this discrepancy. He states that the relationship between fear of crime and age may be different in rural than in urban settings. For example, Leibowitz, in a 1975 analysis of National
Opinion Research Center data, found that the elderly had a higher level of fear than the younger population in urban areas, but there were no significant differences by age in rural areas. The urban environment is a good example of surroundings that might particularly lead to fear of crime (Braungart et al., 1979; Antunes et al., 1977; Patterson, 1978). Cities are high crime areas and the elderly are especially concentrated in cities. (For a more detailed description see the section in this chapter labeled ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINANTS: CITY.) The second explanation that Yin (1980), offers for the discrepancy is that different studies employed different measurements of crime and fear of crime.

It appears that many older people are quite apprehensive and fearful while other elderly remain relatively unafraid, thus it is doubtful that age per se can adequately account for the differences in the levels of fear among the elderly. A few attempts have been made to identify other characteristics that are associated with high levels of fearfulness among the aged. These are gender, race\(^2\), social class and income, and will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

\(^2\)Although race is a variable which is consistently related to fear of victimization (Biderman et al., 1967; Braungart et al., 1980; Clemente and Kleiman, 1977; Conklin, 1975; Ennis, 1967; Fowler, 1974; Garofalo, 1977a; Harris, 1975; Liska, Lawrence, and Sanchirico, 1982; Select Committee on Aging, 1977; Sundeen and Mathieu, 1976a,b; Wise and Hoyer, 1979), it is not a variable which could be isolated in the present study as all the respondents were caucasian. Therefore it was felt that a lengthy discussion of race and fear would not be pertinent. In fact most of the literature is from the United States, which has a large racial population, a factor not relevant to the same degree in Canada.
Gender

Gender has been the major factor related to fear of victimization. Despite substantially lower victimization rates for women in most crime categories, gender consistently emerges as the most powerful predictor of fear of personal crime. The level of fear is substantially higher for women of all ages, and especially for elderly women (Biderman et al., 1967; Braungart et al., 1980; Clemente and Kleiman, 1976, 1977; Cook et al., 1983; Conklin, 1975; Ennis, 1967; Garofalo, 1977b; Greater Vancouver Victimization Survey, 1981; Hough and Mayhew, 1983; Leibowitz, 1975; Maxfield, 1984; Riger, 1981; Riger and Gordon, 1981; Skogan and Maxfield, 1981; Maxfield, 1984; Toseland, 1982). All found women to be more fearful than men. Baumer (1978) offers two explanations for the different fear levels between men and women. The most common explanation is that, as a group, women possess less physical strength than men, making them more vulnerable. In addition to their greater vulnerability, women are also almost exclusively the targets of sexual assault, an especially terrifying form of personal violation (Riger, 1978). In addition, some authors suggest that higher levels of fear among women may be due to passive sex role socialization, submissive socialization designed to perpetuate male dominance (Baumer, 1978).

The pattern of women being more fearful of victimization than men holds true for the elderly female. However, the differences in fear levels between men and women in their older
years are not as great as they are between younger age groups. Higher fear levels among older women may be a reflection of their greater isolation; more women, by nature of their longer life expectancies, are living alone. The increased similarity in fear levels between the sexes among the elderly may be due to their recognition that once they enter their later years, physical endurance or strength does not vary much between sexes. Both men and women view themselves as quite vulnerable to attacks by the typical offender, a young stranger who is usually strong and fast (Riger, 1978).

Studies do indicate, however, that the older female is generally more fearful than the older male. Clarke and Lewis (1982) found, when controlling for age, that females were more fearful than males, with over half of the female subjects expressing fear, compared to just over one third of the males. This is consistent with the findings of Braungart et al., (1980), Davis and Brody (1979), Kahana et al., (1977), Lebowitz, (1975), and Riger (1978), who all found that a much higher number of women reported fear than men.

Social Class/Income

Income is a variable which appears to be consistently related to fear of victimization. Individuals at lower income levels express more fear of victimization/crime than people at higher income levels (Biderman et al., 1967; Clemente and Kleiman, 1977; Ennis, 1967; Garofalo, 1977a; Harris, 1975;
Leibowitz, 1975). Clemente and Kleiman (1977) found that the high-income elderly generally expressed less fear of property crime than did low income elderly. The difference, however, was not great. The United States Department of Justice (1977), in a sample of the general population in eight cities, reported a stronger difference in the same direction between the classes.

This relationship between social class, income and fear may be explained by the fact that poorer people generally live in the inner cities and experience higher victimization rates, or at the very least, greater contact with victims, than their wealthier suburban counterparts (Baumer, 1978). The elderly poor may very well be more fearful because they live in high crime neighborhoods. In addition, poorer elderly are less able to cope with crime, they cannot afford good locks, cannot replace lost money or property, and often cannot afford insurance, especially in high-crime areas (Cook et al., 1983). The over-representation of the elderly among the poor may account for the fact that the relationship between income and fear is even stronger for them than for the general population. As Baumer (1978) has indicated, people tend to group themselves by social class, and high crime areas are often those located at the lower end of this scale. He states:

In view of this tendency race, income. . .differences in fear often are viewed as spurious and attributed to other characteristics of the local environment. Given similar residential situations we might expect these demographic differences to disappear. . .Thus it may be that the apparent relationship between these variables and fear is a product of the tendency for people to group themselves spatially, along racial and class
lines. Within smaller, more homogeneous areas, their effect on fear appears to be more problematic and variable (Baumer, 1978, p.257).

Most of the existing research is devoted to identifying the effects of demographic characteristics on fear of victimization among the elderly. However, such factors tell us only the characteristics of fearful persons, and not why people are fearful, or the consequences of their fear. Therefore, this study will also incorporate what effect the physical, psychological, environmental and social factors have on the level of fear among the elderly.

Physical Determinants

A second group of factors which may explain variations of fear of victimization among the elderly are physical factors. There is widespread recognition that, because of the aging process, older people have a greater likelihood of being weaker, more vulnerable, and thus easier targets for criminals. The elderly have diminished physical strength and stamina, hence they are less able to defend themselves or to escape from threatening situations. Older people are far more likely to suffer from physical impairments such as loss of hearing or sight, arthritis, and circulatory problems, which increase their vulnerability. Older people are physically more fragile, and recovery from an illness or attack is more difficult, therefore they may be less likely to resist attackers. Potential criminals
are aware of the diminished physical capacity and the physical vulnerability of the elderly and thus are more likely to seek out an elderly target whose age status is easily visible (Goldsmith and Thomas, 1974; Singer, 1977; Skogan and Klecka, 1977; Stinchombe et al., 1977).

Antunes et al. (1977), Braungart et al. (1979; 1980), Goldsmith and Goldsmith (1976), Hindelang et al. (1978), Skogan and Maxfield (1981), and Maxfield (1984) all support this argument that physical decline and illness appear to increase fear in the elderly, particularly the female elderly. In an analysis done by Braungart et al. (1980) nearly three-fourths of the elderly women who were in poor health claimed they were afraid of being a victim of a crime.

**Psychological Determinants**

The work of Lawton et al. (1976) has shed some light on the psychological responses of older people in relation to crime. On the one hand, they possess traits that make them more vulnerable to crime; for example, due to limitations in vision and hearing, the elderly may not readily recognize a threat. However, in trying to compensate for their reduced capacity to appreciate risk, they may become oversensitized to the point of chronic anxiety. Alternately, even if they do recognize a threat accurately, they may not analyze the situation properly in terms of a response; usually an attempted crime happens quickly and
suddenly, straining the limits of anyone's information-processing capacity, but especially that of the older person. Thus, the uncomprehending victim may remain passive when action should be taken, or may take inappropriate action (Lawton et al., 1976; Smith, 1979).

The major variables within the psychological determinants of fear, according to Yin (1980) are:
1. The perceived high probability of being victimized;
2. the perceived seriousness of the specific crime; and
3. the perceived inability to recuperate from a victimization experience.

These psychological factors are located within the subject's cognitive realm. Whether they are realistic or not is irrelevant; they may still affect fear of victimization. These psychological factors are relevant to fear among the elderly as vulnerability appears to be a factor which greatly affects fear. Those elderly who perceive themselves as vulnerable may have higher fear levels than those who perceive themselves as less vulnerable.

Recognition that these psychological factors may increase the elderly's fear of victimization is a major point mentioned in the literature. For example, Lawton et al., (1976) and Antunes et al., (1977) hypothesize that increased fear not only increases anxiety but also may cause a devaluation of self by many older people. This may contribute to despair and a turning inward which makes it more likely that a person would exaggerate fears for the self.
Considerable reference has also been made to the tendency for the aging process to correlate with the shift from active, aggressive modes of interaction to passive and cooperative modes (Patterson, 1978). Thus, many older persons limit their participation in social and recreational activities because they are afraid to go out on the streets. This in turn can have disastrous effects on the psychological well-being of the aged person.

Environmental Determinants

The question of victimization and the elderly cannot be dealt with effectively until there is a clear understanding of the dynamics of the relationship between the elderly and their environment. The sense in which the word environment is used will include both the physical and social surroundings as they act upon a person. A major task confronting the researcher in this area is to unravel the mechanics underlying the fear of victimization among the elderly and their environment.

Fear of crime varies consistently by size of city and by place of residence within a city (Baumer, 1978; Maxfield, 1984; Skogan and Maxfield, 1981; Sparks et. al., 1977). Clemente and Kleiman (1977) and Stinchcombe et. al., (1977) both found the size of the city to be significantly related to fear. In a study of rural, suburban, and urban residents of Missouri, Boggs
(1971) reported urban dwellers to be more fearful than residents of the other areas. However, fear does not appear to vary much between cities of comparable size (Garofalo, 1977a). Within cities, Biderman et al., (1967), Reiss (1967), Conklin (1975) and Maxfield, (1984) all have shown place of residence to be related to fear. Therefore, residential location may be a variable which greatly affects the elderly's fear of victimization. The components of this concept can be arranged into three levels: the home and neighborhood and the city. Each of these will be discussed in the following section.

City

One of the key factors in the elderly's perception of, and vulnerability to crime, stems from their location in urban areas, and particularly their residence in neighborhoods with high crime rates. A number of studies indicate that fear levels are higher in cities and neighborhoods with higher official crime rates (Biderman et al., 1967; Fowler and Mangione, 1974; Furstenberg, 1971; Skogan, 1977; Skogan and Maxfield, 1981). In the United States more than 32% of the elderly live in metropolitan areas, and most of these people reside in the inner city (Golant, 1979). Many have been living in an area for decades and for either cultural, emotional or economic reasons have not moved. Many older people live in the central city because they cannot afford housing in the suburbs or they cannot afford to move to rural areas. For whatever reasons, the urban elderly often find themselves in close proximity in the city to
the people who are most likely to victimize them (Goldsmith and Thomas, 1974).

The level of fear of victimization from crime also depends on the size of the area in which the elderly live. Clemente and Kleiman (1977) found the size of the city to be significantly related to fear. They also found the urban elderly to be more fearful than the rural elderly, and fear in the elderly decreases in a clear pattern as one moves from a large city to rural areas. Sundeen and Mathieu (1976) compared the fear of crime of the elderly in a central city environment, an urban middle class municipality and a suburban retirement neighborhood. Their findings also supported the view that central city residents have a significantly higher fear of criminal victimization in their immediate neighborhood than the other two groups.

**Home**

Home refers to the territory known as home base; for example, the type of building an individual lives in. The home is a structure or area in which an emotional investment has been made by an individual or a small group. It is a space which has been personalized (Porteous, 1977). Territorial principles suggest that space which is personalized is also defended. Boundary lines are important to the owner, and may be actively defended to the point of litigation. Fences and walls are efficient territorial markers when their locations are agreed
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upon by both parties. Personalized and actively defended, the home frequently becomes a security refuge for the aged. Rainwater (1966) has argued that the most primitive level of evaluation of housing should be whether it shelters individuals from outside threats. The shelter from outside threats involves rituals, for example when entering another person's home base one must perform the ritual of door knocking, bell ringing or using more elaborate apartment intercom systems.

The type of housing in which the elderly live (subsidized versus community housing) can also have an effect on fear of crime/victimization. Gubrium (1974) has hypothesized that those elderly living in age-heterogeneous housing will be more fearful of crime than those in age-homogeneous housing; and Sherman, Newman and Nelson (1976) reported that their research supports the idea of age-homogeneous public housing for the elderly as a means of reducing fear of crime. Kahana et al., (1977) studied the effect of types of housing on fear of crime among the elderly. They found that residents in subsidized housing felt more vulnerable to neighborhood problems than did other neighborhood residents. The major reason for this may be due to the physical design of subsidized housing. It usually consists of apartment blocks, and is similar to institutional settings in that it discourages personal relationships. This is compounded by the inability of residents to informally control stairwells, elevators, and corridors. Highrises often provide no windows or semipublic areas whereby residents may informally survey, and
thus control, the public areas from their private areas. Consequently stairwells and elevators may become scenes of muggings, assaults and harassment.

Rainwater (1966) studied public housing projects and found not only a high fear of crime, but that the fear of crime among residents led to decreased mobility, both during the day and night. This in turn led to decreased social interaction, a lack of community cohesiveness and feelings of alienation. The ultimate result was exceedingly poor tenant morale and low life satisfaction.

Finally, some of the differences in fear among the general population are associated with housing characteristics such as the density of housing units, and whether individuals own or rent their home. These factors are strongly correlated with inner city residence, because apartment and rental dwellings are more common in the inner city. Maxfield (1984) found fear to be much higher among those living in apartments rather than detached houses. Homeowners were the least troubled by victimization and fear, whether they lived in the inner cities or elsewhere.

Neighborhood
The last, but key unit of residential locale uses the neighborhood as the unit of analysis. It should be noted that the discussion will not distinguish between the term community and the term neighborhood: they will be used interchangeably.
Neighborhood refers to the home base at the collective level. At its simplest, one's neighborhood is the geographic space in which one feels at home. This space generally contains the individual's core home base, the house. Reference to one's neighborhood may mean little more than the vicinity of one's house, which encompasses housing and persons of similar lifestyle (Porteous, 1977).

The type of neighborhood in the city and the persons in it may influence the elderly's fear of crime (Lewis and Maxfield, 1980; Skogan and Maxfield, 1981). People who live in neighborhoods with crime problems are more fearful than those from placid communities (Skogan, 1981). The age composition of elderly residents of a neighborhood can also affect their perception of fear. Sundeen and Mathieu (1976) tested an alternate form of Gubrium's (1974) hypothesis (that those elderly living in age-heterogenous housing will be more fearful of crime than those living in an age-homogeneous housing) by substituting the age composition of residents of the neighborhood for that of the housing. They found that the elderly residents in age-heterogeneous neighborhoods had a higher degree of fear than those in age-homogeneous neighborhoods.

Age composition is certainly not the only dimension by which neighborhoods are measured. Reynolds and Blyth's (1976) study
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3 Neighborhood is not defined in the fear of victimization literature, see Chapter IV.
differentiated neighborhoods according to suburbs and central city. Those who lived in the central city had higher levels of fear than those who lived in the suburbs. Their data suggests, however, that this difference did not have significant effects on fear of crime after the effects of life cycle and past experience were partialled out. Bishop and Klecka (1978) reported that the neighborhood was a significant predictor of fear of crime among the aged, but they did not report how neighborhood was measured. And Henig and Maxfield (1978) hypothesized that physical structures of neighborhoods, such as poor lighting and blind spots, could produce a high level of fear.

In concluding this section, it is apparent that fear varies with the size of the city and the place of residence. People report higher fear in big cities (see Baumer, 1978) and within cities fear of crime varies considerably between neighborhoods (Lewis and Maxfield, 1980; Skogan and Maxfield, 1981). There are a number of possible reasons for this; it could be due to real risk of victimization, or communications about crime in the area. Skogan and Maxfield (1981) have indicated that fear is more closely related to hearing about crime from neighbors than from other less personalized sources of information), personal perception of the area, and extent of integration in the neighborhood.

Although there are problems with estimating real risk of victimization, as official crime reports do not reflect the real
chance of victimization well and are not specific to crimes that may produce the most fear, Baumer (1978) and Maxfield (1984) found that people who live in high crime areas are more fearful than their counterparts in low crime areas. Yin (1980), reviewing fear of crime among the elderly reports:

The consensus is that people seem to have fairly accurate perceptions of the relative crime rate of their particular neighborhood and that such perceptions correlate with the degree of fear reported (p. 245).

Within neighborhoods a number of social processes are at work. Although not mutually exclusive, these processes will be examined in Chapter III in the following categories: integration in the neighborhood and support through (1) residential integration (2) social integration and (3) signs of incivility/disorder. Further, the perceived risk of victimization and fear of victimization from crime among the elderly, the effect of previous victimization, and the effect of interpersonal communication on fear, will be discussed. Finally, the consequences of fear among the elderly will be examined — whether it affects their activity levels and thus perhaps their social support systems.
CHAPTER III
SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF FEAR OF VICTIMIZATION AMONG THE ELDERLY

Introduction

Although fear seems to be generally related to local crime rates, elderly within the same locality differ considerably, both in the extent to which they fear crime and in their use of self protective tactics (See Dubow, McCabe and Kaplan, 1979, for a comprehensive review of reactions to crime.) Some people become isolated in their own homes, while others in the same neighborhood do little to protect themselves from danger. As indicated, gender, age and race account for a considerable amount of variability in fear (Dubow et. al., 1979) but the extent to which people feel integrated into their communities may have additional effects on their reactions to crime (Jaycox, 1978). Ties to others in one's neighborhood, and involvement in local community life, could provide support in the face of neighborhood problems such as crime.

Provisions of social support through the environment has become a key area of interest for researchers. For example, the recent President's Commission on Mental Health included a separate task panel on community support systems which emphasized that community and social support not only can reduce the consequences of emotional stress, but can also help keep stress from developing (Task Panel on Community Support, 1978).
The panel recommended that a major new federal initiative be developed which would recognize and strengthen the natural helping networks to which people belong, and emphasized the neighborhood as the locus for support (Riger and Lavrakas, 1981). In addition to providing opportunities for social interaction, neighborhoods can provide a sense of belonging for people - young or old. This sense of belonging may be an instrumental factor reducing the fear of victimization from crime among the elderly.

Fear of victimization may be due, in part, to the living environment and perception of the environment. In addition, fear may profoundly affect the way people behave in their environment. This may have several implications for the elderly and their fear of victimization from crime. People's life circumstances, particularly their stage in the life cycle, may play a critical role in determining how they are integrated into their environment, specifically their degree of residential attachment to the neighborhood and their social interaction in the neighborhood - this in turn could affect their fear level.
Integration in the Neighborhood

Most of the ways in which contemporary scholars characterize communities and the people who live in them can be found in the oldest traditions of urban sociology. This is certainly true of integration in the neighborhood (Lewis, 1980). Ever since Durkheim (1933) described the role of crime in affirming the solidarity of the community, researchers have continued to probe various aspects of the relationship between integration and crime. More than forty years ago Shaw and McKay (1942) reported integration produced lower rates of delinquency. Maccoby, Johnson and Church (1958) followed up on Shaw and McKay's ideas in a study of two neighborhoods in Massachusetts; the neighborhoods were similar in terms of residents' socio-economic status, but one neighborhood had three times as much juvenile delinquency as the other. They explained the difference in delinquency rates by the degree of integration in the two areas. In the area with the higher delinquency rates few residents knew each other and expressed affection for the neighborhood.

Cohen (1966) recognized that under certain circumstances deviance may contribute to social integration. Thus a common enemy - external or internal to the group - may unite the group.

There have been other approaches to the concept of integration in the neighborhood, such as social disorganization. As Skogan and Maxfield (1981) indicate, integration in the neighborhood is "...a key building block in theories of urbanization since the turn of the century. Integration is one small set of concepts which make up social disorganization theory" (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981, p. 98).
against the deviant, thereby contributing to group integration or solidarity. Deviant behavior may lead to increased frequency and intensity of interaction among members of a neighborhood. This supports Durkheim's (1933) argument that crime increases social solidarity by binding people together in opposition to the law violator:

Crime brings together upright consciences and concentrates them. We have only to notice what happens, particularly in a small town, when some moral scandal has just been committed. They stop each other on the street, they visit each other, they seek to come together to talk of the event and to wax indignant in common (p. 102).

Durkheim (1933) went on to point out that "if the traversed state is strong, if the offence is serious, the whole group attacked masses itself in the face of danger and unites, so to speak, in itself" (p. 103). Similarly Mead (1918) argued that

...the attitude of hostility toward the lawbreaker has the unique advantage of uniting all members of the community in the emotional solidarity of aggression... The criminal does not seriously endanger the structure of society by his destructive activities, and on the other hand he is responsible for a sense of solidarity, aroused among those whose attention would be otherwise centered upon interests quite divergent from those of each other (p. 588).

Research on these issues in relation to fear of victimization among the elderly has been almost non-existent. However, some research has been conducted, particularly with the general population. For example, Seibel (1972) found that deviance and reactions to it enhanced the level of integration among groups in a small African society, probably because the units for integration are the families of the offender and the
victim - that is, groups rather than individuals. Some support for the notion that crime unites members of the neighborhood appears in Poveda's (1972) observations of a town's reactions to adolescent drug use. Community discussion groups were formed and a mass meeting was held to discuss drug use and the most appropriate neighborhood response to it.

More recently, Conklin (1975) has suggested a counter-argument that the existence of crime may serve to undermine social solidarity, especially when offenders remain unapprehended and crime is perceived as getting worse (it should be noted, however, that Conklin's independent variable was the perception of local crime - what others have sometimes called concern about crime. This should be distinguished from personal fear of victimization or crime). Conklin found that crime reduces social solidarity and perhaps contributes to increased crime rates through weakened informal social controls in the community resulting from reduced solidarity or integration.

Both Conklin (1975) and Lewis and Maxfield (1980) suggest that the impact of crime on community residents may be a function of, as well as have an effect on, their attitudes towards their area. Where a high degree of community solidarity or integration exists, crime, and the fear that it generates, may not be sufficient to destroy this cohesiveness. This may be why Lewis et al. (1980) and Riger et al., (1981) both found that in more integrated communities residents seemed less affected when they encounter what they call the "signs of
crime". Where less solidarity or integration prevails, crime could have a strong impact on the relations among community members.

Integration can also be examined in relation to fear of victimization from crime. Newman (1972), Jacobs (1961), and Hunter and Baumer (1982), describe how fear is affected by physical and social integration and characteristics of urban neighborhoods. Integration has been measured many different ways, including: degree of normative value agreement, the degree of social interaction, the extent of functional interdependence, and the degree of mutual identification within a social group or among the residents of a particular area (Hunter, 1974).

The studies that consider integration and general perceptions of crime most often include one or two but not all of the above measures of integration (Dubow, et al., 1979). These studies can, to some extent, be distinguished in terms of whether they examine the individual's social integration or the individual's residential integration. These are two very distinct concepts and will be treated as such. People are more integrated into their communities when they have lived there for a long time, when they have a financial investment and if they plan to remain living there. This implies attachment to an area - and a sense of belonging and familiarity.
Residential Integration in the Neighborhood

The relationship between fear of victimization from crime and residential integration can be examined in terms of the degree to which people are integrated into the area itself. In a study conducted by Riger (1981), the results provide support for the proposition that residential integration affects the female urban resident's fear of crime. From such a perspective, one might ask whether the fear of victimization of elderly residents is low in neighborhoods which are highly integrated, or whether the patterns of judgements, emotions and evaluations concerning fear of victimization are influenced by the level of residential integration of an area at all. Four aspects of residential integration will be discussed. They are: attachment to the neighborhood, familiarity with the neighborhood, and related to this, the concept of strangers, and finally, satisfaction with the neighborhood as a place to live. Each aspect will be discussed separately, however there are large overlaps of information. These aspects are most certainly not mutually exclusive but will be discussed as such to provide clarity.

Initially the sense of attachment to the neighborhood will be discussed in order to explicate factors which may facilitate or inhibit its existence among people in urban neighborhoods. Following that, the relationship between attachment to the neighborhood and (the effect it may have on) fear of victimization of the residents will be explored. The discussion,
however, will pertain to all age groups as very little research has been conducted specifically on the elderly in relation to attachment.

Attachment

The elderly's life circumstances may play a critical role in determining their degree of attachment to local neighborhood settings. Age appears to distinguish among levels of physical attachment (Riger and Lavrakas, 1981). Feelings of attachment to a place appear to be related to length of residence: the longer people live in an area the more likely they are to feel attached to the area (Hunter, 1975). Feelings of attachment to an area also appear to be related to tenure. Those who own their home are more attached to their neighborhood than those who rent (Atkinson, 1981). However, the exact extent of the correlation and direction of causality between feelings of attachment and fear of victimization remains unclear. Some previous research suggests feelings of attachment to the area may influence the relationship between crime rates and residents' support of the area. For example, Hunter and Baumer (1982) tested Jacobs (1961) hypothesis that perceived safety of city streets was partly a function of people using them. They found that those who felt less attached to the area had a higher fear of crime when there were many people on the street, while those who felt more attached to the area expressed lower fear of crime in the presence of equally high levels of pedestrian traffic. Jaycox (1978) discovered that those elderly who were less afraid of
crime were more likely to say that they felt a part of the neighborhood.

Another theory suggests that people will be less fearful to the extent that they feel a part of the neighborhood in which residents work together. The theory is that when there is informal social control, which results from integration, potential offenders - particularly those who live outside the neighborhood - can less comfortably wander the streets looking for targets (Fowler and Mangione, 1982). The work of Lewis et al., (1980) and Skogan and Maxfield (1981) provides correlational evidence that would lead one to expect that integration in the neighborhood might have a salutory effect on fear of victimization from crime. Attachment to the neighborhood should, in turn, cause familiarity. This familiarity with the neighborhood may be a key factor in fear of victimization among the elderly.

Familiarity

A common observation is that people generally tend to feel safer in their own neighborhood, even if it is a high crime neighborhood - this may be due in part to their familiarity with the area. Some description of this phenomenon can be found in Brantingham (1982). People may also feel safer in their neighborhood because familiarity with the neighborhood may promote 'mental maps' of dangerous or safe areas within the neighborhood that enable people to know which places to avoid.
Familiarity and involvement in neighborhood settings then, can be a medium for obtaining information and assistance and thus can serve to reduce stress resulting from fear of victimization.

Lewis and Maxfield (1980) found that signs of social disorder, such as abandoned buildings and teenagers hanging out, affected residents' level of fear in addition to local crime rates. However, long term residence and feelings of attachment to an area may heighten the resident's cognitive ability to identify such signs of danger. In doing so familiarity may enable people to perceive or actually exert control over their exposure to that danger and hence reduce fear.

In addition to feelings of attachment and familiarity with the area, familiarity with other people in the neighborhood may also reduce fear of victimization from crime. Merry (1976) found that being familiar with one's neighborhood and neighbors reduced one's level of fear of crime. Based on her observations of a housing project for one and one half-years, Merry concluded that those who knew their neighborhood and the people they encountered, had a lower degree of fear of crime. Those who regarded their neighbors as strangers were more fearful. She found an association between the relationship residents maintained with young people who hung out in the neighborhood and the fears on the part of the residents; while it did not affect the likelihood of being victimized, such familiarity did increase the predictability, and hence the manageability, of youth behavior.
Fear of Strangers

Many people have relatively clear expectations of what the perpetrators of particular crimes will look like. Mugging victims in New York, however, reported surprise that their assailants were better dressed and better mannered than they had expected. The circumstances of these muggings and the appearance of the perpetrators were often so radically different from expectations that for the first few seconds many victims did not believe that they were being robbed (LeJeune and Alex, 1973).

The characteristics of 'strangers' vary with time and social setting. Strangers may be defined in terms of class, race, ethnicity, geographic origins, or some combination of these factors. The proportion of crime people perceive to be inter-racial, inter-class, or inter-ethnic tends to be much higher than what is found in either official or victimization statistics. In many areas, 'outsiders' are believed largely responsible for crime, or at least most of the serious crime (Dubow et. al., 1979).

Conklin (1975) sees the tendency to blame outsiders for crime as a psychological mechanism which makes continued residence in an area easier than if neighbors are perceived as the actual threat. It may be then that fear of crime reflects a fear of unknown danger or a fear of unfamiliar people and places (Conklin, 1975). Brooks (1974) went so far as to say that fear
of crime is actually a fear of strangers. For this reason, high levels of fear and perceived risk are believed to be associated with greater suspicion and fear of strangers (Garofalo and Laub, 1978; President's Commission, 1967).

Fear of victimization from crime, in many cases, can then be seen as highly correlated with a fear of strangers. Even though the proportion of crimes committed by strangers is relatively small, it is their unpredictability and potential for violence which creates such fear (Ennis, 1967). The number of strangers or 'strange looking' people may make the environment more fearful. A study of the West End in Vancouver, Canada, found that residents thought crime had increased when in fact it had not. One reason for this finding may be the number of 'strange looking' people in the West End (Brantingham et. al., 1982). One important precursor to integration and familiarity is knowing who belongs in the neighborhood and who does not. Fowler and Mangione (1982) found that increased stranger recognition plays a key role in decreasing the fear of crime.

Antunes et. al., (1977) suggests that fear of crime among the elderly has increased because, as compared to younger victims, older victims usually do not recognize the criminals who confront them. Hunter and Baumer (1982) also suggest that integration into neighborhood settings mitigates fear by reducing the number of people who are strangers. They state that residential integration increases awareness of strange people in the neighborhood and increases the belief that neighbors can be
relied on for assistance, if needed (Hunter and Baumer, 1982; Fowler and Mangione, 1982). Research on bystander intervention indicates that people are more likely to help one another if they are familiar with them or the area, even if only briefly acquainted (Hackler, Ho and Urquhart Ross, 1974; Latane and Darley, 1970).

Satisfaction with the Neighborhood

Satisfaction with the neighborhood can be interpreted as one aspect of commitment to an area. In Minneapolis, the level of satisfaction with the neighborhood was not associated with levels of criminal victimization, but it was related to levels of fear. Neighborhoods with higher levels of satisfaction had lower fear levels (Frisbie, 1977). This was particularly significant in an area with relatively high crime, but low fear (Frisbie, 1977). Frisbie suggests that high satisfaction with a neighborhood makes residents more tolerant of crime. Taub, Taylor and Duhan (1981) also found that, when studying satisfaction with safety of neighborhood, respondents in low crime areas were neither fearful nor dissatisfied with the safety of their neighborhood (however, the converse was not necessarily true). Respondents in some of the high crime neighborhoods perceive that their risk of becoming a victim of crime is fairly high, yet they report they are satisfied with the safety of their neighborhood. Thus it is apparent that people will tolerate fairly high levels of crime as long as they find other aspects of community life sufficiently gratifying to
compensate. However, both Hartnagel (1979) and Lawton and Yaffe (1980), in a study of elderly people, found that fear of crime reduced the satisfaction to be gained from living in a particular neighborhood. And both Skogan and Maxfield (1981) and Maxfield (1984) found that residents of inner city and urban neighborhoods who felt unsafe said they would be pleased to move if they had the opportunity to do so.

In conclusion, it should be noted that the social aspect of integration has not been discussed. Rather, this discussion has entailed only the cognitive consequences of integration (even though the cognitive consequences are socially produced). These cognitive consequences, however, may be a critical factor in reducing fear of victimization from crime. For example, research has demonstrated that anxious people preferred waiting with one another in the same situation rather than by themselves, not necessarily for social companionship but because the social comparison process which ensued allowed them to assess the reasonableness of their fear levels (Schachter, 1959). Aged residents of an urban neighborhood may receive information about the appropriateness of their fears in the same manner, not necessarily by talking with others, but rather by becoming familiar with patterns of behavior that occur in their neighborhood. For example, Yancey (1971), reporting on the work of Wolfe, Lex, and Yancey (1968), concluded that the level of personal integration in the neighborhood network is strongly related to the perception of danger in the environment. Persons
who were not integrated into these networks and who were unfamiliar with the patterns of behaviour were more likely to express concern over allowing their children out. They felt that they were vulnerable to strangers and unsafe on the streets at night.

A lack of residential integration and familiarity may thus inhibit the exercise of informal social control mechanisms by the residents to reduce the frequency of deviant acts that generate fear (Fowler and Mangione, 1982), particularly for the elderly. This, in turn, may lead to less social integration in the neighborhood. The elderly, while not totally isolated from the community, already have less social involvement in their neighborhoods than other age groups. Social isolation, which may be a result of fear of victimization among the elderly, could have serious consequences. Elderly, who fear to walk on the streets, will eventually cut themselves off from important social contacts, and more importantly, from neighborhood allies.

Social Integration in the Neighborhood

This brings the discussion to the second aspect of integration in the neighborhood, that of social interaction/social networks in the neighborhood. Characteristics of the social networks in the neighborhood have also been associated with variations in fear (Hunter and Baumer, 1982; Skogan and Maxfield, 1981; Lewis et al., 1980). Urban residents carry out
their daily routines with certain spatial constraints; for the elderly these spatial constraints are usually associated with their home and neighborhood. Even the means by which people, including the elderly, learn indirectly about crime are associated with neighborhood networks of communication. Those who are more integrated into their neighborhood's social system may become more involved in collective efforts, because they are linked to the communication networks which pass along information about local conditions and events, and because they know whom to go to when they have a problem. This also may serve to reduce the sense of social isolation and vulnerability, which may be a powerful predictor of fear of victimization among the elderly.

Henig and Maxfield (1978) suggest that social policies encouraging the participation of residents in neighborhood life may indirectly reduce fear of crime by heightening social integration. (However it may also have the consequence of getting people out on the street and thus increasing exposure to crime and actual crime.) Increasing neighborhood attachment and social integration may serve to add vital resources to the neighborhood and reduce the stressful effects of victimization on residents. Thus regular social contact with others in the neighborhood may be viewed as an important factor in the reduction of fear of victimization. Yet this reduction in fear of victimization may increase the actual incidence of crime by increasing the opportunity structures.
Some authors (Yancey, 1971) have suggested that the level of personal integration into the social networks in the neighborhood is related to the perceptions of dangers likely to be encountered in the neighborhood, in other words, those lacking sufficient social integration (the socially isolated) are more likely to view the streets as unsafe.

Taken one step further it has been argued that the extensiveness of social interaction in urban neighborhoods can reduce crime and fear by increasing surveillance (Jacobs, 1961). Hunter and Baumer (1977) suggest that the degree of social interaction may only decrease fears when the interaction is with non-strangers. High volumes of street traffic composed of strangers is not likely to be integrating, even though the degree of social interaction in the neighborhood may be high. Upon secondary analysis, Hunter and Baumer (1982) found that the perception of increased traffic leads to greater fear. However, they also found that for those who were socially integrated into their neighborhoods, the perceived volume of street traffic had no relationship to fear, while for those not socially integrated, the greater the perceived street usage the greater the fear.

Thus far the discussion has pertained to whether social integration in the neighborhood affects fear levels in the general population. However the question: "Is the extent of social integration also associated with levels of fear among the elderly?" needs to be dealt with. Several researchers have
speculated about the effect of social integration on fear of crime among the elderly. While research has not shown a significant relationship between fear of crime and social integration generally (Hartnagel, 1979; Riger et al., 1981), some authors agree that it plays a part in the elderly's perception of their safety (Smith, 1979).

Because of our mobile society, the process of aging, and personal choice, the elderly are more likely than younger persons to experience isolation, narrow social networks of friends and family, and restricted social contacts (Patterson, 1978). Because such a high percentage of older citizens do in fact live alone in our society, and because physical and social isolation create an atmosphere in which criminal activity is directly invited, older persons in our society are especially vulnerable to crime. Add to this the fact that many aging residents live in urban highrise apartments, they face the additional problem resulting from the alienation and anonymity associated with populations of such units in many cases. When all of this is compounded by the departure of the members of one's own ethnic group, and the influx of new groups causing a racial mix which is unfamiliar to the elderly resident, the neighborhood may take on a high degree of strangeness and level of fear may escalate dramatically (Teski, 1981). This explains why people in retirement communities feel safer—there are more people like them, therefore, they may feel 'strength in numbers' (Select Committee on Aging, 1977).
Gubrium (1974) hypothesized that elderly who live in age-homogeneous housing have comparatively more extensive friendships than elderly living in age-heterogeneous housing. Greater friendships would mean less social isolation (greater social interaction) and less fear of victimization from crime. Sherman, Newman and Nelson (1976), also studied age-segregated housing for the elderly. They found that social integration was higher and fear of crime lower in the age-segregated settings. They concluded that fear of crime is highest among those elderly with weak or unsupportive social networks.

In a Portland, Oregon, elderly crime study, Rifai (1976), used a social isolation scale based on ten survey questions that were weighted differentially. Respondents were asked whether they lived alone, had family in the area, visited or telephoned family members, knew and visited neighbors, and attended social groups. These are all aspects of social interaction. There was no relationship between the degree of social isolation and whether respondents had or had not been victims of crimes, but greater social isolation was related to higher anxiety about crime. Lebowitz (1975) also found that older people living alone were generally more fearful than those who were living with others in the household. And finally, Jaycox (1978) found that those who were more integrated into their neighborhoods (using social ties as measures) were less likely than others to report being fearful.
Being socially integrated in the neighborhood may reduce fear of victimization in the elderly because the catastrophic element of victimization may be reduced if people view themselves as capable of recuperation, with the help of the support network in the neighborhood.

Thus, it is clear that integration in the neighborhood, on both a physical and social level, may affect fear of victimization from crime among the elderly. It has been suggested that a sense of neighborhood, coupled with a cohesive and extensive social network of friends and acquaintances in the neighborhood, can be influential in reducing the level of fear of crime among the elderly (Sundeen and Mathieu, 1976). In addition, there is another aspect of the neighborhood which may provide insight into fear of victimization among the elderly; this is a visible dimension of the neighborhood—signs of disorder, or as otherwise termed, incivilities.
Incivilities/Signs of Disorder

Crime problems are most often spoken of with reference to violent and property crimes. Some researchers, however, have discovered other behaviours associated with high crime areas which frequently upset people. According to Biderman et al. (1967) people are more likely to come in contact with disreputable behaviour such as drunkenness, boisterousness, and untidiness than they are to be victimized, or to witness a crime. Exposure to such behaviour may produce considerable discomfort, and violate an individual's sense of what is appropriate or civil. Such inappropriate behaviour may be interpreted as a sign of the social disorder and moral decay of which crime is a part and, hence, be as threatening as more victim-oriented crime.

Within urban neighborhoods people have varying success in negotiating with other users of their common space a working set of expectations about how they should behave (Hunter, 1978). In addition, Furstenberg (1972, p. 607) notes that: "To a very great extent people take their cue from their neighborhood of how afraid to be". Within the neighborhood the level of fear is fairly homogeneous. Very few people in high crime areas were unaffected of victimization. Fear of an area has an effect on the area. The precautions taken by people in certain areas, such as avoiding strangers or not going out at night, provides cues to others that the neighborhood is unsafe. There is, then, a
behavioural aspect as well as a physical aspect, to the labeling of a high crime area, or crime dangerous area. The means by which an area comes to be labelled 'dangerous' stems, to a large extent, from physical cues which indicate a lack of concern or care for the environment. These cues form part of what has come to be known as 'signs of incivilities' (Dubow et al., 1979). Incivilities, which threaten what Wilson (1968) called the "right and seemly standards" of neighborhood life, are an important class of threatening environmental conditions. These often involve troublesome conditions which the police do not take seriously, including the presence of loitering bands of youths, public drinking, street solicitation, visible grafitti and vandalism and the presence of abandoned buildings (Skogan, 1983). Surveys indicate that incivilities have important implications for fear of crime (Fowler and Mangione, 1981), perceptions of risk, satisfaction with neighborhood safety (Taub, et al., 1981), community organization (Lewis and Maxfield, 1980), and individual and household protective measures (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981).

The impact of incivility was reflected in a study of a small industrial town in California which found that much fear of crime was simply fear of teenagers who lived in the area (Poveda, 1972). In another study, areas where teenagers gathered to drink beer and play loud music were identified as the most dangerous locations by residents of a small public housing project in a industrial city (Merry, 1976). Rifai (1976)
reported that, in Portland, a large proportion of victimizations recalled by the elderly involved nonphysical, verbal harassment by teenagers. In a study of 'dangerous places' Riger and Gordon (1979) asked female respondents why they were dangerous: the reason given most often, for the most frequently nominated places (alleys and parks), was that "kids hang out there". Maxfield (1984) found that 39% of inner city residents who said that a problem with teenagers was common, felt very unsafe. Older persons were much more likely to believe that a problem with teenagers was common and to feel unsafe, but younger persons were not immune. Fowler and Mangione (1974) conclude that removing people and activities which are perceived as threatening might be one of the most effective strategies for reducing fear.

An analysis of four Chicago neighborhoods has shown that expressed concern about crime varies more closely with perceptions of incivility in the neighborhood than with neighborhood crime rates (Lewis and Maxfield, 1978). Lewis and Maxfield (1980) defined "signs of incivility" to include the following features: abandoned or burned out buildings or shopfronts, vandalism, graffiti, broken windows, the presence of groups of teenagers hanging out in the street and people using drugs. They found that residents could accurately assess the relatively dangerous areas in their neighborhoods. The findings indicate that in the areas where residents expressed most concern about crime (not fear of victimization), they also
expressed concern about incivility in the environment: and people generally saw the problem of incivility as more important than the problem of crime itself. The authors concluded that incivility and crime are symptomatic of a more fundamental social decline which affects people's perception of safety and fear of crime. Levels of perceived risk are greatest when there is a combination of high concern about crime and incivility. So signs of incivility may act as clues to dangerousness, and hence fear of victimization from crime, and they may be realistic.

This relatively high frequency of crime-linked problems has led Skogan and Maxfield (1981) to echo the sentiments of Hunter (1978), who stated that:

Fear in the urban environment is above all a fear of social disorder that may come to threaten the individual. I suggest that this fear results more from experiencing incivility than from direct experience with crime itself. Within areas of a city incivility and crime may in fact be empirically correlated. As such, incivility would then be a symbolic cue to the heightened possibility for more serious criminal victimization. Independent of this empirical question, incivility may still produce greater variation in fear than does crime because of its relative frequency in daily experience of urban dwellers (p.9).

A very recent study by Maxfield (1984) indicates that elderly respondents living in neighborhoods plagued by incivility problems had higher fear of crime than those living in neighborhoods with lower levels of incivility.
Victimization Experience

Actual Victimization Experience and Fear

Actual experience with victimization as a determinant of fear of victimization in the general population has been well researched, but the findings have not been consistent (Garofalo and Laub, 1979). When measured as a global variable summing up all prior experiences with crime, actual victimization is not related to fear of victimization from crime. Studies by Biderman et al., (1967), Block and Long (1973), and Fowler and Mangione (1974) all failed to demonstrate significant differences between victims and nonvictims. The United States Department of Justice (1977a) reported that there was virtually no difference in fear of crime between those who had been victimized within the last twelve months and those who had not. Reiss (1967) and Bishop and Klecka (1978) also reported that personal victimization had no effect on fear.

Yin (1980) has concluded, from an analysis of the literature on the elderly and fear of crime, that the experience of being a victim is not in itself a sufficient predictor of fear of crime. When looking at research among all age groups, these findings seem to be due to the inclusion of property crimes in the measures (Baumer, 1978). When property crimes are eliminated from such measures, the victims of certain personal crimes (robbery, rape, theft) are indeed more fearful than non-victims (Garofalo, 1977a; Skogan, 1977; Stinchombe et al., 1977;
Shotland, Hayward, Young, Mindinali, Kennedy, Rovine and Danowitz, 1979). Both Reynolds and Blyth (1976) and Lawton and Yaffe (1980) found personal experience with victimization to be a strong predictor of fear of crime.

Skogan and Maxfield (1981) and Maxfield (1984) sum up the research by arguing that fear of crime among the population generally appears to be higher for personal rather than property crimes, but even in urban centers these crimes occur fairly infrequently. Among different types of personal crimes, those which are rated by the public as being most serious are less frequent in occurrence. They state that because many more people report being afraid than report being victimized, personal experience with crime simply cannot explain much of the current level of fear in cities. While victims are more fearful than non-victims, most of those who are fearful have not recently been attacked. In contrast, burglary may play an important role in instigating fear because it is far more frequent in occurrence than personal crime. Sundeen (1977) reported that fear was higher among those who had been burglarized but not among robbery victims.

Unfortunately, because age was not introduced as a control variable in most of the above studies, there is no way to tell whether the pattern exists for the elderly or not. Sundeen (1977) is one of the researchers who has studied victimization of the elderly. He found, in contrast to Yin (1982), that fear of crime increases among the elderly once they have been
burglarized, and this may have an important consequence. It should be noted that elderly victims may decrease their activities outside the home (Rifai, 1977). While most elderly victims reported little change in their mobility patterns and social activities (Midwest Research Institute, 1977), a decrease in evening activities was reported by 33% of the females and approximately 10% of the males. Lawton and others (1976) found that even a higher percentage of elderly victims in their study curtailed evening activities: 69% chose to stay home in the evening following victimization. Another 42% avoided feared locations at all times. An unfortunate consequence of isolation in one's home is the increased probability of revictimization (Butler, 1975). Lawton *et al.*, (1976) reported that 40% of the elderly victims in their study were victimized in their own homes.

Thus it is apparent that those who are victimized by personal crimes (including the elderly) are more fearful than others; when controlling for a host of alternative causes of fear, the more serious the victimization the greater the fear (Skogan, 1981). But this variable can only account for a fraction of the variance in measures of fear. Past studies have consistently found that 40 to 50% of the population report some level of fear, but only a small percentage report a direct experience with personal crime. This would suggest that one must look to other variables as well. One potential source of fear may be the communication of crime information through
interpersonal channels (Baumer, 1978).

*Indirect Victimization And Fear*

Very little is known about the interpersonal communication of crime information and its effect on fear. LeJeune and Alex (1973) report that the victims of crime spend a lot of time recounting their experience to others. Because most people have little experience with crime these vicarious sources of experience may play a great role in shaping impressions of the crime problem and fear. Thus, interactions with friends and neighbors about crime (regardless of personal experience) constitutes another probable source of fear. This vicarious experience refers to talking with people about crime; for example, recounting one's own and/or others' experience with crime (Yin, 1980). It also involves the influence of the mass media's portrait of the elderly as victims and the impact of other information such as anti-crime programs. These latter issues, however, are beyond the scope of this thesis.

As was mentioned above, little research has been conducted in relation to interpersonal communication of crime and victimization and its effect on fear. Some studies do report, however, that the victims of crime spend a lot of time recounting their experiences to others (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981). Thus one crime may have a snowball effect, affecting not only the victim but whoever else comes into contact with him. This has been termed 'indirect victimization' by Skogan (1977).
who investigated the effect of victimization on fear, on other members of one's household. Those respondents who lived in households with a resident who had experienced either a robbery or a personal theft within the past year felt less safe than respondents from households with no such reported victimization. This would indicate that associations with people who have been victims of crime is a more powerful predictor of fearfulness than personal victimization. This view has been supported by Baumer (1978) who has stated that in his neighborhood studies "one crime may have a 'ripple effect', affecting not only the victim, but through his recounting of the event, also his friends, neighbors and relatives who live in the area" (p. 264). Maxfield (1984) found that fear of crime increases as experience (even indirect) increases. Skogan and Maxfield (1981) have found that, even though certain violent crimes like rape do not occur often, the knowledge of victims of these crimes in the neighborhood is very high. They found that two-thirds of their respondents knew the victim of a serious crime. Further, in terms of the relative frequency of events, they were disproportionately acquainted with victims of violent crimes. Thus the apparent magnification of the relative frequency of personal crime by the mechanisms through which this knowledge spreads becomes quite significant (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981).

The above conclusion may have significant ramifications for women and the elderly. As indicated earlier in this chapter women and the elderly are less likely than most to be involved
in the majority of serious crimes. However, word of mouth, which spreads crime stories, could create a greatly distorted picture of the risks they face. Bishop and Klecka (1978) have remarked that this is of particular significance with regard to fearfulness among the elderly. They found that, contrary to popular belief, the crime-related experience of the elderly's friends is an even stronger predictor of fear than is the respondent's own experience. Lawton et al., (1976), found that one-half of the elderly residents of a low income housing project could describe crimes against fellow tenants.

Clarke and Lewis (1982), in a study concerned with an investigation of fear of crime among the elderly, found that while knowledge of victimization of others is not a major determinant of individual fearfulness, it is an important informational variable which directly affects the fear of crime. Indirect victimization alone might not be sufficient to generate a fearful response, but it is an important source of crime information, and as such is instrumental in influencing perceptions of safety within the neighborhood. Thus fear may be created and perpetuated by a subculture among the elderly who reinforce each other in labeling crime as a threat to their daily life. In conclusion then, being a victim or knowing someone who has been a victim, are sources of information which

---

2. Note a logical conundrum here; as residential and social integration increases indirect victimization may also increase. As the elderly become more integrated into their neighborhoods and, therefore, possibly have more contact with actual victims, their indirect victimization may actually increase.
may contribute to fear of victimization from crime among the elderly.

Consequence of Fear: Decreased Activity, Decreased Social Support

From the previous sections it can be hypothesized that the greater the number, frequency and intensity of social contacts and support the elderly have, the lower their fear of victimization from crime. However, this social support and activity does not need to be concentrated only within the elderly's neighborhood. Research has found that some of urbanite's ties tend to be clustered into tightly knit, dense networks - their solidarity reinforced either by kinship structures, residential, or workplace proximity; yet it has been found that such clusters are likely to comprise only a minority of one's important network ties. The other ties tend to be much less densely connected; only a small portion of these ties are located in the same neighborhood (Wellman and Leighton, 1979). Neighborhood relationships do persist and are valuable, but only as specialized components of overall networks. The variety of ties in which an individual can be involved - intimate friends, less intimate friends, co-workers etc., can provide a support system for dealing with emergency matters.

Because of our mobile society, the aging process and personal choice, the elderly are more likely than younger
persons to experience narrow social networks of friends and family, and restricted social contacts (Braungart et al., 1979; Cook et al., 1978; Lawton and Simon, 1968; Lawton et al., 1976; Maxfield, 1984; Patterson, 1978; Sundeen and Mathieu, 1976, a,b; Yin, 1982).

People at any given stage of the life cycle have a variety of needs and motivations, each with implications for their happiness. One of people's most basic and universal needs is association with other human beings. For many elderly people, however, old age is a period characterized by a disruption of their social world at a time when their health and income makes them most dependent upon the help of others. Although mediated by personality and other factors, numerous studies have found that various social activities are generally related to the happiness of old people while social isolation is associated with low morale and depression (Neugarten, 1968; Rosow, 1967). A common manifestation of social isolation and decreased activity is fear of crime, and a common manifestation of fear of crime is social isolation and decreased activity (Butler, 1975; Conklin, 1976; Hartnagel, 1979; Lawton et al., 1976; Leibowitz, 1975; Schack and Frank, 1978; Sundeen, 1977).

A central element involved in fear of victimization may be individual activity. In studies of activity patterns there are certain factors which have been found to guide the use of a person's activity space. An individual's activity space is the spatial pattern of his activity system. His activity system is
"a flow of activities during some specified period of time...during which a person is engaged in the pursuit of his affairs" (Chapin and Brail, 1969, p.81) In a major study of activity patterns in the United States, Chapin and Brail (1969) asked respondents to detail their time and space budgets for a single workday. One general result was that if all obligatory activities are excluded from the typical adult's 24 hour day only about five hours remain for discretionary activity. However, the amount of discretionary time spent in the home for the elderly was 85 percent.

Income differences can be considered a predictor of activity patterns of persons; the affluent are able to spend discretionary time away from home, however, many elderly are not financially able to do this. Many other variables can be considered as predictors of activity patterns of persons. The results indicate that of greatest importance as activity predictors for all ages are: gender, stage in life cycle (for example age, family responsibility), status (income, education), and race. These are the same elements which are indicators of high levels of fear among the elderly. The individual with the highest fear of victimization from crime in American society is the elderly black female of low income and education. This is also the individual with the lowest activity cycle.

Fear of victimization from crime among the elderly carries meaning only if it causes significant behavioural changes which detract from the quality of life. One behavioral change may be a
reduction of activity. Researchers have uncovered a wide range of ways in which the elderly have decreased their activity due to fear of victimization. Some elderly do not walk outside after dark, and avoid particular areas of the city (Rifai, 1975); some do not engage in certain neighborhood activities (Broderick and Harell, 1977); some even sell their homes if they have been victimized (Midwest Research Institute, 1977); some avoid certain areas of their own apartment buildings like the basement and laundry rooms (Bishop and Klecka, 1978); some limit their use of public parks and recreation or senior citizens centers; and some try to get home before school lets out (Godbey et al., 1980).

The Harris poll (1975) attested to this condition of restricted activity when it disclosed that approximately 25 percent of older people significantly limited their mobility in response to fear of crime. Many other researchers have described the decreased mobility of the elderly, or put another way, 'self-imposed house arrest'. Several studies have shown the extent to which older persons limit their movement and activity, often preferring to stay home at night, and in many cases even keeping oneself "locked in" during the day (Wolf, 1977; Braungart et al., 1979; Lawton et al., 1976; Hunter et al., 1978; Garofalo, 1981). The desire to avoid danger also limits the choice of housing for those elderly who are fortunate enough to have a choice. Related to this decreased mobility is a reduction in social interaction and social contacts. Conklin (1976) notes
that this not only deprives the aged person from enjoyable social behavior but also decreases the social control and surveillance in a building or neighborhood that may constrain potential offenders.

However, despite the apparent agreement of many experts in this area that fear of victimization from crime profoundly affects the elderly person's lifestyle in a negative way, the image of fear keeping the aged captive at home may be an exaggeration. Dubow et al., (1979) state that some studies find only one-third of the elderly gave crime as the reason for their lack of mobility. Lawton and Yaffe (1980) did not find any relationship between fear of crime and social activity among the elderly. Another study, conducted in Florida, indicated that only 15 percent of the elderly had changed their lifestyle as a result of a real or feared crime (Tighe, 1977). Yin (1982) found that, although fear isolates the elderly from social activities, the relationship is much weaker than was commonly thought. Thus, even when the aged are restricted and limited in their activities, fear of victimization from crime may not be the most important reason for this limitation. Much activity restraint may be due simply to reduced strength or stamina, poor health, limited access to transportation, or low economic status.

Although the proportion of elderly who have been forced by fear of victimization from crime to alter their way of life varies from study to study, almost all of the studies indicate that the elderly have changed their activities in response to
the increase in fear more often than younger people. It is clear that for many elderly persons, fear of victimization causes them to limit their behaviour more than they otherwise would. While most may not make themselves virtual prisoners in their own homes, as some studies have suggested, many do circumscribe their activities.

Summary

The preceding review of the literature makes it clear that fear of victimization from crime among the elderly is a complex concept. The determinants and consequences of fear of victimization are difficult to pinpoint. The amount of victimization, the measurements of fear among the elderly, and the determinants of fear, which included demographic, physical, psychological, environmental, and most importantly, social determinants, have been examined in the literature. The following is a brief summary of the major conclusions of this research.

Victimization of Elderly

The results of the majority of victimization surveys, whether they have been conducted in the U.S. or in Europe, locally or on a national scale, are strikingly similar. The elderly are not the most victimized group. In actual fact, for most crimes, they are the least victimized group.
Perceived Risk, Exposure and Fear of Victimization

Disagreement exists among researchers about whether the elderly's fear of victimization from crime is 'realistic,' considering their low victimization rates. However, their limited exposure to risk suggests that they may be disproportionately victimized compared to the frequency with which they leave home.

Extent of Fear of Victimization Among the Elderly: Some Determinants

Fear of victimization from crime has been found to be a great concern of the elderly. However, some surveys found that this fear is not experienced by all elderly alike. The majority of studies, however, indicate that the most fearful are women, black, the less educated, the poor living in central urban neighborhoods, and the weaker members of society, which leads to the hypothesis that the fear of victimization from crime among the elderly may be due to a feeling of helplessness, both on a physical and a psychological level.

Environmental Determinants

An investigation into the relationship between fear of victimization from crime and residence suggests that the
financial status of the elderly plays a very important role. Because of the poor financial position of a large portion of the elderly in society, many of them are forced to live in the inner cities which are high crime areas, and this circumstance in turn increases the level of fear among the elderly.
Residential and Social Integration

The research does tend to support the hypothesis that persons with a high level of residential and social integration into their neighborhoods may have a lower fear of victimization from crime; the level of correlation and direction of causality, however, still remains somewhat unclear. This problem is magnified by the fact that there has been virtually no research conducted examining the relationships between the elderly, integration in the neighborhood and fear of victimization.

Actual Victimization Experience: Indirect Victimization Experience

Actual experience with victimization as a determinant of fear has been researched but the findings have not been consistent. One conclusion that can be drawn from the research is that, although older people are victimized by property crimes much more often than by personal crimes, they are more fearful of personal attacks. This fear corresponds with their self-perceived vulnerability and the potential consequences of attack.

Little research has been conducted on the interactions between aged friends and neighbors regarding crime. However, that which has been undertaken indicates that this
interaction concerning victimization does constitute another probable source of fear.
Consequence of Fear: Decreased Activity, Decreased Social Support

The proportion of elderly who have been forced by fear of victimization from crime to alter their way of life varies from study to study, but almost all of the studies indicate that the elderly change their activities in response to fear more often than younger people. The elderly who do limit their activities because of fear of victimization, increase their isolation, which in turn can lead to a development of chronic anxiety and increased fear.

Lawton et al., (1976) sum up the major issues relating to the elderly and their fear of crime. They explained that the normal aging process is punctuated by a series of losses. The elderly are generally faced with a reduction in income and with the consequent limited ability to purchase goods and services. Twelve to fifteen percent of the elderly are partially or totally disabled; 85 percent have one or more chronic illnesses. A significant number of the elderly live in inadequate housing; many have constraints on their access to transportation or difficulty with mobility. There is a constant reduction in their social network - often the loss of a spouse, loss of meaningful relationships and loss of role. Any one or combination of these losses is associated with a devaluation of the elderly's self image and a heightened susceptibility to stress.
Lawton et al., (1976) have explained how these conditions are related to the threat of a crime. A threat is perceived, whether in terms of doubt in one's ability to deal with a problem, or in the magnitude of the problem. Maintaining this state is always experienced as a "cost" to the person in terms of strain and anxiety, and in extreme situations, can result in psychological and physical symptoms, one being a decrease in activity.

Living in a high crime neighborhood can also pose a chronic threat as it requires constant vigilance to maintain safe appropriate behavior. This adds enormous stress to an already vulnerable group of people. Any time a threat is perceived, behavior may be maladaptive, and many people respond to the fear of crime by minimizing their exposure. Many curtail participation in activities and limit their visiting of friends; many refuse to go out after dark, and others limit their trips away from home. Although, in one sense this reduces opportunity for victimization, there are attendant social and psychological losses. By limiting their opportunities for social relationships, many important areas of life satisfaction are blocked.
CHAPTER IV
CONCEPTUAL ISSUES AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In the previous chapters it was suggested that fear of victimization from crime among the elderly may be a major problem. It was suggested that integration in the neighborhood, direct and indirect victimization experience, social support and activity would have an impact on fear. The specific hypotheses that were generated were:

1. Those elderly who had high levels of neighborhood integration (socially and residentially) would have lower fear of victimization, and

2. those elderly who had been victimized, and/or knew victims, would have increased fear of victimization, and

3. the intensity of the elderly's social support networks and their activity levels would have an effect on their level of fear of victimization.

Again it should be noted that the current study will be focusing on a subgroup of the population only, the elderly. The current study would appear to have three useful applications. First, the study was designed to identify which, if any, of the above variables have an effect on fear. Second, it was designed to see if previous findings could be replicated. And finally, if it failed to replicate previous findings, it would, at least, indicate new directions for research.
This chapter will begin with a section involving conceptual problems, then measurement and operational issues concerning fear of victimization from crime, following with a section on research design, which will include the questionnaire design, sampling techniques, and the data analysis.

**Conceptual Issues**

Since the advent of the initial fear of crime and victimization surveys in the mid 1960's, interest in the development of such surveys and the information derived from them has increased. These surveys have provided critical information about victimization experiences and fear of victimization that was previously unavailable. With regard to fear of victimization among the aged, attention was primarily focused on the individual characteristics of those elderly who fear victimization. Such variables as race, residential locale, social class and previous victimization experience were studied.

Although numerous surveys have been undertaken, extensive conceptual and methodological work remains to be done. A wide variety of operational constructs have been employed as measures of the concept 'fear of crime', resulting in little standardization and scant knowledge of the area (see Baumer, 1978, 1979). The term 'fear of crime' has not been clearly

'Note again that 'fear of crime' is the standard term used by researchers. This study utilized the term 'fear of victimization'. However, both terms will be used, the usage being dependent upon the original researchers' term.
defined—it has been used in reference to a wide variety of feelings, beliefs, perceptions, behaviours and opinions regarding crime (Baumer, 1979; Baumer and Rosenbaum, 1980; 1982). Consequently, reports of findings on the causes or results of fear of crime/victimization are difficult to interpret unless one knows how fear was measured. Contradictory findings may be explained by differences in the way fear was conceptualized or operationalized.

Certainly, 'fear of crime', as commonly conceived, is not fear at all; technically speaking fear refers to physiological responses which are usually conceptualized as following immediately from a specific event (Levanthal, 1974; Plutchik, 1980). At its most basic level, fear is an emotional response to a threat. When confronted with a situation that poses danger, people experience physiological changes that help cope with the threat. This "fight or flight" reaction is an autonomic response (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981; Maxfield, 1984). This may describe someone who is mugged, but few would argue that 'fear of crime' is actually limited to those who face attack. Garofalo (1981) differentiates between this as an example of actual fear, and what he refers to as 'potential fear' which is experienced by someone who anticipates the possibility of a crime happening to them. This anticipated fear is usually what is meant by the term 'fear of crime', thus reactions referred to as fear may be more related to anxiety than actual fear.
Since initial studies in this area, researchers have regularly acknowledged the multidimensionality of fear of crime/victimization and the need to redefine this construct. However, in a review of the literature, Yin (1980) found only one study that reported a definition for fear of crime; "the amount of anxiety and concern that persons have of being a victim" (Sundeen and Mathieu, 1976, p.55). The root of the conceptual problem in the study of fear of crime, then, is the problem of defining the term. There have been four major attempts at conceptual specification, they are: fear and concern, perceptions and judgments, emotions, and behavioral reactions.

Some of the research involving conceptual issues in defining 'fear of crime/victimization' are summarized in the following paragraphs. However, with regard to these issues, the literature is specified more thoroughly in Appendix A.

Four simple concepts by which many of the findings can be categorized are:

1. Concern about crime--this involves the ranking of crime when compared to other social problems. This is not, however, part of what is commonly referred to as 'fear of crime/victimization', and therefore will not be included as a component of this research.

2. Perceptions of crime--this involves beliefs about the amount of crime in the residents' immediate environment, it includes incivilities.

3. Feelings of personal danger--this involves the
personalization of a threat, the interpretation of danger in the environment in personal terms. Combines the belief that victimization is possible and anxiety about this belief. Fear may result even if the risk of victimization is low.

4. Behavior adaption--this involves a change of behavior as a consequence of fear.

The second and third categories turn out to involve the general appellation of 'fear of crime', or as this research has termed it 'fear of victimization from crime', although categories two and three are conceptually distinct. The fourth category is a consequence of the previous two categories. The most important manifestation of fear of victimization is its implication for behavior, particularly for the elderly. It is with the last two categories that this research is concerned.

There is a specific reason why only these two dimensions were selected. Earlier, the need to distinguish between the personal threat which crime poses to individuals and their perception of the local crime problem was mentioned. Of course, there probably are people who view the crime problem in their neighborhood as rather serious, but yet do not feel personally threatened by the possibility of victimization. Thus, assessment of the neighborhood crime problem should be treated as a separate dimension. Worry about personal victimization is considered an assessment of threat, and protective behavior is viewed as an adaptation to that perceived threat of victimization (Baumer and Rosenbaum, 1980). Thus the approach
that this thesis will take involves crime in relation to one's self, that is, perceived threat and behavioral adaption to that threat (Baumer and Rosenbaum, 1980) and not an assessment of local crime problems.

For the purpose of this study fear of crime/victimization is defined as Garofalo has defined it: fear is an emotional reaction characterized by a sense of danger and anxiety produced by the threat of physical harm elicited from a criminal victimization. However this researcher will also include emotional harm elicited from the threat of a criminal victimization. The reaction produced by property loss is more cerebral, while the reaction elicited from physical harm is more emotional (Garofalo, 1981). The reactions to the threat of physical harm differs from the reactions to the threat of property loss. There is also a distinction to be made between actual fear and anticipated fear (Garofalo, 1981). It is apparent that there is a difference between someone who is confronted by a potential offender from than someone who feels that they would be afraid if confronted. This is not to say that anticipated fear is unimportant. It is important, particularly if people have experienced fear in similar situations in the past. Assuming people attempt to reduce fearful situations it is possible to assume that anticipated fear, in addition to actual fear, will affect behavior.

Previous research generally has not incorporated behavioral adaption used to protect oneself or one's property in the 'fear
of crime/victimization' construct. Baumer and Rosenbaum (1980) argue that behavioral responses to victimization not only deserve treatment in the same conceptual framework, but such responses may be the best indicators of fear of victimization, given that fear cannot be measured directly. Thus, behavioral adaption, specifically avoidance, will also be included in the conceptualization of 'fear of crime'.

Measurement And Operational Issues

Measuring fear of victimization is a complex task. Most research has examined fear of victimization/crime through the use of surveys which question a large number of people about their experiences as crime victims and their attitudes and beliefs about crime. Such methods do not assess actual fear at that moment, but assess potential fear.

One of the major criterion for using a question as an indicator of fear is its face validity or its previous usage by another author or researcher. This has led to a proliferation of indicators, each professing to measure fear of crime/victimization. The typical measurement approach is to use two basic questions as indicators of fear. The first question, "Is there any area, right around here--that is, within a mile--where you would be afraid to walk alone at night?" has been used by Gallup and more recently by the National Research Center at least ten times between 1966 and 1978. The second question, used
on the Census Bureau's National Crime Panel and many other surveys, is "How safe do you feel, or would you feel, being alone in your neighborhood after dark?" For 'safe' other terms have been used to directly measure fear of crime including the words 'afraid', 'worried', 'uneasy', and 'concerned' (Baumer and Rosenbaum, 1980). Both of these items attempt to measure the fear of 'street crime'. Fear of personal attack appears to be the single most salient dimension for most people in evaluating an area's safety (Baumer and Dubow, 1977).

One of the strengths of the latter measure is its apparent reliability. It was included in the National Survey in March of 1972, again in December of that year, and then in March of 1973. The percentage of affirmative answers for these three points was 41%, 42% and 42% (Baumer and Dubow, 1977). Unlike the measure employed by Harris, this item yields reasonably consistent results when asked at relatively close points in time.

Skogan and Maxfield (1981) present an extended discussion of the question "How safe do you feel, or would you feel, being alone in your neighborhood after dark?", and its reliability as a measure. They conclude that, though relatively narrow in scope, it is a reliable indicator of fear for personal safety. The question presents a more or less specific situation or stimulus--walking alone after dark. Assessments of risk are implicit since feelings of safety on neighborhood streets at night presumably reflect beliefs about the likelihood of victimization. The question asks specifically about night-time
safety primarily because other studies have found that few people feel unsafe walking in their neighborhood during the day (Maxfield, 1984).

Both of these commonly used measures, however, suffer from a number of limitations, as Baumer and Dubow (1977) and Garofalo (1979) have indicated. First, the question "Is there any area right around here—that is, within a mile—where you would be afraid to walk alone at night?" mentions within a mile of their home. 'Within' a mile probably is not a useful unit of reference for many respondents. As Baumer and Dubow (1977) indicate, urban sociologists have found that people tend to define their neighborhood as an area within a few blocks of their own home. For many urban residents, areas a mile away are likely to be unfamiliar. Further, they indicate that a number of surveys report that people tend to see their own neighborhood as safer than the area around it; thus, a question that asks within a mile may cloud the actual amount of fear that a respondent has of their neighborhood—depending on how they define neighborhood. Because of these problems, the question "How safe do you feel, or would you feel, being alone in your neighborhood after dark?" is a somewhat more reliable indicator as it states neighborhood.

A second criticism can also be leveled at the Gallup/NORC item ("Is there any area, right around here—that is, within a mile—where you would be afraid to walk alone at night?"). It is possible that this item involves reports of worries and concern
about crime without involving a specific estimate of risk (Baumer and Dubow, 1977). Several studies have concluded that fear of victimization/crime is basically one's perception of risk, as Furstenberg (1971) indicated when he distinguished between fear of crime and concern about crime as a social problem. Fear of crime was conceptualized as perception of risk. Fowler and Mangione (1974) further distinguished perception of risk and worry about crime.

There are also several problems with the measure "How safe do you feel, or would you feel, being alone in your neighborhood after dark?" as Riger and Gordon (1981) indicate. First, there is no explicit definition given to the term 'neighborhood'. Even though it is a more specific indicator than 'within one mile', the term neighborhood could mean different things to different respondents. Second, the question does not mention crime as the source of feelings for lack of safety. Third, the amount of time people spend outside their home may vary considerably, affecting responses. Fourth, the question assumes that 'at night' means after dark. Fifth, the 'do you feel or would you feel' portion of the question mixes actual with hypothetical situations. Sixth, these items are often so direct as to elicit socially undesirable responses (for example, young males are unlikely to admit feeling 'unsafe' or being 'afraid'). And finally, Hough and Mayhew (1983) state that this measure only refers to street crime which is relatively rare.
However, since Baumer and Dubow (1977) and Fowler and Mangione (1974) identified the question "How safe do you feel, or would you feel, being alone in your neighborhood after dark?" as the most frequently used measure of fear of crime/victimization, and since it is still being used as a measure, this study also employed it in a somewhat modified form. The modifications came as a result of an attempt to eliminate the original flaws, as indicated by the previous critiques.

In response to the first critique, the term 'neighborhood' was defined. Neighborhood was defined to mean one or two blocks around the respondent's home. In response to the second critique, the question does not need to specifically mention crime as the cause of feeling unsafe as it is implicit in the nature of the questionnaire and the question that crime, as the cause for feeling unsafe, is being referred to. Third, the variation in the time that people spend outside their homes has been controlled by asking questions pertaining specifically to activities outside the home. Fourth, the question does assume that night means after dark since there is a preliminary question which asks about certain feelings that the respondent may have in relation to fear of crime during the day. Fifth, the 'would you feel' portions of the question were eliminated so as not to confuse actual with hypothetical situations. Sixth, it is not necessary to be concerned with the critique that the question may elicit socially undesirable responses, as it is usually young males who are more unlikely to admit feeling
unsafe and the male respondents in this study are over the age of fifty-five. Seventh, respondents were asked questions concerning feelings of safety in the home, in addition to safety outside the home, to combat the critique that the measure only refers to street crime. Finally, respondents were asked an open ended question on fear to allow for the inclusion of white collar crimes and also to allow for internal and external validity. It was assumed that the open ended question would ensure that conceptualization of fear used by this researcher was the same as the respondents' conceptualization of fear.
Research Design

There are three major methods of obtaining data in social science research; one can observe the behaviors of persons, one can ask people questions (in the form of questionnaires, surveys and interviews), and one can use and interpret data already gathered from other research. For the purpose of this study using data gathered from other research was not a good choice as there has been very little consistent research conducted to devise a scale to measure the elderly's fear of victimization from crime. It seemed that a survey involving an orally administered questionnaire to assess fear of victimization from crime among the elderly was the most appropriate approach to take.

Questionnaire Design

Pretest of the Questionnaire:

The questionnaire was developed in two stages. First, a pretest of the original instrument was undertaken. Although it did increase the overall cost of the research, it was felt to be necessary to point out potential flaws before the actual study commenced. It was hoped that the pretest would indicate sampling defects, language errors, procedural errors, ambiguity of questions, confusion with questions, and questions which simply were not necessary. It was also hoped that it would give an indication of the practicality of the project.
The sample on which the questionnaire was tested came from the same location as the sample on which the actual questionnaire was conducted (refer to the sampling section for further details). It was felt that if the pretest was to be valid it must be tested on a sample possessing virtually the same characteristics as the final sample to be tested.

In the second stage the questionnaire was finalized after the initial pretest and revisions. The pretesting was conducted by fourth year undergraduate students in the Department of Criminology at Simon Fraser University. The pretesting of the questionnaire was done in person to person interviews so that interviewers could observe the actions of the respondents while answering the questionnaire. Upon completion of the interview, the respondents were also questioned regarding possible language confusion, comprehension of item meanings, and their attitude toward the subject of the survey. The pretest, which was conducted on fifty randomly selected respondents from New Westminster, did identify problems with the length and clarity of the instrument. The questionnaire was then revised to remove some items and to simplify the response format. This revised version became the final instrument which was used in the fall of 1983 and the spring of 1984 on seventy respondents over the age of fifty-five. The size of the sample and the age category may be two strong limitations of this research (see Chapter V).
Final Questionnaire:

The final questionnaire contained the following sections (a complete copy of the instrument is presented in Appendix C). The items contained in the questionnaire were developed after an exhaustive literature review of fear of victimization/crime. They are:

1. Concern for Personal Safety Items:

   Sixteen items were used to assess concern for personal safety in a local setting (home or neighborhood), alone or with someone, during the day or during the night, in a five-point Likert format. If the respondents said that they felt somewhat unsafe or very unsafe they were asked why in an open ended format.

2. Demographic Items:

   This section contained questions concerned with the respondent's age, gender, racial or ethnic background, employment status, educational level, income, living arrangements and marital status. These factors were identified through the literature as influencing concern for safety and behavioral adaptations among the elderly.

3. Health Items:

   The respondents were asked to rate their health on a five point Likert scale. They were asked in a yes or no
format if they could, for example, walk one-half mile without help. The respondents were also asked in an open ended format if there was any health problem that bothered them, and finally, in a series of three statements dealing with general health, the respondents were to indicate which one fit them the best.

4. Integration in the Neighborhood Items:

Two types of integration in the neighborhood were assessed. The first type involved residential integration which was further categorized into four groups. They are: respondents' attachment to the neighborhood, familiarity with the neighborhood and related to this, whether the respondent could recognize a stranger in the neighborhood, and finally, satisfaction with the neighborhood as a place to live. Respondents were asked how long they had lived in their home and how long they had lived in the area, and if they owned or rented their home. These items were indicators of attachment. The respondents were also asked several questions relating to neighborhood satisfaction and familiarity with people in the neighborhood.

The second type of integration in the neighborhood involved social integration. The respondents were asked in a yes or no format, whether they had a neighbor they could call on. In a five-point Likert format respondents were asked how often they chatted with their neighbors. They were
also asked in an open-ended question what they liked the best and the least about their neighborhood. Finally, respondents were asked in a five point Likert scale if the neighborhood had friendly people.

A dimension related to integration in the neighborhood is incivility (see Skogan and Maxfield, 1981; Dubow et al., 1979). In order to assess this, the respondents were asked, on a four point scale, whether teenagers, drugs, alcohol or vandalism were a problem.

5. Victimization Experience Items:

Two types of experience with crime were assessed. The first involved direct experience as victims. In an item with a yes or no format, respondents were asked if anyone had tried to rob or assault them, or burglarize their home in the last year. The second type of victimization has been referred to as indirect victimization experience (Lavrakas et al., 1980; Skogan and Maxfield, 1981; Tyler, 1980). Four items asked whether respondents knew of anyone who had been robbed, assaulted or burglarized during the past year and whether the victimization occurred in their neighborhood or elsewhere.
6. Social Support Items:

The respondents were asked how many people they lived with and the relationship of these people to them. They were asked in a yes or no format if they had a close friend in whom they could confide, and if they had someone to take care of them if they became ill.

7. Social Activity/Behavior Adaptation Items:

The section on social activity contained questions concerning leisure activities outside the home such as visiting with friends, participating in sports and shopping. The respondents then had to indicate, in a yes or no format, whether they had to limit their participation in any of these activities and the reasons preventing them from participating. Examples of items were health, transportation, time, money, fear of victimization from victimization/crime, lack of interest and others. Finally, in relation to social activity, the respondents were asked, in a yes or no format, if they had a car or someone who could drive them places.
Sample Area

The selected area for study was New Westminster as it contains a large elderly population (20.5% according to Statistics Canada, 1981). In addition, New Westminster was selected because it is a region typical of most suburban areas on the West Coast, both in physical and socioeconomic characteristics, and in crime rates and distributions. This area was also selected because it fit the criteria of being large enough to encompass a full range of elderly, but not so large as to introduce extra environmental variables. Finally, New Westminster was selected because it is an urban area and crime is particularly an urban problem. In small towns less than 30 percent of all residents report being afraid to walk somewhere nearby at night; in large cities this figure exceeds 60 percent. Among selected subgroups in the urban population this figure climbs even higher; among the urban elderly, for example, 75 percent indicate that they are afraid to walk the streets at night (Cook et al., 1983). The limitation of selecting New Westminster was that it had no inner city ghettos (such as those found in large urban areas) and little racial diversity.

Sample Respondents

The respondents were males and females approaching retirement age or over retirement age (55 or older) at the time.
the study was conducted. Fifty-five was selected because of the difficulty in obtaining respondents over 60 or 65, which is the standard age used in most studies (for a more detailed discussion see the section of this chapter labeled PROBLEM WITH RESPONSE RATES). The elderly were randomly selected from different areas in New Westminster, which contained different types of accommodation. This was accomplished by numbering the areas on a map of New Westminster and choosing each area through the use of a random numbers table. In addition, streets within each area were numbered and selected; the selection was again determined by the use of a random numbers table. With the help of a reverse telephone directory (this lists addresses then phone numbers), a representative sample of households on each street was selected, and within each household respondents were randomly selected. In every case those questioned were randomly selected from among the adults in the household who answered the phone. Telephone numbers that went unanswered, or gave a busy signal, were called several times in an attempt to contact residents in the household.

After potential respondents had been identified, located and placed on a sample list, each individual was contacted via telephone and upon contact was asked if they were 55 years or older. If not, the call was politely terminated. If the respondents were 55 or older, they were informed of the nature of the study and that they had been selected to participate in the study. They were asked if they would be willing to
participate and those who agreed were visited as promptly as possible in an attempt to increase response rates.

The sample, of course, was limited to those who had telephones. However, this limitation was not felt to be of concern because the elderly are one of the most likely groups to have a telephone (Burkhardt and Norton, 1977). Another problem which plagues many studies of this type is unlisted telephone numbers. However, this study was not restricted to those who had listed phone numbers. When using a reverse telephone directory, people who are not normally listed are— as the listing is in order of address then telephone number, not telephone number then address.

Such a geographically stratified random sample\(^2\) avoids the problems of much previous fear of victimization from crime research, where the elderly are only located in inner city areas or similar living environments, where crime rates are high. This study avoids biasing the sample in this direction and allowed a sample with a full range of characteristics (other than inner city ghetto elderly).

Problem with Response Rates

Even though the respondents were informed that they would be sent covering letters from Simon Fraser University and the New Westminster Police Department and that the interviewer would

---

\(^2\)This is a sample which contains elderly with all types of characteristics, from all types of areas.
also carry a covering letter and identification, there were a large majority of contacted elderly who did not want to participate in the research (75%). Due to this problem it was necessary to reduce the sample respondents' age to 55. Whether this problem was caused by fear and/or other reasons, there is no way of knowing (the elderly seemed to be the subjects of many research projects in New Westminster, perhaps they were simply tired of participating!).

In addition to the problem of response rates, there were some elderly who would not allow a stranger into their homes. In an attempt to compensate for this, some interviews were obtained by telephone rather than in the respondents' home. Five interviews were obtained in this manner. However, there were no apparent differences in the responses between those subjects who had been interviewed in person and those who had been interviewed by telephone. By the end of the interviewing period, a total of 70 interviews had been completed.

Data Analysis

Coding of the responses for the data analysis for this survey was relatively simple as the majority of the items were pre-coded. Some coding, however, was necessary to cover the open ended questions. The data set was coded for subsequent computer analysis, using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.
(Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner and Bent, 1975) for analysis of the data. This will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.
CHAPTER V
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

Descriptive and inferential statistics are used in the quantitative analysis presented in the following section of the study. The descriptive statistics (frequencies) are used primarily to describe the characteristics of the respondents and to present information about the factors examined in the study—for example residential variables, the extent of actual victimization, and fear of victimization. Where appropriate, inferential statistics are used to determine if statistically significant relationships occur among these findings by doing one-way analyses (crosstabulations). It should be noted that due to the small sample size, only one-way bivariate statistical analysis could be undertaken.

To test the association between two variables, the chi-square ($\chi^2$) statistic was used. This allowed for the analysis of bivariate tables. An absolute probability equal to .05 was used as a cutoff to ascertain that a statistically significant relationship existed. However, as this was a preliminary study of fear of victimization from crime among the elderly in Canada, and because the sample size was small, a significance level of .3 was noted as indicating a trend in the data. These trends could perhaps be investigated in future research with larger samples. In this type of preliminary small sample research, it
is important not to reject a hypothesis which might be true if tested in a larger study. In addition, it should be pointed out that comparative percentages were given throughout, even if the results were not significant \((p = .05)\), or approaching significance \((p = .3)\).

An analysis of the results of the survey of the elderly in New Westminster provides the following concise description of their characteristics. They include:

1. a demographic description of the elderly respondents;
2. characteristics of the neighborhoods in which the elderly lived — in terms of residential integration, social integration and signs of incivilities;
3. the number of elderly victims of crime, the crimes committed against them, and the number of people they knew who had been victims;
4. the social support systems of the elderly and the kinds of leisure behavior they did or did not take part in outside the home; and
5. the concern they had for their own safety.

The subsequent sections contain information about each of the above characteristics. These sections are followed by a discussion of the interaction between these characteristics.\(^1\)

The latter portion of the chapter will look further into the relationships between these variables and the level of fear among the elderly in neighborhoods in New Westminster, and

\(^{1}\)For more detailed information concerning points one through four see Appendix B.
compare these findings with other research findings and with the original hypotheses.

**Demographic Characteristics**

The respondents were between the ages of 55 and 90. All were white. Just over half lived in single family homes, they were not wealthy, but fairly comfortable, and well educated. The majority were retired and a large portion had health problems. More of the female respondents were over the age of 70 than the male respondents.

Those who were older and female tended to live alone and live in apartments, had health problems and had a lower income than those elderly respondents who were younger and male.²

**Neighborhood Characteristics**

According to the measures of integration used in this study, the neighborhoods studied appear to be quite residentially and socially integrated. Of the sample, more than three-quarters had lived in their home for five years or more. Half of the respondents owned their residence, most of them stated they liked what they saw in their neighborhood, and that they had no desire to move. However, less than half of the respondents could identify a stranger. The majority of the elderly said they had a neighbor to call on, that their neighbors were friendly, and

²For a more detailed description of the sample refer to Appendix B.
that they chatted with their neighbors at least a few times a month.

There were some signs of disorder however; 43% said teenagers were a problem, 16% said people using drugs were a problem, 21% said people using alcohol were a problem, and finally 46% said vandalism was a problem.

*Interaction Between Integration Variables*

Those elderly who owned their own home could identify a stranger more easily than renters, however length of residence made no difference to the ability to identify strangers.

Generally, those who owned their home liked what they saw when they looked outside more than those who rented. Once again length of residence made no difference in the elderly's response to this variable. Those who rented felt their neighborhood had changed for the worse more than those who owned (this finding was not statistically significant, however).

Of those elderly who owned a home, slightly fewer had a desire to move than those who rented (a general finding, not statistically significant). Those who lived in their home for a long time seemed to have less desire to move but again the difference was very slight. Generally, most people liked where they lived, regardless of how long they had lived there.

Fewer of those who had a neighbor to call on for help could identify a stranger than those who did not have a neighbor on
whom to call. Of those elderly who had no neighbor to call on, more rented than owned, and more had lived in their neighborhood for fewer years--those who have relied on their neighbors for assistance generally tended to live in their neighborhoods the longest.

It made no difference to the respondents' perception of their neighborhood when they looked outside whether they had a neighbor to call on or not. However, more of those who did not have a neighbor to rely on felt their neighborhood had changed for the worse. Similarly, respondents who had no neighbor to rely on wanted to move more than those who did have a neighbor to rely on.

Fewer respondents who never chatted with neighbors could identify a stranger than those who did chat with neighbors. As expected, more respondents who did not chat with neighbors rented; and the longer the respondents lived in their homes and in New Westminster the more they chatted with their neighbors. More of those who never chatted with neighbors felt that their neighborhood had changed for the worse than those who did chat with neighbors.

The longer the respondents lived in their neighborhoods the less friendly they felt it was. All of those who stated their neighborhood was unfriendly liked what they saw when they looked outside. Most who said their neighborhood was friendly liked what they saw. More respondents who felt their neighborhood was
unfriendly said that their neighborhood had changed for the worse, and that they had a desire to move, than those who felt their neighborhood was friendly.

More respondents who liked what they saw in their neighborhood found it easier to identify a stranger than those who did not like what they saw. There were no differences between those who felt their neighborhood had changed and the identification of a stranger in the neighborhood. Against expectation, more of those who had a desire to move could identify a stranger than those who had no desire to move.

Discussion

These findings can be related back to the Quality of Life study (Atkinson, 1979) which was designed to investigate the responses of residents of large Canadian cities to a series of policy questions of importance in urban centers, to determine the aspects of the urban environment which affect variation in policy preferences.

The study assessed neighborhoods as it was felt they were the more critical aspects of responses to urban environments and are 'a more daily manifestation of urban life' (Atkinson p.27). In the case of the elderly, who are usually retired, the neighborhood may encompass almost all of the contact that they have with physical and social life.
The Quality of Life study found that neighborhood attraction was a function of neighborhood rather than city. This may be supported by the present study. Respondents in New Westminster responded favorably about their neighborhoods, yet the Quality of Life study found that people in Vancouver generally had poor neighborhood assessments (this may be due to the fact that neighborhood was defined in this study, it was not defined in the Quality of Life Survey). The distinction between New Westminster and Vancouver in terms of favorable neighborhood assessments may be because New Westminster is smaller than Vancouver. The Quality of Life study offers two explanations for the more favorable assessments of neighborhoods in smaller cities. The first is the homogeneity hypothesis which indicates that people interact better with those who have similar ethnic and social backgrounds. Larger cities are probably more diverse than smaller ones and center city areas are generally more mixed than suburban neighborhoods. There is, in fact, greater heterogeneity in Vancouver as compared to New Westminster (Atkinson, 1979). A second hypothesis may be that high population density increases the likelihood of social interactions which result in conflict. Acceptable behaviours in New Westminster may be intrusions in the higher density neighborhoods found in Vancouver (Atkinson, 1979).

The Quality of Life study also indicated that social, not physical aspects of the neighborhood were the most critical determinants of neighborhood satisfaction. This appears to
support the findings presented here. Those elderly who were socially integrated into their neighborhoods also were satisfied with their neighborhood as a place to live.

Finally, findings in the present research indicate that tenure has an effect on residential integration. Those elderly who owned their home seemed to be more familiar, attached and satisfied with their neighborhood. In the Quality of Life study assessments of the effects of tenure and type of housing on satisfaction with the dwelling indicated that a high level of satisfaction with the home may be due more to home ownership than with the type of home. We may be able to assume from this that the level of satisfaction with the neighborhood may also be due to the home ownership, not the type of neighborhood lived in.

It would appear that tenure is more important than is housing type in relation to neighborhood satisfaction. One interpretation may be that Canadian elderly can be very satisfied owing their home even if it is not located in a 'good neighborhood'.

Convenience may also to be a strong indicator of neighborhood satisfaction. The results of this study and the Quality of Life study indicated that the elderly preferred locations that were physically close to the city (convenience) and which required little maintenance. An additional study also indicated that Vancouver elderly preferred living in areas which
were convenient, even if the living arrangements and the neighborhoods were not wholly adequate (Hanowski, Hayward, Reed and Teather, 1962)

Victimization Characteristics

The results of this study indicate that one-quarter of the sample had been the victim of an actual or attempted crime in the last year, the majority involving burglary. Eighty percent of the sample knew someone who had been a victim, again the majority involving burglary. A comment on the dissimilarity of this finding in comparison to previous research is found in a following section labeled 'Discussion'.

Profile of the Elderly Victim

In New Westminster there is really no such thing as a "typical" elderly victim of crime. There is no particular combination of characteristics that would make an elderly person more or less likely to be a victim of crime. This is not to negate the findings of the previous pages, but to indicate that there are no statistically significant combinations of individual characteristics that influence the elderly's probability of victimization. This indicates that crimes against the elderly do not follow any particular pattern with regard to victimization.
Effects of Victimization

It made little difference to the elderly respondents whether they had been victimized or knew someone in their neighborhood who had been a victim and their attachment or satisfaction with their neighborhood. The majority of the respondents who had been involved in a direct and/or indirect victimization felt their neighborhood was safe; and very few limited their activities as a result of victimization.

Discussion

How valid are these findings? In previous attempts to evaluate the extent of victimization among the elderly it was found that the elderly are not a highly victimized group. Actually they are the least victimized with age acting as a decreasing risk factor³ (see Chapter I). Nonetheless, when victimized they are prone to fall victim to burglary, larceny, fraud and vandalism. In addition, previous literature indicates that there is no set of personal characteristics which would increase the elderly's propensity to become victims.

This research supports some of the above findings, while disputing others. Supporting previous research, this study found no set of characteristics that would make an elderly person more subject to the risk of victimization. However, in contrast to previous findings, the elderly in this study had a fairly high

³Note again the risk versus exposure factor which has not been considered in most of the previous studies.
rate of victimization; 19 of the 70 respondents had been victimized. The most common type of victimization was burglary, a finding that is consistent with other studies.

What could account for some of the apparent discrepancies in the findings between this study and other studies? One factor may be the income levels of the elderly in this sample. The relationship between income and victimization is complex, but as one might hypothesize, the higher the income the more likely the elderly will experience some form of property victimization. This sample indicated they were fairly affluent which may have accounted for their increased victimization.

In addition, activity is considered an important element in relation to victimization. An element that is strongly related to risk of personal and property victimization is the amount of time the elderly spend outside the home. This is the lifestyle-exposure factor (see Chapter I). One of the most powerful predictors of the risk of victimization found in the Canadian Urban Victimization Survey (1981) was the average number of activities outside the home. As the number of activities increased the risk of victimization increased. This could mean an increase in both property (leaving the home unattended) and personal (more exposure to victimization) crime. The elderly's risk of victimization may be strongly related to exposure. Traditionally the elderly have not exposed themselves to risk of victimization due to their low activity levels. However, in contrast to previous research, the elderly in this
study were very active, and therefore were more subjected to risk of victimization.

One final factor which may account for the discrepancy between this and other studies may be the lack of Canadian research on elderly victimization. There is a considerable amount of literature on the elderly in Canada, but very little on their actual victimization. Official interest in victimization, not just of the elderly, but of all people, is a phenomenon of recent development in Canada. However, the few studies which have been undertaken (Greater Vancouver Victimization Survey, 1981; Canadian Urban Victimization Survey, 1983; Canadian Department of Justice, 1981; Ministry of the Solicitor General, 1982) suggest that the victimization of the elderly in Canada is no different from victimization of the elderly in the United States in terms of crime and characteristics. Nevertheless, the study of Canadian victimization is still in its infancy. As a preliminary study, this research has produced a highly interesting finding—that the elderly in New Westminster have a high level of victimization. It would be interesting to pursue this line of inquiry with a further study (with a larger sample), to ascertain if, in fact, these elderly do have a high level of victimization, compared to elderly in surrounding areas.
Social Support and Activity Characteristics

The majority of the respondents indicated they had a close friend in whom they could confide and someone who could take care of them if they became ill. However, almost one-half of the elderly lived alone.

The respondents generally participated in most activities. The major reasons given for non-participation were poor health, lack of money and lack of time. It was the older, widowed female with lower income who limited activity the most frequently.

Of special note here is the finding that 10% of those who limited their activity indicated that they did so because of victimization. In addition, more than half of the respondents who had been the victim of a burglary also indicated that they limited their activity. However, we cannot assume that this limitation of activity was due directly to the burglary as the respondents were not asked specifically if they had limited their activity due to burglary.

Discussion

Previous studies have found diminished participation in social activity and in activity generally, with increased age. Interaction with friends decreases as age increases. Lower frequency of participation is associated with aging in going dancing, attending movies, sports and physical exercise, reading and cultural production. Equal frequency of participation is
found for television viewing, discussion, visiting, entertaining and home embellishment. Higher frequency of participation was found only for relaxation (Cunningham, Montage, Metzner and Keller, 1970; Bultena and Wood, 1972).

The results of this study are fairly consistent with the previous findings. What is inconsistent with previous literature is that few of the elderly in this sample went to a recreation or a senior citizens' centre. Visitation at such centres has been found in previous literature to be a fairly widespread phenomenon (Bultena and Wood, 1972), however only a small fraction of the elderly sample attended such centres. In addition, contrary to other literature, the replies from the elderly indicated a surprisingly mobile and active sample.

The reasons given by the subjects for non-participation in particular activities (poor health, lack of money and lack of time), were consistent with findings of previous literature.

Again, while it is difficult to generalize, it does appear that fear of victimization may also affect the respondents' activity. Ten percent stated they had limited participation in response to fear of victimization, 50% of those who stated they had to limit participation had been the victim of a burglary. Finally, 73% who limited activity knew someone who had been the victim of a burglary.
Concern for Personal Safety

Although there has been much written about fear of victimization/crime none of the literature indicated adequate measures of the fear that an elderly person may experience. Because of this, sixteen items were used to measure fear (see Chapter IV for a complete discussion). The sixteen measures of fear are given in Appendix C. Although the elderly's responses to all sixteen measures of concern for personal safety were relevant, only four are considered to be of major importance, as they provided the most significant responses. (See Appendix C for complete details.)

The elderly respondents were only fearful in specific circumstances. These circumstances are shown in Table 1. As expected, the elderly respondent had a higher degree of fear at night when alone, particularly when out alone in the neighborhood at night. Beyond that, the level of fear among the elderly respondent in New Westminster was not substantial. It may be that Canadian elderly are not as fearful as their American counterparts, at least the elderly in New Westminster did not give evidence of a high degree of concern for their safety from criminal victimization.
Table 1
Concern for Personal Safety
Significant Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Item</th>
<th>% Somewhat &amp; Very Unsafe*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How Safe Do You Feel In Your House During The Night When You Are Alone?</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Safe Do You Feel In Laundry room, etc. During The Night When Alone?</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Safe Do You Feel Out In Your Neighborhood During The Night When You Are Alone?</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When You Are With Someone?</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Safe Do You Feel Walking From Transportation To Dwelling During The Night When You Are Alone?</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When You Are With Someone?</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N=70
* Somewhat unsafe and very unsafe have been combined.

Characteristics of the Fearful Elderly

This section focuses on the characteristics of persons who are fearful as they contrast to the elderly in general.

---

In some instances the very safe and the somewhat safe responses and the very unsafe and somewhat unsafe responses have been combined.
As expected, there was no significant relationship between age and feeling safe alone in the home at night. There was, however, a significant relationship between age and fear of being out in the neighborhood alone at night. The elderly who were 70 and above were more fearful than the elderly between 55-69, as shown in Table 2 ($\chi^2 = 3.17, \text{df} = 1, p = .042$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>55-69</th>
<th>70 and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably Safe</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unsafe</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, there was a significant relationship between feeling safe while walking from mode of transportation to dwelling and age. Approximately 63% of those elderly between 55-69 felt safe, in comparison, 72% of those 70 and above felt safe ($\chi^2 = 15.37$, df = 3, $p = .002$).

Gender

Again, as expected, there were no significant differences at the .05 level between gender and feelings of safety in the home at night, however there was a general trend approaching significance (.3). Twenty-three of the 24 male subjects and 42 of the 46 female respondents felt safe in their home alone at night ($\chi^2 = 5.85$, df = 3, $p = .119$). Similarly, there were no significant relationships between gender and safety in the respondents' apartment building at night. All of the male respondents felt safe, and 19 of the 46 female respondents felt safe. However, women were much more fearful of being out alone in their neighborhood at night than were men, or at least they admitted to it more often (see Riger, 1981). The relationship shown in Table 3 is fairly strong ($\chi^2 = 11.31$, df = 3, $p = .010$). An explanation for this could be that elderly males stated that they were not afraid, although they may have felt afraid.

There were no significant relationships between feelings of safety while traveling from mode of transportation to home and gender, however a general trend was apparent ($\chi^2 = 6.41$ df = 3, $p = .093$). Six of the male respondents felt unsafe and 15 of the
female respondents felt unsafe when walking alone at night from their car to their home.

_Education_

Education had some general influence on feelings of safety, but the relationship was not a simple one. Eight percent of those who had a grade twelve education or less were afraid to be alone in their home at night, 25% of those who had less than an elementary school education felt unsafe in areas of their apartment buildings. In relation to fear of being out alone in the neighborhood after dark, 67% of those with less than elementary school felt unsafe and 59% of those with a high school education felt unsafe. Of those with a university degree (or 13 to 16 years of schooling) 50% felt unsafe, and of those with more than 17 years of school, only 20% felt unsafe. As education increased, the elderly respondents' feeling of safety
increased. There were similar results for feelings of safety when walking from mode of transportation to dwelling. Of those who had less than an elementary school education, 67% felt unsafe, of those who had a university education, 80% felt safe.

At the extremes of the educational scale, the least educated were the more fearful. However, in some instances, persons in the middle of the educational scale were nearly as afraid as the less educated.

Income

Because income and education are highly correlated, we would expect these characteristics to associate in the same fashion with fear measures, and they do somewhat. There were no significant relationships between income and feeling safe alone in the home at night, or between income and feelings of safety in building areas at night. However, there was a significant relationship between income of between $5,000 and $14,999 and feeling safe when walking from the subjects' mode of transportation to their dwelling ($\chi^2 = 17.03, df = 3, p = .009$). Different modes of transportation may account for less fear for this income bracket. Those elderly with higher incomes may have owned their own car, while those elderly who were on the lower end of the income scale may have only had the bus as a source of transportation.

------------------

5See Appendix B for categories of income.
There was also a significant relationship between income and feeling unsafe alone in the neighborhood at night. Eighteen of the 27 respondents who had incomes between $5,000-$14,999 felt unsafe alone in their neighborhood at night ($x^2 = 17.03$, df = 6, p = .003).

Other Associations

Elderly persons who lived in apartments were more afraid when out alone in their neighborhood at night than those who lived in single family homes ($x^2 = 10.09$, df = 2, p = .006) (See Table 4). Persons who lived in apartments were also generally more afraid when walking from their transportation to their home. Once again this may be due to the type of transportation; those who owned their homes may also have owned a car, and may not have had to walk as far to get to their home from their transportation ($x^2 = 8.46$, df = 6, p = .206).

There was no association between fear and employment. However, there was a significant relationship between fear and marital status in one fear category; 75% of the respondents who were single, and 60% of the respondents who were widowed felt unsafe out in their neighborhood alone at night, compared to 40% of the married subjects ($x^2 = 7.42$, df = 3, p = .049). Finally, there was a relationship between the concern for personal safety of the respondents and their health. Elderly persons who indicated they had a health problem also felt fear when out in their neighborhood alone at night ($x^2 = 19.45$, df = 5, p = .004).
Table 4
Concern for Personal Safety in Neighborhood and Accommodation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe Alone in Neighborhood at Night</th>
<th>Detached House</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Row Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsafe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column Total 35 27 2 64

Relationship Between the Characteristics of the Elderly Respondents' Neighborhood and Personal Safety

Having outlined the characteristics of the elderly who are fearful in comparison to the elderly in general, this section will explore the relationships among residential integration (attachment, satisfaction and familiarity), social integration, incivilities, and the concern the elderly have for their safety from victimization.

Residential Integration and Concern for Personal Safety

Attachment: The first indicator of residential integration was attachment. Respondents were questioned about the number of years they had lived in New Westminster and in their home and whether they owned or rented their home. These items were crossed with the four items measuring concern for personal safety. The items were not statistically significant, however
the relationship between whether the respondents owned or rented their home and their feelings of safety when out alone in the neighborhood at night approached significance \( (x^2= 7.55, \text{ df}= 3, \ p= .056) \). Of those 35 respondents who felt unsafe, 20 rented their home, and of those 29 who felt safe only seven rented their home, the rest owned their home.

**Satisfaction:** The second indicator of residential integration was satisfaction with the neighborhood. Five items were combined to assess the respondents' satisfaction with the neighborhood. Three items asked how the respondents felt about their neighborhood, while two items asked if the respondents wished to move and why. Only a few of these items were found to be significantly related to concern for personal safety.

Feelings of safety alone in the house at night were found to be significantly related to the respondents' liking what they saw in their neighborhood when they looked outside \( (x^2= 18.45, \text{ df}= 9, \ p= .030) \), and their desire not to move \( (x^2= 35.69, \text{ df}= 6, \ p= .0000) \) (See Tables 5 and 6). Ninety-two percent of the respondents who felt safe liked what they saw when they looked outside and 98% of the respondents who felt safe had no desire to move. In addition, feelings of safety when walking from mode of transportation to dwelling alone at night were also found to be significantly related to the respondents' desire to move from their neighborhood (See Table 7). Ninety-three percent of the respondents who felt safe had no desire to move \( (x^2= 26.34, \text{ df}= 6, \ p= .0002) \).
### Table 5
Concern for Personal Safety in Home and Liking Neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feelings of Safety When Alone in House at Night</th>
<th>When I Look Outside I Like What I See</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Alone</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably Safe</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unsafe</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unsafe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Totals</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6
Concern for Personal Safety in Home and Desire to Move

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feelings of Safety When Alone in House at Night</th>
<th>How Much Do You Wish to Move from Your Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Desire to Move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Safe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably Safe</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unsafe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unsafe</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Totals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
Concern for Personal Safety, Transportation, and Desire to Move

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feelings of Safety When Walking From Transportation to Dwelling Alone at Night</th>
<th>How Much Do You Wish to Move From Your Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Desire to Move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Safe</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably Safe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unsafe</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unsafe</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Totals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Familiarity: The third indicator of residential integration was familiarity with the neighborhood. The respondents were questioned about their ability to recognize a stranger in their area. There were no significant relationships found. There was, however, a relationship approaching statistical significance. Sixteen of the 28 elderly who felt safe alone in the neighborhood at night could identify a stranger in their neighborhood; however, 20 of the 34 subjects who felt unsafe stated they could not identify a stranger in the neighborhood ($x^2 = 10.85$, df = 6, p = .093).
Social Integration and Concern for Personal Safety

It was thought that the greater the number of social contacts the respondents had in their neighborhood, the lower concern they would have for their safety. In pursuing this line of inquiry, the respondents were asked how often they chatted with their neighbors, if they had a neighbor to call on in case of a problem and if they felt their neighborhood was friendly. Again, except for two instances, there were no significant relationships between these three items and the four concern for personal safety items.

Fifty-six of the 64 subjects who felt safe in their home at night had a neighbor to call on in case of a problem, three of the five who felt unsafe did not have a neighbor to call on ($\chi^2 = 4.666, \text{ df} = 1, p = .031$) (See Table 8). Ninety-five percent of those who felt safe walking from their mode of transportation to their home alone at night talked to their neighbors at least a few times a month ($\chi^2 = 19.46, \text{ df} = 6, p = .003$). Twenty-three of the 26 elderly respondents who felt safe alone in their building areas alone at night talked to their neighbors a few times a week or month ($\chi^2 = 12.06, \text{ df} = 6, p = .061$) Interestingly, 77% of the respondents who felt very unsafe talked to their neighbors a few times a week or month.

There is a further interesting, although not statistically significant trend. Twenty-eight percent of those who felt unsafe walking from their mode of transportation to their dwelling had
Table 8
Concern for Personal Safety in Home and a Neighbor to Call On

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feel Safe Alone in Home at Night</th>
<th>Do You Have a Neighbor to Call On in Case of a Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Totals</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a neighbor to call on. In comparison, 11% of those who felt safe had no neighbor to call on ($x^2= 1.89$, df = 1, p = .169).

Incivilities/Signs of Disorder and Personal Safety

Some researchers have argued that fear in certain neighborhoods is derived from signs of incivility, and is specific to the respondents' neighborhood (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981). These incivilities involve behavior that may be disconcerting to people.

To evaluate the effects of such behavior on fear we asked the respondents to indicate if the following conditions were a big problem, some problem or no problem: the use of alcohol, the use of drugs, problems with teenagers, and vandalism. While the
respondents did indicate that these conditions were somewhat of a problem, there were no significant relationships between them and the respondents' concern for personal safety. However there was a relationship approaching significance, one which makes a great deal of sense. Forty-six percent of those elderly respondents who felt safe alone in their neighborhood at night also felt that vandalism was no problem, however 67% of those elderly who felt unsafe in their neighborhood at night also felt that vandalism was a problem ($\chi^2 = 4.95$, df = 3, $p = .175$).

However, this study indicated that the elderly's level of fear is generally not affected by signs of incivility, even though almost one-half of the subjects felt that vandalism and teenagers were a problem in their neighborhood.

**Victimization and Concern for Personal Safety**

This section will explore the relationship between victimization (direct and indirect) and concern for personal safety. The effects of criminal victimization which involved the respondents (assault, robbery) and their homes (burglary, property theft) on concern for personal safety will be examined. A section will also focus upon indirect victimization. Respondents were asked if they knew anyone who had been the victim of a burglary, robbery, assault or attempted assault.

It was hypothesized that the greater the number of victimization experiences the respondents had, the greater their
fear would be. However there were no significant relationships between the four measures of victimization and the four measures of fear. There was one relationship approaching significance. There was a general relationship between feeling safe alone in the neighborhood at night and being the victim of a burglary. Of the 29 respondents who felt safe, 25 had not been involved in a burglary ($\chi^2 = 5.30$, df = 3, $p = .151$). There were also few significant relationships between indirect victimization and concern for personal safety, except for the items: "Do you know anyone who had their home illegally entered?" and "Do you know of anyone who had been involved in an attempted assault?"

Feeling safe seemed to have a relationship with burglary. Fifty-four percent of those who felt safe alone in their home at night did not know someone who had been the victim of a burglary, while 32% of those who felt unsafe did know the victim of a burglary ($\chi^2 = 19.74$, df = 9, $p = .019$) (see Table 9). Fifty-two percent of those who felt unsafe when walking from their mode of transportation to their dwelling alone at night knew of someone who had been the victim of a burglary ($\chi^2 = 17.82$, df = 9, $p = .037$). Feeling safe also seemed to have a relationship with attempted assault. Eighty-two percent of the respondents who felt unsafe when walking from their mode of transportation to their dwelling did not know the victim of an attempted assault, however; 52% of those who felt unsafe did know the victim of an attempted assault ($\chi^2 = 8.34$, df = 2, $p = .015$). Of the 26 respondents who felt safe alone in their
Table 9
Concern for Personal Safety in Home and Knowledge of Someone Who Was a Victim of a B & E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feel Safe Alone in Home at Night</th>
<th>Do You Know of Someone who had Their Home Recently Broken Into</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Totals</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

apartment areas at night, 18 did not know the victim of an attempted assault ($\chi^2 = 7.95, df = 6, p = .241$)

Social Support, Activity, and Concern for Personal Safety

This section will consider the impact of social support and activity on fear of victimization from crime. It was hypothesized that the greater the number of social contacts the elderly respondents had, the lower their fear of victimization would be. Following this line of inquiry, information was gathered from respondents concerning the number and the nature of their social contacts. The items focused on here are: how often elderly respondents went to movies, restaurants, visited with friends and neighbors in their homes, and how often they walked six blocks. In order to ascertain if the elderly
respondents had a social support network, they were asked how many people they lived with, and if they had a close friend in whom they could confide. These items were again crossed with the four fear items.

Looking at concern for personal safety as expressed in terms of curtailing activities, few strong associations were found. Ninety-three percent of those who felt safe in their home at night did not limit visiting with friends and neighbors ($\chi^2 = 11.94$, df = 3, $p = .008$). When the elderly respondents were asked about activity and fear alone at night in their apartment a general trend was evident. Sixty-five percent of the elderly who felt safe alone in their apartment at night also did not limit activity, 75% who felt unsafe did limit activity ($\chi^2 = 2.42$, df = 1, $p = .120$).

As Table 10 indicates, 66% of those who were not afraid to walk from their mode of transportation to their dwelling alone at night also felt that they did not have to limit their walking six blocks around their home. Interestingly, of those who felt unsafe, 73% did not limit walking around their home.

It appears then, that fear of victimization from crime does not restrict the behavior of the elderly, its most significant effect may be to keep the elderly in their homes at night.

In relation to social support there were two significant relationships and one approaching significance. Fifty-nine
Table 10
Concern for Personal Safety, Transportation, and Limit Walking Around Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feel Safe Walking From Mode of Transportation to Dwelling at Night</th>
<th>Do You Limit Walking Six Blocks Around Your Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Totals</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

percent of those who felt safe walking alone from their mode of transportation to their dwelling at night lived with someone ($x^2= 8.02$, df= 3, $p= .045$). Of those who felt safe walking alone in their neighborhood at night, 69% lived with someone. Of those who felt unsafe, 57% did not live with someone ($x^2= 3.37$, df= 1, $p = .066$). Of those 29 subjects who felt safe alone in their neighborhood at night, 20 lived with various family members, however 20 of the 35 who felt unsafe lived alone ($x^2= 16.0$, df= 8, $p = .043$). All four of those who felt unsafe alone in their apartment areas at night lived alone ($x^2= 4.88$, df= 3, $p = .081$).
Fear of Victimization as a Problem for the Elderly

It should be pointed out that before discussing the results, all statistically significant relationships and general trends in the data were reported. In the attempt to capture as many potential relationships as possible, all of the relationships, statistically significant, and potentially statistically significant, will be discussed here.

The results of this study indicate that it may be misleading to assume, as some of the literature has suggested, that fear of victimization from crime among the elderly is a major social problem. The key point of this research has been that fear of victimization is not shared by all elderly in all circumstances. There are important differences in fear. As expected from an examination of the literature, the elderly respondent in New Westminster had a higher degree of fear at night, when alone in the neighborhood, (50% were afraid), and when walking from their mode of transportation to their dwelling alone at night (30% were afraid). Beyond that, the level of fear among the elderly respondents was difficult to establish. Almost all of the elderly felt safe alone during the day in their neighborhood. These findings are consistent with the Greater Vancouver Victimization Survey (1981) and the Canadian Urban Victimization Survey (1983).

As mentioned previously, the elderly here may not have the levels of fear that have been found in other research because
this study utilized a sample with geographic differences. Other research often looked at urban elderly living in high crime areas, therefore their fear may have been a function of where they live, more than the fact that they were afraid because they were old. This study looked at elderly from all types of areas (other than the inner city ghetto) in the hope of acquiring elderly with a full range of characteristics.
"It is fun to discover that lawfullness and a neat set of experiments that solve a problem can and does produce peak experiences, but puzzeling guessing and making fantastic and playful surmises is also part of the scientific game and the fun of the chase."

Maslow

This thesis sought to establish a relationship between fear of victimization from crime among the elderly and a number of variables traditionally suggested in the literature to be associated with the phenomenon. The various chapters examined demographic factors, patterns of victimization, integration in the neighborhood, social support and activity.

While the level of fear of criminal victimization among the elderly was of some interest, the main focus of the research was to analyze the impact of certain demographic, environmental and social factors on fear of victimization. The examination of differences among the elderly in terms of factors that affected their fear is crucial in gaining an understanding of why they are afraid.

From the outset it was clear that the relationships between fear of victimization from crime and the variables examined were
complex. The research revealed many discordant relationships between fear of victimization and other variables that had not been previously noted. This concluding chapter summarizes these findings and the discrepancies among them. It also indicates some methodological considerations and discusses directions for future research.

Summary of the Findings

Who is Afraid?

Many of the previously reported relationships indicated in the literature were evident, however many were not. The results of this investigation suggest that the elderly did express fear, however only in certain limited circumstances. When a more detailed approach to the data was taken important differences in the levels of fear were shown, specifically gender, type of tenure and income differences.

Previous research revealed that fear of victimization does not affect all elderly similarly. Most studies seem to indicate, as did the analysis from this data, that fear is greatest among females, the less educated and the poor. However age is a factor which does not consistently emerge as a predictor of fear.

Most previous research found the elderly to be very fearful of victimization from crime, as indicated in Chapter II. However, not all surveys have produced these results. This
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researcher found studies which indicated that the elderly's fear of victimization was not high (Biderman et al., 1967; Burkhardt and Norton, 1977; Erskine, 1974; Ragan, 1977; Yin, 1982). Age is a confusing predictor of fear. Advancing age was related to increased chances of being fearful of victimization, however in an inconsistent fashion. Those elderly who were over 70 were more fearful walking alone in their neighborhood at night than those under 70, however those under 70 were more fearful walking from their transportation to their home alone at night.

Previous studies had found gender differences to be more pronounced than age differences in fear of victimization among the elderly; in this study it was found that females were more fearful than males. Evidence to support this trend has been found by most researchers.

The findings of this research were consistent with Lebowitz (1974) who found a high proportion of women expressing fear but only one-third of the men. Evidence to support such a trend has been provided by Riger et al., (1978). More recently Braungart et al., (1980) found 64% of the elderly women reporting fearfulness and only 32% of the elderly males. Erskine (1974), Clemente and Kleiman (1976), the Greater Vancouver Victimization Survey (1981) and the Canadian Urban Victimization Survey (1983) all report that the elderly female is more afraid of victimization than is the elderly male.
It has been suggested that women generally (including the elderly female) are more fearful than men because, as a group, women possess less physical strength than men, and women are almost exclusively the target of sexual assault (Riger, 1978). In addition, social conditioning may produce submissive behaviour in women which can perpetuate feelings of helplessness, and therefore contribute to their higher levels of fear (Baumer, 1978). This may be particularly relevant to the older female, who has been subjected to years of social conditioning.

Other previously reported relationships in the literature were also evident. Those elderly with lower incomes, those who were unmarried or widowed, and those who lived in apartments were generally (in varying degrees) more fearful than those who had a higher income, were married and who were living in houses. However education had no significant effect on fear, even though it is reported in the literature as consistently affecting fear.

Moreover, income is a variable which consistently appears to be related to fear of victimization from crime. Clemente and Kleiman (1976) found that high income elderly generally expressed lower fear of victimization than did low income elderly. Those elderly subjects in this survey with lower incomes reported more fear when alone in their neighborhood at night, and when walking from their mode of transportation to their dwelling at night, than those subjects who had higher incomes. This would appear to have basis in fact as those
elderly who have a higher income may also have their own vehicle and therefore may not need to walk lengthy distances from their mode of transportation to their dwelling. They may be able to drive directly into their garage while those elderly who have lower incomes may have to walk a fair distance from their transportation to their dwelling.

Income may also be a specific indicator of fear due to housing type as well as transportation. If the elderly respondents are wealthy enough to purchase a secure home in a secure neighborhood then they need not worry about their safety from victimization to the same degree as the elderly who cannot afford to live in a secure, safe environment. In addition, the consequences of victimization, particularly property victimization, are not as severe for those wealthy elderly in comparison to those who are poor. Obviously victimization will not have as strong an impact on those elderly who have higher incomes. Higher income may be an indication of reduced vulnerability to the consequences of victimization, which in turn should mean, and did appear to indicate, that fear levels are reduced.

There are some studies, however, which challenge the general conclusion that education and income are related to fear of victimization. Toseland (1982) found that both education and income had no effect on fear among the elderly. In addition, in a California study it was found that education and income had no relation whatsoever to the elderly's fear of crime (Sundeen, 1977).
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Many of these patterns of demographic relationships associated with fear of victimization in this study support previous arguments in the literature that the groups inclined to be fearful are those that are particularly vulnerable. Physical illness and general health problems also appear to be one source of feelings of vulnerability. The literature indicates that as a group the elderly, due to declining physical strength and agility, are especially vulnerable to certain crimes (Stinchombe et al., 1977; Singer et al., 1977).

Sixty percent of the sample indicated that they had some sort of health problem. Those elderly in this survey who had health problems also felt more unsafe alone in their neighborhood at night. The elderly may be physically more fragile, and may be aware of this vulnerability, which may have increased their fear.

Integration in the Neighborhood

In theory, how integrated the elderly are in their neighborhood on a residential and a social level, and how they perceive their neighborhoods in terms of problems of disorder should affect the level of fear that they have. The results of this study indicate that most of the respondents were well integrated in their neighborhoods, most liked what they saw, had no desire to move, had lived in their neighborhoods for a fairly long period of time, had a neighbor to call on, and talked to
their neighbors at least a few times a month. However, approximately 50% could not identify a stranger (could not recognize a stranger to their area), and about 40% stated that vandalism and teenagers were a problem.

The results provided here do not lend support to the proposition that integration in the neighborhood affects elderly residents' fear of victimization. Significant interactions were not obtained for the majority of the combinations of the integration in the neighborhood items and the fear of victimization items.

Generally the measures of residential integration (attachment, satisfaction, familiarity) and signs of incivilities were not significantly related to fear of victimization, except in a few instances. As expected, those who owned their homes felt safer than those who rented (a finding consistent with Maxfield, 1984). And generally, those who felt safe liked their neighborhood and had no desire to move. This is consistent with Toseland (1982) who found satisfaction with a person's neighborhood to be related to fear. These were, however, the only residential factors associated with fear of victimization from crime.

One other measure of integration in the neighborhood, that of social integration, also did not appear to have an impact on fear levels, except in a few cases. More of those who felt safe in their home at night had a neighbor to call on than those who
did not, those who felt safe walking from their mode of transportation alone at night talked to their neighbors a lot. This was consistent with the findings of Clarke and Lewis (1982). They found that those elderly respondents who had contact with neighbors and who thought neighbors would provide assistance if needed, had lower levels of fear. However, those respondents who felt unsafe also talked to their neighbors a lot.¹

There was no strong relationship between integration in the neighborhood and fear of victimization among the elderly sample. The data provide little evidence that integration in the neighborhood provides significant benefits with regard to fear of victimization from crime among the elderly in neighborhoods in New Westminster.

As previous studies have at least partially supported the proposition that residential integration affects fear of crime among the general population (Riger et al., 1981; Hartnagel, 1979), the findings of this research project warrant further consideration. It may be that the level of fear of victimization from crime was not great enough to affect integration in the neighborhood, or integration in the neighborhood may not have been great enough to allow the fear of victimization to increase.

¹Again, note a logical conundrum here. As residential and social integration increases, indirect victimization may also increase. As the elderly become more integrated into their neighborhoods, and therefore possibly have more contact with actual victims, their indirect victimization may increase, which means that their actual fear may also increase.
this integration. Furthermore, as Hartnagel (1979) has indicated:

the response to the criminal has increasingly become impersonal phenomena to be responded to and controlled through formal mechanisms and they may therefore fail to elicit much in the way of a general response. Formal, bureaucratic crime control has taken over the action, if not the function, of informal community response and control (p. 93).

Moreover, for integration in the neighborhood to have the hypothesized relationship with fear of victimization, such fear may have to be beyond a certain level, and may have to be experienced by many persons in the neighborhood, not just a few, as in this case.

Victimization

Although the elderly may not be more prone to victimization than other groups in society, special attention should be given to the impact victimization has on their fear. As indicated previously, findings in this area have not been consistent.

This study made a distinction between direct and indirect victimization. There was not a significant relationship between direct victimization and fear, which is consistent with previous research; the experience of being a recent victim is not a sufficient predictor of fear of crime among the elderly (Yin, 1982; Clarke and Lewis, 1982). However, this may be due to the inclusion of property crimes in the measurement. In previous studies when property crimes were eliminated from the measurement, the victims of certain personal crimes were more
fearful. However, the number of victims in the sample who had been the victim of a personal crime was too small to warrant any analysis.

In addition, as this study only asked the subject about victimization in the past year the extent of their revealed victimization was limited. The relationship between victimization and fear may have been stronger if the subjects had been asked if they had ever been victimized. Therefore this study only considered short term effects of victimization on fear.

Attention was also focused upon indirect victimization. Very little is known about the effects of interpersonal communication of crime information of fear—however it is known that victims spend a lot of time recounting their experiences to others (Skogan, 1979). It has been found that crime related experience of elderly's friends is even a stronger predictor than is the respondent's own experience. This has been supported by Baumer (1978), and Bishop and Kleck (1978), who have remarked that this is of particular significance with regard to fear among the elderly. Clarke and Lewis (1982), on the other hand, found that indirect victimization was not a powerful predictor of fearfulness among the elderly.

The results of this survey demonstrated few significant relationships between the items which measured indirect victimization and those which measured fear. Slightly more than
half of the respondents who felt safe alone in their home at night and who felt safe walking from their mode of transportation alone at night, did not know any burglary victims. Fifty-two percent of those who felt unsafe when walking from their transportation to their home alone at night knew someone who had been the victim of an attempted assault. However, these limited results make it impossible to determine if indirect victimization is a predictor of fearfulness—it certainly is not a powerful predictor.

In summary, the survey indicated that personal victimization plays a limited role in explaining general fear of victimization among the elderly sample, a finding consistent with previous research.

The main point to notice is that fear may not be learned through experience with direct victimization. Moreover, the knowledge of the victimization of others may be insignificant in generating concern about personal safety. Perhaps because the elderly respondents' fear of victimization was not great, interactions concerning victimization were not significantly related to fear.

Activity

The major variables considered to be predictors of activity patterns are gender, stage in the life cycle, and status (income and education). These are the same variables that are considered to be indicators of high levels of fear in society.
This research found that the elderly sample generally was active, and did not limit their activity. However, the older female respondent with lower income did limit their activity, and were the most fearful.

Fear of victimization carries meaning for the elderly if it causes significant behavioural changes, one of these changes being the reduction of activity. A high level of fear of victimization per se among the elderly is not really the problem. The problem of fear is the effect it has on those elderly who are fearful. Among such effects is isolation or reduction of activity. Research has not established an entrenched relationship between fear among the elderly and activity. Lebowitz (1975), Reynolds and Blyth (1976, Butler (1975) and Lawton et al., (1976), argue that because of fear of victimization the elderly limit how much they go out. In contrast, Lawton and Yaffe (1979), Clarke and Lewis (1982) and the U.S. Department of Justice (1977), have concluded that fear does not appear to be a major factor in the limitation of activity among the elderly they studied.

This research found very little association between fear of victimization from crime and activity. The data did not provide statistical support for the belief that fear of victimization isolated the elderly from social activities. This finding was consistent with the weak relationship between fear of victimization and activity; when respondents were asked why they had trouble participating in certain activities, very few mentioned fear.
The proportion of elderly who have been forced by fear of victimization from crime to alter their way of life varies from study to study, but most indicate that the elderly have changed their activities in response to fear. The findings of this survey do not indicate that fear caused behavioural change among the elderly. However, perhaps the level of fear was not sufficiently high to cause a change in activity, or perhaps the frequency of various social activities was so entrenched that an extremely high level of fear was required before the elderly would alter their behaviour. The way in which many other researchers have linked the decreased mobility of the elderly to fear of victimization, or put another way—'self imposed house arrest', does not exist for the elderly in this study, except perhaps when preferring to stay at home at night, but that certainly was not unreasonable behaviour.

This research supports the findings of Dubow et al. (1979), Lawton and Yaffe (1980), Yin (1982), Cook et al. (1983) and Maxfield (1984) that fear of victimization as greatly restricting activity may be an exaggeration. Fear may isolate the elderly from some activities but the relationship is much weaker than commonly thought. Even when the elderly are limited in their activity, fear of victimization may not be the cause. Much activity restriction among the elderly in this study was due to other factors such as poor health, low economic status and lack of time.
An issue to note in terms of this study and previous research is whether reduction of activity is an indicator of the level of fear of victimization among the elderly or whether the level of fear increases as a result of reduction of activity. The latter case would be similar to a cycle where the elderly respond to their fear in their neighborhood by limiting activity. In turn, the limitation of activity may function to heighten the elderly's sensitivity to the problem and therefore magnify their fears.

**Social Support**

Gubrium (1974), Lebowitz (1975) and Sundeen and Mathieu (1976) have all found indicate that a social support network reduces fear of victimization. In particular, those elderly respondents who lived with someone had less fear than those who lived alone. However, Yin (1982) found no indication that social support groups affect fear among the elderly. Cook et al. (1983) conclude that isolation could account for some fear among elderly, but by no means all of the fear of victimization. Nevertheless the the levels of fear among the elderly in this sample vary somewhat in relation to whether or nor they alone. Those repondents who lived with someone tended to feel safer in their neighborhood alone at night than those who lived alone.

If the respondent has someone else at home social isolation may be reduced. This reduction in isolation may have the potential to cause an elderly individual to increase
participation in routine activities. Thus social support may not totally counteract the effects of fear among those elderly who are fearful, but it may reduce it somewhat. However, this is difficult to demonstrate from this study, as the fear levels among this elderly sample were not high.

Some Concerns

This section will focus on some of the unanswered questions raised in this investigation of fear and its impact on the elderly. Overall the results suggest that the demographic variables were the most important determinants of fear of victimization. When considering the effects of gender, age, health and social support, it becomes clear that fear of victimization is not evenly distributed, but how it is distributed is complex. Being a woman, of old age, in poor health, with a low income and living alone, are factors which will increase the likelihood of experiencing fear of victimization. Elderly persons who have these characteristics are particularly vulnerable.

Fear is considerably rarer for males than it is for females; this is one of the paradoxes of fear. One explanation may be that in males fear may be underrepresented because men feel reluctant to confess their fears. However this seems unlikely when we are dealing with the older male. An explanation that makes more sense may be that vulnerability affects persons who
are more powerless to do anything about actual victimization. Women are victimized in a way that men are not. Women are more likely to be victims of certain personal crimes. Interestingly though, these feelings of vulnerability among the elderly females in this study did not cause a reduction in their activities, even when they had a high degree of victimization.

The findings of this study with respect to activity, victimization and fear raise many questions. The expectation was that those who had been victimized would have greater fear and thus reduce their activity and exposure. In fact the opposite occurred. Rather than the elderly being 'prisoners in their homes', most of the elderly respondents were active, and the elderly who had been victimized did not differ from the elderly who had not been victimized in this respect. An explanation for this may be that those who once experienced fear had already reduced their activities unconsciously, thereby also reducing their fear unconsciously. However, victimization was not associated with change in activity. One can only speculate as to why victimized elderly did not reduce their activity. It is possible that activity was so important that avoidance behaviour was not even considered. But for whatever reason, the elderly in this study were not adjusting their activity, and therefore their exposure, in a way that might reduce their actual chances of victimization.

It should be noted, however, that the literature indicates rate of victimization for household crimes is greater for the
elderly than the rate for other crimes (Antunes et al., 1977). Therefore it cannot be suggested that the elderly stay home more in the attempt to reduce their chances of victimization, and in the attempt to reduce their fear of victimization. Among elderly victims, Sundeen (1977) and Cunningham (1976) found fear to be higher among burglary victims than among victims of other types of crime. A question for future research to pursue would be to determine if there are different levels of fear in relation to victimization in the home or victimization outside the home.

To summarize, the elderly did not seem to reduce their activity in response to victimization or fear. The findings gave no support to the idea that the elderly become 'prisoners in their homes'. However the problem may be that, for whatever reason, the elderly were not adjusting their activity, and therefore their exposure in a way that might reduce their actual chances of victimization.

The findings of others that isolation was associated with higher fear of victimization were not as strongly supported in this study. The results did, however, indicate that the availability of someone may maintain feelings of security and reduce fear. Further investigation is needed to ascertain the direction of this relationship; for example, do persons who are socially isolated become more fearful or does a support group reduce this fear?
The most interesting paradox concerns the high levels of integration among the elderly, their low levels of fear, and their high levels of victimization. As mentioned earlier, an explanation may be that because the elderly have such high levels of social integration, this integration may actually increase fear resulting from indirect victimization, as the more integrated the elderly are into their community, the more opportunity they have to discuss victimization.

According to the theory of integration the community should prevent fear and victimization. The examination of community life in relation to crime has been an enduring topic in the study of crime. While Durkheim (1958) stressed that crime can affirm community values, the Chicago School formulated a related theory, that of social disorganization. Social disorganization results from mobility, heterogeneity and dense interpersonal relations. As these factors increase, local social control, based on the constraining influence of primary group relationships, breaks down (Dubow and Emmons, 1981). Crime was one of the many consequences of this breakdown. In this view, social disorganization, rather than individual pathology, leads to crime. It was argued that neighborhoods would diminish as a site of social control and thus diminish as a provider of belonging, moral guidance, and resources for mutual assistance to its residents (Dubow and Emmons, 1981).

Taken one step further, as neighborhoods diminish as sites for social control, not only would crime increase but so would
fear. Conversely, in neighborhoods with low social disorganization and high integration, fear and crime will be lower.

It was initially assumed that strong residential and social integration would lead to a strong sense of community which would, in turn, lead to increased social interaction, and thus to more effective informal social control. This assumption was not supported according to the results of this study. New Westminster is a highly integrated community with informal control, which should lead to lower crime and victimization. These results indicate that neighborhoods in New Westminster appear to be a highly integrated, but the elderly respondents in New Westminster also have high levels of actual victimization.

The low fear, high victimization discrepancy is the least understood relationship produced by this research. Perhaps there is a high degree of residential and social integration in the neighborhood but there is not a strong sense of 'total community'. Suttles (1968) may provide the answer. He states that social control, even in an integrated community, may be highly selective. Some neighborhoods may have mechanisms for protecting their turf in varying degrees against external intrusions, but are relatively ineffective against certain predations of the community residents on each other. In other neighborhoods the reverse may be true, effective controls may extend only to the residents' behaviour within the neighborhood. This may have occurred in New Westminster. The elderly
respondents may have felt integrated into their community and have had high levels of victimization, but still have low levels of fear; when people like and are attached and satisfied with their neighborhood they may see things as going well in the neighborhood (Taub et al., 1981). Another explanation may be that the elderly were unaware of their actual probability of victimization. When living in an urban ghetto, individuals are constantly aware of their probability of victimization. The diffusion of information concerning victimization is not as intensive in an non-ghetto community. Finally, these variables may be unrelated simply because the level of fear was not high enough to affect the residential and social integration of the neighborhoods and the respondents to the degree where social control would be enhanced. In addition, neighborhoods in New Westminster may not have enough of a communal spirit to provide identity and belonging, which is necessary to produce the informal surveillance that may reduce the chances of victimization and fear.

Limitations and Methodological Considerations

In contrast to this research, several studies have identified the elderly as very fearful and have indicated the particular variables that affect their fear. How can these contrasting findings be reconciled?

While the data may not support the previous assertions that fear of victimization is a major problem for the elderly, it is
necessary to point out the limitations and the problems of the study. Several notes of caution are in order before generalizing from the results presented here.

The data are based on self-reports and are limited to a section of the population at one point in time. In addition, the results of the study may point to the need for additional information regarding fear of victimization; no doubt there may be sources of fearfulness which were not identified due to the small sample size.

Unfortunately, the results of this study are obviously limited to the particular respondents this researcher came into contact with. Due to time and financial constraints the size of the sample was limited; only 70 respondents were questioned. With larger samples other relationships might appear. Thus, this change from previous studies may be attributable to the sample size.

A final problem resulting from the size of the sample may be the limitation of statistical analysis. With a larger sample, more complex interactions could be tested for. It may be useful to conduct further research on a larger sample to see if the lack of statistically significant relationships is maintained.

The sample included persons from the age of 55 to 90. Although many advantages accrue from a sample with that particular age range, care must be taken in interpreting the data. Originally the respondents were selected if they were 65
and above, but because of the difficulty in obtaining respondents in that age range, respondents in the age range 55 and above were selected. The sample was divided into two age groups to allow a comparison. It was felt that a single age description could not do justice to the heterogeneity of the entire age range.

The focus of the research, however, was directed to the phenomenon of fear of victimization among the elderly; an attempt was made to delineate factors influencing this fear as an exercise of value in and of itself, without reference to other age groups. On that basis, as an exploratory study of the phenomenon, energies were directed toward that end.

It is also important when interpreting the results, to think critically about fear and how it is measured. Fear for personal safety alone in the neighborhood at night does not access other anxieties such as fear of being a victim of burglary. Yet it is only in this circumstance that the elderly were consistently fearful. Interestingly, it was questions used previously in other studies as operationalizations of 'fear of crime' that did result in reported fear; the new measures developed for this study did not indicate fear among the elderly. Does this indicate that the elderly in New Westminster are not fearful of victimization from crime in any other circumstances? Or does this indicate there may be other factors at work? Unfortunately, these questions are beyond the scope of this thesis and will be for future research to answer.
It is also important to think critically about 'crime'. The discussion focused on crime in the streets, crime in the neighborhood, and crime in the home, rather than specifically on white collar crime, such as consumer frauds or confidence rackets. However, the respondents were asked if they had been the victim of any crime other than burglary, robbery or assault. This should have compensated for the lack of a direct question assessing white collar crime. In addition, fear of victimization from crime did not tap into other more general concerns (social concerns) that the elderly may have had, nor was it intended to.

Finally, the absence of significant interactions between most of these items should be reiterated. This may be, in part, due to the absence of extensive statistical testing. However given the results, this seems unlikely. There may have been little interaction due to the lack of variability in the social economic status, activity levels, social support, and even fear of victimization among the elderly respondents. However, even those respondents who had lower levels of education, income social support and integration, had lower levels of fear than previous research indicated they should have.

In sum, a conclusive test of these relationships may require still further improvement in methods of measuring fear, integration in the neighborhood, victimization, social support and activity.
General Concerns

Fear of criminal victimization does not appear to be a major social problem for the elderly. In addition, fear of victimization (this refers to the traditional image of victimization and crime held in the fear of crime literature) may not be as important a social issue to the elderly as fear of other types of social victimization. Therefore it is to be hoped that research would be undertaken for all of the different ways in which the elderly are, or could be victimized. The main purpose of this research project was to emphasize the importance of research into fear of victimization of specific crimes, its necessity, and also its very complex nature. There is no easy solution to the problem. Before one can come to definite conclusions in this area, more research must be undertaken. Future research in this area should possibly be undertaken in conjunction with research on other possible areas of fear among the elderly.

Some Cautions

Many elderly may be potentially afraid of victimization from crime. This study indicated that there are some groups within the elderly population, though, that are far more vulnerable to fear than others (for example the female, the poor, and the less educated).
This study revealed that more than one-quarter of the sample had been victimized; perhaps general concerns should be aimed in this direction. The elderly could be involved in education programs, with particular attention being focused on when the criminals are most likely to commit crimes, how to make their homes more secure and how to become alert to possible victimizations. However, there is a question as to whether or not victimization and fear reduction strategies should be aimed specifically at the elderly.

Because of the crucial significance that has been ascribed to the fear of victimization among the elderly, but more specifically the determinants of that fear, this concluding section will recommend actions to take to limit this fear. However it will also recommend caution concerning actions taken to reduce fear of victimization. Such caution is necessary, regardless of the particular theoretical stance given rise to and the justifications of this research.

Persons who are concerned about the quality of life of older persons are caught in a dilemma. On the one hand we wish to call attention to the problems and thereby help find solutions. On the other hand, we want to avoid the negative, latent consequences that may be inherent in focusing on the problems. This dilemma is most apparent in the area of crime against the elderly and their fear of victimization from crime.
The advantages of calling attention to the problem of fear of victimization and actual victimization are obvious. The community should, and will, hopefully provide greater protection from actual victimization of the elderly. Even more importantly, the elderly will become aware of the problem and hopefully deal with it. To become more informed about victimization may reduce their fear—the knowledge of the ability to deal with the problem may alleviate some anxiety and fear.

However, there are also inherent disadvantages, or 'backlash' effects (Henig and Maxfield, 1978). These effects should also be considered. The emphasis on fear and victimization may change or contribute to the media and the public perception of fear of victimization among the elderly. In cases where obvious attempts are made to reduce fear and victimization, the opposite may result. Focusing on the fear may further increase fear among those elderly who are already fearful, or create fear among those elderly who are not. The elderly may not have fear of victimization until they begin to question why attempts are made to reduce their fear. These attempts may, in fact, produce an exaggerated sense of the probability of actual victimization. In addition, the extent to which the media portrays the problem of the elderly as victims and the younger person as the victimizer, may actually create or increase age conflicts in society (Rifai, 1978). Also, to the degree to which the elderly are stressed as having a high level of fear, the image of themselves as 'helpless, dependent, and frail', may do damage to their self
esteem (Riger, 1978). This may contribute to anxiety and a turning inward which makes it more likely that the elderly will exaggerate their fear. Finally, the reduction of actual fear may cause the elderly to become careless and inattentive, thereby actually increasing their risks of victimization (Henig and Maxfield, 1978).

There are also inherent problems when conducting research in the area of fear of victimization among the elderly. A separate victimization and fear of victimization survey of the elderly may simply serve to perpetuate myths about the elderly as a distinct category of the population. This and other research may, paradoxically, contribute to the elderly's fear of criminal victimization. What is the solution? Do researchers avoid researching fear among the elderly?

Agreement about the problem of fear of victimization is far easier to reach than agreement about the appropriateness of actions to investigate or eliminate the problem (assuming that we want to eliminate or reduce it). This alone should caution one against the tendency, tempting and understandable, to assume that fear of victimization is a concept which should involve official response and action (specifically actions that ensure certain desired outcomes) if this action might be inappropriate and harmful to the elderly.

However, the temptation to oversimplify the concept of 'fear of victimization' among the elderly and to insist that it is a
major social problem without further substantiation must be resisted. This has led to research with confusing and ambiguous results, and has created many problems for researchers. These researchers may have, in fact, contributed to the problem because of the over-simplification and assumptions that fear of victimization does exist and is a major problem for the elderly. However, one cannot understand the dimension or existence of a problem unless one poses a question and finds an answer. Research is necessary to establish whether or not the problem exists and what the parameters of the problem are. The researcher must be aware of possible latent negative consequences and take steps to minimize them. Certainly in research on fear of victimization among the elderly it is important to establish how pervasive the fear is among the elderly and what the determinants of this fear are. It may, however, be equally important to study how the concept 'fear of victimization from crime' has evolved. Fear of more subtle, and possibly more pervasive, victimization of the elderly, and what role society, in general, plays in the perpetuation of this fear, has not been extensively studied.

**The Impact of the Political Process**

The eagerness with which the concept 'fear of victimization among the elderly' has been accepted may testify more to the strength of the political system than to our understanding of the realities of this fear. One must understand how the elderly, and others, acquire their perceptions of crime, victimization,
and fear. Criminal conceptions are constructed and diffused through society by various means of communication. The reaction of the elderly to crime is a product of the social reality of crime, but is also a product of the construction of conceptions about crime. Reactions to crime and fear of victimization appear to vary throughout a population according to age, gender and social class. Reactions and attitudes to crime are influenced by the knowledge of crime and the perceptions about the meaning of crime.

How are these reactions constructed? Why has fear of victimization among the elderly emerged as such a controversial issue? One possible explanation may be the political system. Cook (1981) provides a lucid explanation. He argues that this issue emerged because 'the social and political climate was ripe', and also because the problem was 'independently and similarly articulated by several different groups at the same time'. Moreover, it was 'relatively conflict free, eliciting much sympathy from those who learned of it' (p. 123).

Cook (1981) indicates that the issue went through several major stages. The 1970's were ripe for the development of the issue of victimization among the elderly (also, fear of victimization). There was increasing concern about crime and crime victims. The most important theme in the victimization debate, Cook contends, was the elderly themselves. Due to the recognition of large numbers of elderly as a voting block, and particularly due to the recognition of many of the unmet needs
of the elderly, several policy related impacts occurred. For politicians criminal victimization and fear of victimization was a good issue to espouse. It was a convenient issue as it had no opposition, and because the politicians were not directly to blame for the problem of fear and victimization (Cook, 1981).

Fear, therefore, may be simply amplified by the political process. The elderly are generally visualized as being powerless and vulnerable and thus easy victims. If the elderly themselves do not accept this image it is possible that they will also reject the image of themselves as easily victimized. Given that the sample used in this research had unusually high economic and educational status, it is possible that they would be more likely to reject a negative image of themselves, and therefore less likely to fear victimization. Future research may indicate that the elderly who have greater income and political participation may have a lesser degree of fear.

It appears that 'fear of victimization' may be an exaggerated concept perpetuated by certain politicians for their own interest. If the public takes fear of victimization as a given, this allows the political process to enhance their power and control, while being praised for dealing with a major social problem. Victimization research may simply amplify the perceived crime problem. Fear, at least in part, may be the result of the fostering of a powerless dependency of the elderly, especially in relation to those elderly who have the least power and who are the most vulnerable, the poor and the female.
The present research supports the explanation that fear of victimization among the elderly may be due to their greater vulnerability to the consequences of victimization. The elderly in this survey generally were not economically, socially or environmentally vulnerable and they did not have higher levels of fear. The consequences of victimization were not as severe for them as for those elderly who have financial, social and environmental concerns. This may indicate that fear of victimization is rooted in economics.

New Directions

This study of fear of victimization from crime among the elderly in New Westminster was clearly a preliminary study of the relationship between fear of victimization and the variables--integration in the neighborhood, victimization, activity and social support. There is a considerable volume of literature on the elderly in Canada, but little on their criminal victimization and almost nothing on their fear of victimization from crime. Previous assumptions about the relationship between variables have depended upon American, and to a lesser extent, European studies.

The results of this survey indicate that fear of victimization among the elderly in Canada may be much rarer than was commonly thought. Canadian elderly, at least in certain neighborhoods in New Westminster, did not give evidence of a
high degree of fear for their personal safety, particularly in their own neighborhood. However there are many issues that need to be pursued before we can generalize from these findings. The results of this study point to the need for additional information regarding fear of victimization from crime, as there may be sources of fearfulness which this study did not tap into.

In response to this, future investigation might examine a larger sample of subjects. As was indicated earlier, the size of the sample was a severe limitation. In addition, as the analysis demonstrated gender differences in fear, information is needed to explain why women are more likely to express fear than men. Moreover, additional information is required about the extent of fear among lower income elderly, as there is every reason to believe that fear is more acute among the poor. Therefore caution not to impute a class bias in attempts to convince the elderly that their fears are groundless, is required.

Little research has been undertaken on the effect that witnessing a crime has on fear of victimization (Dubow et. al., 1979), yet this is clearly an area worthy of further investigation. Misconceptions about the criminal justice system may influence the response of an elderly witness of a crime. Braungart et. al., (1979) note that many elderly lacked information and did not know how the procedures associated with the various branches of the criminal justice system worked. This may result in many misconceptions that influence dealings with the criminal justice system, attitudes about crime, and the fear of victimization.
In addition, because this study hoped to indicate which factors had an effect on fear, actual fear was not considered to be of paramount importance. New research could apply the same methodology used in this research to undertake a comparative analysis of the actual fear levels among other subgroups of the population, and what factors affect that fear.

Finally, fear of victimization may, in fact, be reflecting a more diffuse form of fear--fear emerging from victimization at other levels (financial and social). However, for the purpose of this study these other forms of fear were irrelevant; future research may incorporate these broader forms of fear and examine what impact they have upon the elderly.

This research has taken an initial step in examining fear of crime among the elderly in Canada. The elderly are an important segment of society in Canada, and we need to address the issue of fear of victimization and how it may affect their quality of life. The concept of 'quality of life' has an important place in the fear of victimization debate. O'Brien (1973) has determined that three of the most important correlates of quality of life are "ability to live one's life one's own way' or autonomy, acceptance by others, and security in one's place of residence" (p. 97). It is the issue of security which this study addressed.

Security is a complex phenomenon in its own right, but when we relate it to fear it becomes even more complex, as this
research has indicated. Fear of victimization research has made specific significant contributions to the dimension of the quality of life of the elderly. Most research indicates that fear has affected the quality of life of the elderly in a negative way. However, one can observe through this research clear and consistent differences between this study and established theory, and thus in the general area of the elderly's quality of life. Although only a beginning effort, this study has documented some interesting possibilities for future research, as well as some interesting contributions to the evaluation of fear of victimization among the elderly.
APPENDIX A

Conceptual Distinctions Of Fear

Fear and Concern

Furstenberg (1971) demonstrated that the ranking of crime as a social issue was different from other measures of fear. He made the distinction between concern about crime as a general social issue and fear of crime as a personal issue. Fear, therefore, involves a personalized threat rather than abstract beliefs and attitudes about crime as a problem involving risk. Fowler and Mangione (1974) have further distinguished assessments of risk from emotional reactions to crime. According to them, people may share a common assessment of how likely they are to be a victim of a crime such as burglary, but they may take more or less seriously the probability of being robbed, and may feel frightened in varying degrees. This was substantiated by Conklin (1975) and more recently by Dubow et. al., (1979).

Dubow et. al., (1979) state that people prioritize how the political process should deal with various social issues. However, the common consensus appears to be that, while concern about crime as a social issue is a problem, it is not closely related to the concept of 'fear of crime'.
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Perceptions and Judgements About Crime

The second dimension of the term 'fear of crime' refers to what Conklin labelled 'perception of crime'. This generally refers to the nature of the local crime problem, to the subjective estimate of the extent of crime in the respondent's immediate environment (Baumer and Rosenbaum, 1982). These perceptions also include a relatively new phenomenon termed 'signs of disorder' (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981). Dubow et al., (1979) termed these signs of disorder 'judgements about the factual distribution of crime', which includes ideas of the extent of crime (a cognitive dimension) and a subjective estimate of personal risk (an evaluative dimension).

To expand, Dubow et al., (1979) state that individuals judge the probability of their own victimization, their own risk, and crime rates generally. Although these are assessments of crime events, they are distinct entities. Perceptions of the amount of crime can differ greatly from assessments of personal vulnerability. For example, the elderly may perceive themselves as more vulnerable than the average person, but may not see the actual amount of crime as high.

Two trends appear across a number of studies that deal with judgements about crime (Dubow et al., 1979). First, almost all studies found that most people see crime rates as rising, and secondly, people perceived less crime in their immediate environment than in other locations (Biderman et al., 1967; Boggs, 1971; Garofalo, 1977a).
Emotional Dimension of Fear

The third conceptual area refers to a more emotional or personal dimension of 'fear of crime' (Baumer and Rosebaum, 1982). This refers to subjective estimates of personal danger. Operationally, respondents may be asked to assess their risk of victimization or report an emotional state, such as fear or worry, or concern. These types of questions, obviously, do not measure fear when it actually occurs, but asks people to recall episodes of fear they have experienced or fear which they anticipate they would feel under selected circumstances (Garofalo, 1981).

Drawing on Furstenberg's (1971) distinction between concern and risk, Conklin (1975) describes the emotional dimension as 'feelings of personal safety' and indicates that it is distinct from the perceptual dimension (the estimate of crime in the person's immediate neighborhood)--a finding substantiated by Baumer (1979). This feeling of personal safety has subsequently been referred to as an emotional reaction to crime by Dubow et al., (1979), who state that the distinction between the emotional reaction and the perceptual dimension to a perceived situation are analytically distinguishable.

It is the emotional component to crime which most appropriately includes measures of 'fear'. The distinction between emotion and judgement in relation to fear may be
discussed in terms of the frequency and seriousness, or the certainty and severity of crime. This dimension is the combination of the belief that victimization is possible or likely, and the anxiety about the consequences. This means that fear may result even if the risk of victimization is low. As Cook et al., (1983) in their study of crime and fear among the elderly state:

The concept of threat of crime lies at the nexus between concern and personal risk. People feel threatened by crime when they believe that something could happen to them, even though for a variety of reasons...they may not necessarily feel that it is likely. (p.25)

**Behavioral Reactions to Crime**

Behavioral reactions, designed to protect one from victimization, constitutes the fourth dimension of the 'fear of crime' issue distinguished in the previous literature (Baumer and Rosenbaum, 1982). It has been suggested by some researchers that this is the most critical of the four dimensions (Baumer, 1980). Most arguments that concern the negative impact of crime and fear ultimately rest on some form of behavior modification. There are extremes of behavior modification however. At one extreme, individuals may change their behavior by becoming 'prisoners of fear', locking themselves away behind steel doors and barred windows. At the other extreme, they may become 'activists', banding together with neighbors to prevent crime by taking aggressive steps to challenge strangers, intervening when they observe suspicious circumstances, and act to reduce opportunities for crime (Skogan, 1983).
There are specific subtypes of action resulting from behavior modification. Furstenberg (1972) distinguishes between avoidance and mobilization measures. Kleiman and David (1972) label these measures as passive and aggressive. In general, avoidance and passive behaviors involve little expense, for example, staying off the street, ignoring strangers, etc.; mobilization or aggressive behaviors involve somewhat more of an expense, for example, installing a burgler alarm, buying a gun, etc.

Only one type of behavioral reaction to crime, that of avoidance, was discussed in this thesis as it is this reaction to fear that can have the most severe ramifications for the elderly. Furstenberg (1972) first coined the term avoidance in relation to fear of victimization. He distinguished between avoidance behavior and mobilization techniques and, according to him, avoidance behavior involves "strategies to isolate (oneself) from exposure to victimization" (p.11). Examples of avoidance found in the Harris Survey (1969) included staying off the street at night, taking taxis, locking doors and ignoring strangers. Dubow et al., (1979) define avoidance somewhat similarly to that of Furstenberg (1972). They state:

Avoidance refers to actions taken to decrease exposure to crime by removing oneself from or increasing the distance from situations in which the risk of criminal victimization is believed to be high. (Dubow et al., 1979, p.31)

The situations which are being avoided may be characterized in terms of location, time, people, or some combination thereof.
People avoid going to certain areas, avoid going out at night and avoid types of people--particularly strangers--due to the belief that they may be victimized.
APPENDIX B

General Characteristics of the Elderly Respondents

Demographic Characteristics

The demographic characteristics of the elderly residents in New Westminster that are discussed in this section include:

Age,
Race,
Gender,
Living Arrangements (housing),
Income,
Marital Status,
Level of education, and
Employment Status.

Each of these characteristics will be looked at individually, followed by a discussion of the interrelationships between them.

Age, Race, and Gender of the Elderly

The 70 respondents were classified into six age categories: 55 to 59, 60 to 64, 65 to 69, 70 to 74, 75 to 79, and over 80. Approximately 49% of the elderly respondents fell into what has been termed (by Rifia, 1975, and other researchers) the 'young-old' (69 and under), while 51% fell into the 'old-old' (70 and above). Ten of the elderly were between 55 to 59, 14 were between 60 to 64, ten were between 65 to 69, 12 were
between 70 to 74, 13 were between 75 to 79, and 11 were over 80.

Race or ethnic background was divided into six categories, including Caucasian, Native Indian, Oriental, East Indian, Black, and all others. All of the elderly respondents in the sample were Caucasian.

As might be expected, a predominance of women was found in the study. Of the total sample of 70 elderly people, 24 of the respondents were male and 46 were female.

Living Arrangements of the Elderly in New Westminster

Responses to questions concerning the living arrangements of the elderly in New Westminster specified the types of accommodation and with whom the elderly live. Responses to questions about with whom the elderly live will be discussed under the section labeled "Social Support". Thirty-six of the respondents lived in single family homes, 31 lived in apartments, and the other three lived in miscellaneous types of accommodation.

Income, Marital Status, Education, and Employment Status of the Elderly

Thirty of the subjects refused to reveal their income. Of those elderly who did reveal their income, 21 had an income between $5,000 and $9,999, six had an income between $10,000 and $14,999, four had an income between $15,000 and $19,999, six had an income between $20,000 and $24,999, no one fell into the
$25,000 to $30,000 category, and three had an income over $30,000.

The marital status of the respondents did vary somewhat, with a large number being widowed as was expected (24). Thirty-three of the respondents were married, eight were single, and five were separated or divorced.

Thirty-nine percent of the subjects had less than a high school diploma, 41% had a high school diploma, and 20% had at least some further education.

Eleven of the respondents were employed full time, seven were working part time, 43 were retired, five were not working (unemployed), and four had never worked.

Health Status of the Elderly

The elderly subjects were asked if they had any health problems. Forty percent stated that they did not, while the other 60% had health problems ranging from a heart condition to diabetes. When asked if they could perform activities independantly such as walking stairs, walking one-half mile, going to a movie, or doing housework, the majority said they could; 61 of the respondents could walk stairs, 59 could walk one-half mile, 62 could go to a movie and 54 could do light housework. However when the subjects were asked if they could do heavy housework, or work at a full time job, 30 said they could not. When asked about general health seven stated they could not
work because of their health, 31 said they had to limit their work, and 32 said they did not have to limit any activities due to health. And finally, when asked about general health 43, of the subjects indicated they were very to somewhat healthy, 11 indicated they were very to somewhat unhealthy, and 16 indicated they were average.

Interaction of Demographic Variables: Significant Relationships and General Trends

This section will look at the relationships between the population characteristics that were previously discussed.

The Interaction of Age and Other Variables

Almost 64% of the subjects aged 70 and above were living alone, compared to less than 36% of those between the ages of 55 and 69 ($\chi^2= 7.00$, df = 5, $p = .220$). Almost 56% of those between 55 and 69 lived with their spouses compared with 39% of those who were 70 and above. In addition, the elderly respondents who were 70 and above were more likely to live in apartments than the elderly between 55 and 69. Only 10 of the 55 to 69 year old elderly residents lived in apartments while 22 of the 70 year old and above lived in apartments ($\chi^2 = 5.90$, df = 1, $p = .015$).

Almost three times as many 55-69 year old elderly residents were employed (16) as were the 70 and above elderly (6). Twenty-eight percent of the males were 70 and over, however 72% of the females were 70 and over ($\chi^2 = 12.72$, df = 4, $p = .012$).
Nineteen of those between 55 and 69 years of age were married compared to 14 of the elderly 70 and above, and over 17 of those elderly aged 70 and above were widowed, compared to less than seven widowed among the elderly aged 60 to 69 ($x^2 = 6.70$, df = 3, $p = .081$). As expected younger respondents had fewer health problems. Only two of those aged 55-59 had health problems while nine of those over 70 had health problems ($x^2 = 41.09$, df = 1, $p = .042$).

The Interaction of Gender and Other Variables

Twenty-nine of the 46 female subjects lived alone, compared to only four of the 24 males ($x^2 = 11.81$, df = 1, $p = .001$). Nineteen males lived with their spouses, compared 13 of the females ($x^2 = 46.57$, df = 8, $p = .000$). Nineteen of the male respondents were married, compared to 14 of the females; 20 of the females were widowed, only four of the males were widowed ($x^2 = 8.12$, df = 4, $p = .087$). Fifty-seven percent of the females lived in apartments, 43% lived in single family homes, while 75% of the males lived in single family homes and 25% lived in apartments ($x^2 = 5.10$, df = 1, $p = .024$). More of the female subjects had a high school degree than the male subjects. Fifteen of the 24 males had a high school education, while 34 of the 46 females had a high school education. However, more male subjects had further education than the female subjects. Thirty-three percent of the male respondents were working part-time or full-time, 63% were retired. Twenty-two percent of the elderly female respondents were working and 61% were
retired. There were significant income disparities between the male and the female subjects. Eighty-eight percent of the females and 33% of the males made between $5,000 to $14,999 per year. In the $15,000 to $24,999 income category only 12% were female and 48% were male. Of the respondents in the $25,000 and above income bracket, 20% were male and none were female ($^2 = 13.65, df = 2, p = .001$). Finally, when comparing health, 25 of the 33 females and 18 of the 21 males who responded felt healthy.

Neighborhood Characteristics

The neighborhood characteristics of the elderly residents in New Westminster that are discussed in this section are:

(A) Residential Integration in the Neighborhood which includes:
- Attachment
- Satisfaction
- Familiarity: People and Area

(B) Social Integration in the Neighborhood

(C) Incivilities or Signs of Disorder

Each of these characteristics will be examined individually. This will be followed by a discussion of the interrelationships between these characteristics.
Residential Integration

Neighborhood Attachment

The elderly residents of New Westminster, for the most part, seemed to be very comfortable in the areas in which they lived. Most of them have lived in New Westminster and in their homes for a long period of time. Seventeen of the 70 elderly subjects had lived in their present home for up to five years. Thirteen had lived in their present home for six to 10 years, 14 had lived in their home for 11 to 15 years, and 26 had lived in their home for more than 16 years.

Five subjects had lived in New Westminster for up to five years, three had lived in New Westminster for six to 10 years, 15 had lived in New Westminster for 11 to 15 years, and 47 had lived in New Westminster for more than 16 years. Fifty-four percent of the respondents owned their residences, while 46% rented. Sixty-seven percent of the respondents stated that they felt a part of the neighborhood and 31% said it was just a place to live.

Sixty of the 70 subjects said that their neighbors would call the police for help if they saw a victimization occurring, two said their neighbors would not call the police, and eight did not know. (this may indicate general neighborhood attachment).
Neighborhood Satisfaction

Sixty-four of the elderly subjects stated that they liked what they saw in their neighborhood when they looked outside. Fourteen respondents said that their neighborhood had changed for the better, 45 of the respondents said their neighborhood stayed the same, and 10 stated that they felt that their neighborhood had changed for the worse. Overall, more than half of the subjects indicated that things had stayed the same in their neighborhood.

Fifty-eight of the respondents stated they had no desire to move, nine said they had some desire to move, and three had a very strong desire to move. When asked in an open ended question why they had no desire to move, 33 of the 58 respondents indicated that they did not wish to move because the area was 'convenient', 'familiar', and 'nice'. When the respondents were asked what they liked and disliked about their neighborhood, 31% stated that the neighborhood was convenient, 19% stated that it was quiet, and 16% stated that they liked their home, while 13% said they did not like the noise, 10% did not like the area physically, and six% said that vandalism was a problem.

When asked to rate specific neighborhood characteristics on a five point scale, it appeared that the elderly were generally happy with their neighborhoods. Thirty-six of the 70 elderly felt their neighborhood quiet, 21 felt it was noisy. Fifty-seven felt their neighborhood was private, four felt it was not
private. Fifty-five elderly thought their neighborhood was attractive, only four found it unattractive. Fifty-four thought the buildings were well kept up, and 60 felt the yards were well kept up. Ten felt the yards were not well kept up and 10 thought the buildings were not well kept up. Thirty-seven of the elderly subjects felt the people in their neighborhood were like them, 18 felt the people were not like them; 63 felt the people were pleasant, only three thought people were unpleasant. Fifty-nine of the respondents felt their neighborhood was a good place to live, seven thought it was a poor place to live. Fifty-nine respondents felt their neighborhood was convenient, two thought it was inconvenient. Finally, 60 respondents felt their neighborhood had a good reputation, six felt it had a bad reputation (See Table I for a complete breakdown)

Neighborhood Familiarity/People and Area

Fifty-three percent of respondents said that they felt it was difficult to identify a stranger, only only 44% stated that it was easy to identify a stranger, three percent did not know. When the respondents were asked to state, in an open ended question, what they liked best about their neighborhood, 16% stated familiarity with the neighborhood.
Table I

How Respondent Rated Neighborhood Characteristics  
N=70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>very %</th>
<th>somewhat %</th>
<th>neutral %</th>
<th>not very %</th>
<th>not at all %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noisy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly Kept up</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Place to</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Kept up</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Reputation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Integration in the Neighborhood

Fifty-eight of the 70 respondents stated they had a neighbor to call on in case of a problem, 11 said that they did not. Thirty-eight subjects said they chatted with a neighbor a few times a week or every day, 18 said they chatted with a neighbor a few times a month. Seven of the respondents talked to their
neighbors a few times a year and seven never talked to their neighbors.

When asked the open ended question why they had no intention to move, seven% of the respondents stated they had no desire to move because they had good friends in the neighborhood. In another open ended question, when the respondents were asked what they liked best about their neighborhood 10% stated their friends. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents stated that their neighbors were somewhat to very friendly, and only 11% said their neighbors were somewhat to very unfriendly.

*Incivilities/Signs of Disorder*

When asked about problems with people using drugs, alcohol, or a problem with teenagers and vandalism in the neighborhood, 36 of the subjects stated that teenagers were no problem, while 26 said teenagers were somewhat of a problem, four said that teenagers were a big problem, and four did not know. Twenty-two respondents said people using illegal drugs were not a problem, 11 said that the use of illegal drugs was some problem, three said it was a big problem, and 34 said that they did not know. Thirty-two respondents said people using alcohol were not a problem, 15 said the use of alcohol was some problem, five said it was a big problem, and 18 did not know. Finally, 24 of the subjects stated vandalism was not a problem, while 32 said that it was some problem, 10 said that it was a big problem, and four said that they did not know.
Interaction Between Neighborhood Variables: Significant Relationships and General Trends

This section will explore the significant relationships and the general trends between the neighborhood variables previously discussed. The section will begin with a discussion of attachment, and the interaction between attachment to the neighborhood, and satisfaction and familiarity with the neighborhood as a place to live. Following this the interaction between the respondents social integration in their neighborhood and their satisfaction, attachment and familiarity to their neighborhood will be discussed. Finally the interaction between the respondents satisfaction and familiarity with their neighborhood will be addressed.

(A) Attachment
Attachment was measured by three items.

Item 1: Do the Respondents Own or Rent Their Homes?

Eighteen respondents who owned their residence found they could easily identify a stranger and 19 could not, while only 13 of those who rented could identify a stranger and 18 could not. ¹

¹It should be noted again that comparative results that are so close are emphasized throughout, not for statistical significance, but for general interest.
Of those 38 respondents who owned their own home, 35 liked what they saw in their neighborhood when they looked outside, 29 of the 32 respondents who rented liked what they saw when they looked outside. Of those who owned their home, 18% said the neighborhood had changed for the better, 74% said it had stayed the same, and only 8% said it had changed for the worse. Twenty-two percent of those who rented said their neighborhood had changed for the better. Fifty-three percent of the respondents who rented stated that their neighborhood had stayed the same and 22% (in comparison to the eight% of homeowners) said that their neighborhood had changed for the worse ($x^2 = 4.80$, df = 3, $p = .186$).

When the respondents were asked if they had any desire to move, of the 38 who owned their own homes, six said they had a strong desire, or some desire to move, and 32 said they had no desire to move. Of the 32 who rented, six had some desire or a strong desire to move and 26 had no desire to move.

When the respondents were asked what they liked best and least about their neighborhood, those who owned their home stated it was comfortable (28%) and familiar (21%). Twenty-eight percent of those who rented said their neighborhood was convenient, 19% said it was comfortable. See Table II for a more complete breakdown.
Table II
What Respondent Liked Best About Their Neighborhood  
N=70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living Arrangements</th>
<th>Convenient %</th>
<th>Good %</th>
<th>Quiet %</th>
<th>Familiar %</th>
<th>Comfortable %</th>
<th>Misc. %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 2: How Many Years Have the Respondants Lived in Their Homes?

There did not seem to be any significant interaction between the number of years the respondents had lived in their homes, and whether or not they could recognize a stranger. It also did not appear to make any difference how long the subjects lived in their homes and whether they liked what they saw when they looked outside. However, it did appear to make a difference how many years the subjects had lived in their home and whether they felt their neighborhood had improved. This relationship is approaching significance ($\chi^2 = 20.96$, df = 15, $p = .138$). Finally, there was little variation between those who lived in their homes for a long time and those who had a desire to move. Those who lived in their home the longest had less of a desire to move; however, the difference was very slight. The elderly subjects seemed satisfied with their neighborhood no matter how
long they had lived there.

**Item 3: How Many Years Have the Respondents Lived in New Westminster?**

It made little difference how long the respondents had lived in New Westminster and their ability to recognize a stranger in the area. It also made little difference how long the subjects had lived in New Westminster and whether they felt their neighborhood had changed for the better or gotten worse, or whether they liked or disliked the people in New Westminster ($x^2 = 7.59$, df = 4, $p = .108$). Finally, most people had no desire to move from New Westminster ($x^2 = 11.23$, df = 8, $p = .189$).

(B) Social Integration

Social Integration was measured by three items.

**Item 1: Do The Respondents Have a Neighbor to Call on for Help in Case of a Problem?**

Somewhat unexpected was the finding that of those 58 respondents who had a neighbor to call on in case of a problem, only 23 could identify a stranger in their neighborhood. Of those who did not have a neighbor to call on, eight could identify a stranger in their neighborhood ($x^2 = 4.18$, df = 2, $p = .123$). It was assumed that those who had a neighbor to call on...
would be familiar enough with their neighbors and neighborhood to be able to recognize a stranger.

Of those who had no neighbor to call on, 64% rented. Of those who did have a neighbor to call on, 59% owned. There were no significant associations between if the respondent had a neighbor to call on and how long they had lived in their neighborhood. Those who did rely on their neighbors for assistance generally tended to have lived in their neighborhoods the longest.

Most respondents, even if they did not have a neighbor to call on, liked what they saw in their neighborhood. Of those who did not have a neighbor to call on, 27% felt their neighborhood had changed for the better, 55% felt it had stayed the same, and 18% felt it had changed for the worse. Of those who said they had a neighbor to rely on, 19% said their neighborhood had changed for the better, 67% felt it had stayed the same, and 12% felt it had changed for the worse.

Of the 11 subjects who had no neighbor to call on, one had a strong desire to move, three had some desire to move, but seven had no desire to move. Of the 58 subjects who did have a neighbor to call on, only two had a strong desire to move, six had some desire, and 50 had no desire to move ($\chi^2 = 3.27$, df = 2, p = .194). Finally, it made no difference whether the elderly had a neighbor to call on and whether they liked the people in their neighborhood, the respondent liked the people in their
neighborhood even if they had no neighbor to call on.

Item 2: Do the Respondants Chat with Neighbors?

Of those seven subjects who never chatted with neighbors, three said it was easy to identify a stranger and four said they could not identify a stranger. Of the 63 respondents who chatted with their neighbors a few times a week or a month, 23 could easily identify a stranger but 33 could not.

As expected, five of the seven who never chatted with their neighbors rented. Thirty-six of those who chatted with neighbors a few times a week or month owned, while 27 rented ($\chi^2 = 2.85$, df = 2, p = .239). The longer the subjects lived in their home, the more they chatted with neighbors ($\chi^2 = 21.06$, df = 10, p = .021). Similarly, the longer the subjects lived in New Westminster, the more they chatted with neighbors ($\chi^2 = 24.93$, df = 8, p = .001).

All those who never chatted with neighbors liked what they saw in their neighborhood. Of those who chatted with neighbors a few times a week or month 63 liked what they saw and six did not. Fourteen percent of those who never chatted with neighbors felt their neighborhood had changed for the better, 43% felt it had stayed the same, and 43% felt the neighborhood had changed for the worse. Of those who chatted with their neighbors, 21% felt the neighborhood had changed for the better, 67% felt their
neighborhood had stayed the same, and only 11% felt their neighborhood had gotten worse ($\chi^2 = 8.00, df = 6, p = .237$).

**Item 3: Do the Respondents Find Their Neighborhood Friendly?**

Three of the eight respondents who felt their neighborhood was unfriendly lived in their home for only one to five years, 14 of the 55 subjects who felt their was friendly lived in their home for one to five years. However, as people lived in their homes for longer periods of time, they saw their neighborhood as less friendly ($\chi^2 = 12.08, df = 10, p = .279$).

All eight of those who said their neighborhood was unfriendly liked what they saw when they looked outside. Of those 55 who said their neighborhood was friendly, only five did not like what they saw. Of those who felt their neighborhood was unfriendly, two felt their neighborhood had changed for the worse. Of those 55 who felt their neighborhood was friendly, only two felt their neighborhood had changed for the worse. Of those eight who thought their neighborhood was unfriendly, three had a desire to move and of those who felt their neighborhood was friendly, only seven had some desire to move ($\chi^2 = 5.40, df = 4, p = .248$). When asked what the respondents liked and disliked about their neighborhood, none disliked anything about their neighborhood, regardless of whether or not they felt the neighborhood was friendly or unfriendly ($\chi^2 = 9.13, df = 2, p = .010$).
Neighborhood Satisfaction was measured by only one item.

**Item 1: When the Respondents Look Outside Do They Like What They See?**

Of those 64 respondents who liked what they saw in their neighborhood when they looked outside, 31 found it easy to identify a stranger and 31 found it difficult. However, all six of those who did not like what they saw in their neighborhood found it difficult to identify a stranger ($\chi^2 = 5.85$, df = 2, $p = .053$).

There have been very few studies undertaken to measure integration in the neighborhood among the elderly. However, the results of this survey support the findings of previous studies. The elderly are more likely than anyone else to be long term residents of their neighborhoods, to be homeowners, to have lived in their homes for a long time, to like their neighborhoods and to plan to stay where they were. The elderly also found it difficult to identify a stranger in their neighborhood, a finding substantiated by the literature (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981).
Eldery Victims of Crime

The elderly respondents in this survey were asked if they had been a victim of burglary, robbery, assault, and/or attempted assault within the past year (1983-1984). It was found that of the 70 respondents, 19 reported being the victim of at least one attempted or actual crime. Of these 19 reported incidents, 10 involved burglary, two involved attempted assault, three involved the respondent's car being broken into, two involved vandalism, one involved fraud, and one involved a boat being stolen.

The elderly respondents were asked if they knew of anyone who had been a victim of burglary, robbery, threat of assault and/or actual assault. Of the 70 respondents, 18 knew the victim of a robbery. They were asked if these victims lived in the respondents' neighborhood or elsewhere. Fourteen lived in the respondents' neighborhood while four lived outside their neighborhood. Of the 70 respondents, 32 knew the victim of a burglary. Twenty-nine of these lived in their neighborhood and three lived elsewhere. Of the 70 respondents, three knew of someone who had been assaulted and they were all in the respondents' neighborhood. Finally, of the 70 respondents, three knew someone who had been involved in an attempted assault, two lived in the respondents' neighborhood while one lived elsewhere.
The results indicated that one-quarter of the sample had been the victim of an actual or attempted crime during the last year and 80% of the sample knew someone who was a victim during the last year. This section will discuss in depth the characteristics of elderly persons who had been victimized and, where applicable, those who knew people who had been victims, to determine if any particular patterns of criminal victimization were apparent. Were the victims younger or older than nonvictims? Were they mostly women? Did they have different levels of income? What happened to the victims? Were they more fearful? Did they stay in more? Had they changed their activities? These and other questions, if possible, will be answered in the sections that follow.

Characteristics of Elderly Victims and Non-Victims

Age
No clear cut, statistically significant, pattern of results appears from the analysis of age versus victimization. Victims were more likely to be in the 60-64 age group than any other. Fifty percent of those in that group had been victims. The next age groups the most likely to be victimized were those between 65-69 (21%) and those between 70-74 (21%). Persons over the age of 80 were the least likely to be victimized - none of them had been victims. Twenty-seven percent of all elderly interviewed had been victimized.
Income
Once again, no statistically significant pattern of victimization was discernable. The modal personal income of those interviewed was $5,000-$5,999 and it was this group that had the highest victimization rates. However, 43% of the sample refused to reveal their income. Due to this factor it was felt no conclusions could be drawn.

Gender
The findings show that whether the elderly in New Westminster male or female makes little difference in their propensity to be a victim of crime, nor do the types of crimes vary with gender.

Living Arrangements (Own/Rent)
Those who owned were more likely to have been victims of crimes than those who rented their homes, but the difference was very slight, and not statistically significant. Twenty-nine percent of those who owned their home had been victimized, 25% of those who rented had been victimized. However, those who rented had been the victim of a burglary (19%) more than those who owned their residence (10%).

Living Arrangements (Living with People)
Contrary to popular belief, this survey shows that more of the respondents who lived with someone had been a victim (30%) than those respondents who lived alone (24%). The difference was not, however, significant.
Years in the Home

This study shows that the length of time the respondents had lived in their homes makes no difference in their propensity to become victims.

The Effect of Victimization

Being the victim of a crime can be a potentially traumatic experience. Besides direct economic losses and physical or mental pain, being a victim can have a profound effect on attitudes and actions. For example, victims may be more afraid of crime than others, and this could influence their actions when or if they leave their home.

Attachment and Satisfaction of Neighborhood

Despite first hand experience as victims of crime, those who had been victims were not more likely than those who had not been victimized, to feel less attached or satisfied with their neighborhood as a place to live. Also, those who knew victims in their neighborhood were not more likely than those who did not know victims in their neighborhood to feel less attached or satisfied with their neighborhood as a place to live. No significant variation in respondents' rating of their neighborhood can be attributed to victimization, either direct or indirect. Instead of feeling a part of the neighborhood, twenty-six percent of the victims felt their neighborhood was just a place to live, 26% felt that their neighborhood had changed for the worse and 26% had some desire to move. Only 18%
of those who knew a victim felt that their neighborhood had changed for the worse, and 29% had some desire to move.

Generally, it appears that both victims and non-victims felt attached and satisfied with their neighborhood as a place to live.

**Safety of Respondents' Neighborhood**

Whether or not the subject had been the victim of a crime apparently did not influence their perception of the safety of their neighborhood, all of those who had been victims felt that their neighborhood was safe, and only three% of those who knew of victims in their neighborhood felt unsafe. A more detailed description of concern for personal safety and victimization can be found in a further section of this chapter.

**Limitation of Activities Due to Victimization (Direct and Indirect)**

Respondents were asked if they had to limit their activities. Fifty-three percent of those who had been a victim and five% who knew a victim, indicated that they limited their activities. It is difficult to indicate if this is due to their victimization. However, when asked specifically why they limited certain activities, 10% stated they did so because of fear of victimization. This will be discussed in more detail in the section labeled 'Social Activity'.

The elderly who had been victimized generally did not limit their activities more than non-victims. In fact, the difference
between victims and non-victims was so small that it was not statistically significant.

Social Support

This section of the chapter looks at the social support networks of the elderly subjects. Respondents were asked if they had a close friend in whom they could confide. Eighty-six percent stated that they did, 14% said that they did not. The respondents were asked if they had someone to take care of them if they became ill. Eighty-nine percent said they did and 11% said they did not. The respondents were also asked how many people they lived with (See Table III for results). It is apparent that almost half of the elderly do live alone. Finally, as an indicator of support, the respondents were asked if they did not live alone, what relationship the people they lived with were to them (See Table IV for results).
Table III
The Number of People With Whom Respondent Lived

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of People Lived with</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV
Status of Person With Whom Respondent Lived

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whom Respondent Lived With</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No One</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband &amp; Children</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife &amp; Children</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife &amp; Relative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Relative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency of Social Activity

This section looks at the day to day activities of the elderly in terms of whether they went out or not. The
respondents were asked how often they engaged in certain activities, and if they had to limit their activities, what were the major reasons. The responses of the elderly when asked how often they undertook certain activities are shown in Table V. It would appear that the most common activities were walking, shopping and visiting with friends and neighbors.

If the respondents limited their activities, they were asked to indicate why from a number of choices. It was found that:  
- 37% of the elderly respondents said they had to limit their activities due to health,
- 17% said they had to limit their activities due to unavailability of transportation,
- 9% stated problems with teenagers caused them to limit their activity,
- 11% said they limited their activity due to poor weather,
- 10% said they limited their activities due to the distance of activities,
- 69% said that they limited their activities due to lack of money,
- 10% said that they limited their activities due to fear of victimization, and
- 32% said they limited their activities due to lack of time.

Finally, respondents were asked if they had transportation. Twenty-four percent said that they did not while 76% said that

2 The following categories of activities are not mutually exclusive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Yearly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movies</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Event</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk 6 Blks Around Home</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited with Friends &amp; Neighbors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church or Synag.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sport</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Sport</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Meeting</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ Class</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 6 Blks from home</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop out of New West</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Citizens Center</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they did. Most of the respondents seem to have access to a car or some form of transportation.

Interaction Between Demographic Variables, Victimization and Limitation of Activity

Twenty-four of the 36 'old-old' (70 and above) felt they had to limit their activity compared to 11 of the 34 'young-old' (55-69) ($\chi^2 = 6.91$, df = 1, $p = .008$). Twenty-six of the 46 female respondents felt they had to limit their activity in comparison to nine of the 24 male respondents ($\chi^2 = 1.58$, df = 1, $p = .208$). Fourteen of the 33 married subjects limited their activity; four of the eight who were single limited their activity, and 15 of the 24 who were widowed limited their activity. Fifty-one percent of those who were retired said they limited their activity in comparison to 33% of the working respondents ($\chi^2 = 5.23$, df = 4, $p = .263$).

As incomes increased, limitation of activity decreased. For example: 16 of the 27 respondents between $5,000-\$14,999$ limited activity, four of the six between $15,000-\$24,999$ limited activity and only one of the three respondents above $25,000 felt they had to limit their activity.

Both the health of the subject and fear of victimization had an effect on the activity of the subject. Of those who did limit participation, 92% did so because of health ($\chi^2 = 12.35$, df = 1, $p = .0004$). Seventy-one percent of those who limited their activity did so because of fear of victimization ($\chi^2 = 24.57$, df =
Fifty percent of the elderly who limited participation had been the victim of a burglary. Of those who knew the victim of a burglary, 73% limited activity ($x^2 = 4.98$, $df = 3$, $p = .173$).
## APPENDIX C

### Concern For Personal Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Item</th>
<th>Very Safe</th>
<th>Reas Safe</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Some unsafe</th>
<th>Very Unsafe</th>
<th>Tot %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Your House During the Day When: Alone</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Someone</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Your House During the Night When: Alone</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Someone</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Laundry Rooms, Etc. During Night When: Alone</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Someone</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Laundry Rooms, Etc. During Day When: Alone</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Someone</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Your Neighborhood During Day When: Alone</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Someone</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Your Neighborhood During Night When: Alone</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Someone</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking from Transport to Dwelling During Day When: Alone</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Someone</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking from Transport to Dwelling During Night When: Alone</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Someone</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents Name:
Address:
Phone Number:
Date of Interview:

First I would like a little background information about you.

(001) How many years have you lived in your present home? _____ years

(002) How many years have you lived in New Westminster? _____ years.

(003) Other than yourself, how many people live with you in your home? _____

(004) If you do not live alone, what relationship are these other people to you? Please tell me about all of them:

(0) N.A._____
(1) Husband_____
(2) Wife_____
(3) Children_____
(4) Other Relative (brother or sister for example)_____
(5) Non relative_____
Now I'm going to read you a list of activities in which people sometimes engage. For each activity I mention can you tell me if in the past year, that is from January 1983 to January 1984, you did it:

(1) Never did it
(2) A few times a year
(3) A few times a month
(4) A few times a week
(5) Did it nearly every day?

(005) _____ gone to the movies
(006) _____ gone to a restaurant
(007) _____ gone to a museum
(008) _____ gone to a library
(009) _____ gone to a sporting event
(010) _____ taken a walk 6 block around your home
(011) _____ Visited with friends or neighbors in their homes
(012) _____ attended a church or synagogue activity
(013) _____ participated in an indoor sport (can include bridge, chess, etc.)

(014) _____ participated in an outdoor sport
(015) _____ attended a club meeting
(016) _____ attended an educational class
(017) _____ gone shopping further than 6 blocks from your home, but still in New Westminster.

(018) _____ gone shopping outside New Westminster
(019) _____ gone to a senior citizen's center

(020) Do you feel you have to limit your participation in the above activities?

(1) No_____ (2) Yes_____
(IF YES) I will read the list again and you can tell me in which of the above activities you feel you have to limit your participation. (CHECK THOSE IN WHICH THEY FEEL THEY HAVE TROUBLE PARTICIPATING)

(021) _____ gone to the movies
(022) _____ gone to a restaurant
(023) _____ gone to a museum
(024) _____ gone to a library
(025) _____ gone to a sporting event
(026) _____ taken a walk 6 block around your home
(027) _____ Visited with friends or neighbors in their homes
(028) _____ attended a church or synagogue activity
(029) _____ participated in an indoor sport (can include bridge, chess, etc.)

(030) _____ participated in an outdoor sport
(031) _____ attended a club meeting
(032) _____ attended an educational class
(033) _____ gone shopping further than 6 blocks from your home, but still in New Westminster.

(034) _____ gone shopping outside New Westminster
(035) _____ gone to a senior citizen's center

(FOR EACH ONE IN WHICH THEY DID NOT PARTICIPATE ASK) Did the reason you felt you had to limit you participation in _____ have anything to do with. . . (CHECK APPROPRIATE RESPONSE)

(0) N.A. (1) NO (2) YES

(036) _____ health
(037) _____ transportation
(038) _____ problem with teenagers
(039) _____ the weather
(040) _____ the distance from home
(041) _____ lack of money
(042) _____ fear of victimization
(043) _____ lack of time
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Now, I want to ask you some questions which will help us to see how you feel about life in this community and about your ideas in general. The way I ask these questions is to read you some sentences. After each sentence please tell me whether you agree or disagree with it and how much. The five kinds of answers you might give are:

(1) Agree strongly
(2) Agree somewhat
(3) Neutral
(4) Disagree somewhat
(5) Disagree strongly

(AFTER EACH SENTENCE ASK RESPONDANT: DO YOU AGREE STRONGLY, AGREE SOMEWHAT, DISAGREE SOMEWHAT OR DISAGREE STRONGLY)

(044) When I go outside and look around me at the street and the neighbors' homes, I like what I see.
(1) ___ (2) ___ (3) ___ (4) ___ (5) ___

(045) As a rule you can tell quite a bit about a person by the way he dresses.
(1) ___ (2) ___ (3) ___ (4) ___ (5) ___

(046) It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.
(1) ___ (2) ___ (3) ___ (4) ___ (5) ___

(047) It is worth considerable effort to assure one's self of a good name with important people.
(1) ___ (2) ___ (3) ___ (4) ___ (5) ___

(048) The raising of one's social position is one of the most important goals in life.
(1) ___ (2) ___ (3) ___ (4) ___ (5) ___

(049) These days a person doesn't really know whom he can count on.
(1) ___ (2) ___ (3) ___ (4) ___ (5) ___

(050) There's little use in writing to public officials because often they aren't interested in the problems of the average person.
(1) ___ (2) ___ (3) ___ (4) ___ (5) ___
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Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.  
(1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   

In Spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse, not better.  
(1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU A FEW MORE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS.  

Do you have a close friend in whom you can confide?  
(1) No   (2) Yes   

Do you have a neighbor you can call on in case of a problem?  
(1) No   (2) Yes   

Do you have someone to care for you in case you are ill?  
(1) No   (2) Yes   

Would your neighbors call the police if they thought they saw someone in the neighborhood being victimized or if they thought they saw someone breaking into a neighbor's house or apartment?  
(1) No   (2) Yes   (3) Don't know   

How often do you get together with your neighbors for a chat? Do you get together. . .  
(1) Never   
(2) A few times a year   
(3) A few times a month   
(4) A few times a week   
(5) Nearly every day   

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?  
(1) Easy to identify a stranger   
(2) Difficult to identify stranger   
(3) Don't know   
Has your neighborhood (i.e., the one or two blocks around your home) recently...
(1) Changed for the better
(2) Stayed the same
(3) Changed for the worse
(4) Don't know

Would you say you really feel a part of the neighborhood here (i.e., one or two blocks around your home) or do you think of it more as just a place to live?
(1) Really feel a part of the neighborhood
(2) It's just a place to live
(3) Don't know

If money were no object, how much do you wish to move from your neighborhood? Would you say that you have
(1) A very strong desire to move
(2) Some desire to move
(3) No desire to move
(4) Don't know

Why do you feel that way about the neighborhood around here? (PROBE)
Can you tell me what you like best and like least about this neighborhood? (PROBE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Like</th>
<th>Dislike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now I'm going to read you some problems that exist in some parts of the city. I'd like you to tell me whether some of the things I mention are a big problem in your neighborhood, some problem or no problem.

(069) Groups of teenagers hanging out on the streets.

(1) No problem
(2) Some problem
(3) Big problem
(4) Don't know

(070) People using illegal drugs in the neighborhood.

(1) No problem
(2) Some problem
(3) Big problem
(4) Don't know

(071) A lot of people using alcohol in the neighborhood.

(1) No problem
(2) Some problem
(3) Big problem
(4) Don't know

(072) Vandalism, like kids breaking windows or writing on walls or things like that.

(1) No problem
(2) Some problem
(3) Big problem
(4) Don't know
Here are some words or phrases which we would like you to use to describe this neighborhood as it seems to you. In this case, we mean around your home (1 or 2 blocks). Please check which you think applies by the letter. For example, take the first one, "noisy-quiet", if you feel it is very noisy around here, 1 would be your answer; somewhat noisy, 2 would be your answer; if it is average, 3 would be your answer; if it is rather quiet, 4 would be your answer, and if it is very quiet, then 5 would be your answer.

YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD

(073) Noisy
      (1)____ (2)____ (3)____ (4)____ (5)____

(074) Attractive
      (1)____ (2)____ (3)____ (4)____ (5)____

(075) Unfriendly people
      (1)____ (2)____ (3)____ (4)____ (5)____

(076) Privacy:
      Enough (1)____ (2)____ (3)____ (4)____ (5)____

(077) Buildings:
      Poorly kept (1)____ (2)____ (3)____ (4)____ (5)____

(078) People who are:
      Like me (1)____ (2)____ (3)____ (4)____ (5)____

(079) Pleasant
      (1)____ (2)____ (3)____ (4)____ (5)____

(080) Convenient
      (1)____ (2)____ (3)____ (4)____ (5)____

(081) As a place to live:
      Very poor (1)____ (2)____ (3)____ (4)____ (5)____

(082) Safe
      (1)____ (2)____ (3)____ (4)____ (5)____

(083) Lawns and Yards:
      Well kept (1)____ (2)____ (3)____ (4)____ (5)____

(084) Bad reputation
      (1)____ (2)____ (3)____ (4)____ (5)____
Now I would like to ask you a few questions about some things that may have happened to you last year, that is, from January 1983 to January 1984.

(085) During this time did anyone try to take something from you by using force or threat of force, such as in a holdup or mugging?
   (1) No____    (2) Yes____

(086) If yes, how many times?____

(087) Do you know of anyone who had this happen to them?
   (1) No____    (2) Yes____
   (3) If yes, do they live in this neighborhood ____ or elsewhere____?

(088) Did anyone break into or illegally enter your home/apartment, garage or any other building on this property?
   (1) No____    (2) Yes____

(089) If yes, how many times?____

(090) Do you know of anyone who had this happen to them?
   (1) No____    (2) Yes____
   (3) If yes, do they live in this neighborhood ____ or elsewhere____?

(091) Did anyone hit or kick you, or throw something at you such as a rock or bottle?
   (1) No____    (2) Yes____

(092) If yes, how many times?____

(093) Do you know of anyone who had this happen to them?
   (1) No____    (2) Yes____
   (3) If yes, do they live in this neighborhood ____ or elsewhere____?

(094) Did anyone threaten to hit you, or beat you up or threaten you with a weapon?
   (1) No____    (2) Yes____

(095) If yes, how many times?____
(096) Do you know of anyone who had this happen to them?
   (1) No____   (2) Yes____
   (3) If yes, do they live in this neighborhood ____ or elsewhere____?

(097) Has any other criminal vicimization happened to you in the last year?
   (1) No____   (2) Yes____

(098) If yes, what were they?_________ _________
Now I would like to know how you feel in certain circumstances.

(099) How safe do you feel in your house during the day when you are alone? Do you feel... 

(1) Very safe  
(2) Reasonably safe  
(3) Don't know  
(4) Somewhat unsafe  
(5) Very unsafe  

(If unsafe or very unsafe) Why do you feel unsafe here? (PROBE)

(100) How safe do you feel in your house during the day when you are with someone? Do you feel...  

(1) Very safe  
(2) Reasonably safe  
(3) Don't know  
(4) Somewhat unsafe  
(5) Very unsafe  

(If unsafe or very unsafe) Why do you feel unsafe here? (PROBE)
How safe do you feel in your house during the night when you are alone? Do you feel...

(1) Very safe
(2) Reasonably safe
(3) Don't know
(4) Somewhat unsafe
(5) Very unsafe

(If unsafe or very unsafe) Why do you feel unsafe here? (PROBE)

How safe do you feel in your house during the night when you are with someone? Do you feel...

(1) Very safe
(2) Reasonably safe
(3) Don't know
(4) Somewhat unsafe
(5) Very unsafe

(If unsafe or very unsafe) Why do you feel unsafe here? (PROBE)
103. How safe do you feel in building areas, such as laundry rooms, elevators etc. in your apartment during the night when you are alone? Do you feel

(0) Not applicable
(1) Very safe
(2) Reasonably safe
(3) Don't know
(4) Somewhat unsafe
(5) Very unsafe

(If unsafe or very unsafe) Why do you feel unsafe here? (PROBE)

104. How safe do you feel in building areas, such as laundry rooms, elevators, etc. in your apartment during the night when you are with someone. Do you feel

(0) Not applicable
(1) Very safe
(2) Reasonably safe
(3) Don't know
(4) Somewhat unsafe
(5) Very unsafe

(If unsafe or very unsafe) Why do you feel unsafe here? (PROBE)
How safe do you feel in building areas such as laundry rooms, elevators, etc., in your apartment during the day when you are alone? Do you feel

(0) Not applicable
(1) Very safe
(2) Reasonably safe
(3) Don't know
(4) Somewhat unsafe
(5) Very unsafe

(If unsafe or very unsafe) Why do you feel unsafe here? (PROBE)

How safe do you feel in building areas, such as laundry rooms, elevators, etc., in your apartment during the day when you are with someone? Do you feel

(0) Not applicable
(1) Very safe
(2) Reasonably safe
(3) Don't know
(4) Somewhat unsafe
(5) Very unsafe

(If unsafe or very unsafe) Why do you feel unsafe here? (PROBE)
How safe do you feel being out in your neighborhood (i.e., 1 or 2 blocks around your home) during the day when you are alone? Do you or would you feel

(1) Very safe
(2) Reasonably safe
(3) Don't know
(4) Somewhat unsafe
(5) Very unsafe

(If unsafe or very unsafe) Why do you feel unsafe here? (PROBE)

How safe do you feel being out in your neighborhood (i.e., 1 or 2 blocks around your home) during the day when you are with someone? Do you feel

(1) Very safe
(2) Reasonably safe
(3) Don't know
(4) Somewhat unsafe
(5) Very unsafe

(If unsafe or very unsafe) Why do you feel unsafe here? (PROBE)
How safe do you feel being out in your neighborhood (i.e., 1 or 2 blocks around your home) at night when you are alone? Do you or would you feel

(1) Very safe
(2) Reasonably safe
(3) Don't know
(4) Somewhat unsafe
(5) Very unsafe

(If unsafe or very unsafe) Why do you feel unsafe here? (PROBE)

How safe do you feel being out in your neighborhood (i.e., 1 or 2 blocks around your home) at night when you are with someone? Do you or would you feel

(1) Very safe
(2) Reasonably safe
(3) Don't know
(4) Somewhat unsafe
(5) Very unsafe

(If unsafe or very unsafe) Why do you feel unsafe here? (PROBE)
How safe do you feel walking from your car or other mode of transportation to your dwelling during the day when you are alone? Do you feel

(1) Very safe
(2) Reasonably safe
(3) Don't know
(4) Somewhat unsafe
(5) Very unsafe

(If unsafe or very unsafe) Why do you feel unsafe here? (PROBE)

How safe do you feel walking from your car or other mode of transportation to your dwelling during the day when you are with someone? Do you feel

(1) Very safe
(2) Reasonably safe
(3) Don't know
(4) Somewhat unsafe
(5) Very unsafe

(If unsafe or very unsafe) Why do you feel unsafe here? (PROBE)
How safe do you feel walking from your car or other mode of transportation to your dwelling during the evening when you are alone? Do you feel

(1) Very safe
(2) Reasonably safe
(3) Don't know
(4) Somewhat unsafe
(5) Very unsafe

(If unsafe or very unsafe) Why do you feel unsafe here? (PROBE)

How safe do you feel walking from your car or other mode of transportation to your dwelling during the evening when you are with someone? Do you feel

(1) Very safe
(2) Reasonably safe
(3) Don't know
(4) Somewhat unsafe
(5) Very unsafe

(If unsafe or very unsafe) Why do you feel unsafe here? (PROBE)
Now I would like to ask you a few questions about your health.

(115) Would you say that you are:

(1) Very healthy
(2) Somewhat healthy
(3) Neutral
(4) Somewhat unhealthy
(5) Very unhealthy

(116) Is there any physical condition, illness or health problem that bothers you now? (PROBE)

Which of these things can you do without help?

(117) Go to a movie, church or visit friends.
(1) No_____ (2) Yes_____

(118) Walk up and down stairs to the second floor.
(1) No_____ (2) Yes_____

(119) Walk half a mile (about eight ordinary blocks.)
(1) No_____ (2) Yes_____

(120) Work at a full-time job and/or do ordinary work around the house.
(1) No_____ (2) Yes_____

(121) Heavy work around the house, like washing walls.
(1) No_____ (2) Yes_____

(122) Which of these statements fits you best? (READ RESPONDENT STATEMENTS AND CHECK APPROPRIATE ONE)

(1) I cannot work or keep house because of my health

(2) I have to limit some of the work or other things that I do

(3) I am not limited in any of my activities
Now I'd like a little more background information about you. These questions are needed for statistical purposes.

(123) I'd like to ask you a few questions about your work experience. Have you ever worked on a full-time job (35 hours or more per week) or a part-time job?

(1) Ever worked____  (2) Never worked____

(124) Are you now working full-time, working part-time, or are you retired, not employed, or in school?

(1) Working full-time____
(2) Working part-time____
(3) Retired____
(4) Not employed____
(5) In school____

(125) How many years of school have you completed?

____

(126) Would you please tell me your age, are you...

(1) 55-59____
(2) 60-64____
(3) 65-69____
(4) 70-74____
(5) 75-79____
(6) over 80____
(7) No answer____

(127) Would you please tell me your marital status?

(1) Single____
(2) Married____
(3) Widowed____
(4) Separated/divorced____

(128) Do you own a car or do you have someone who can drive you places?

(1) No____  (2) Yes____
(129) What type of dwelling do you live in? (check appropriate space)
(1) Single family, detached house
(2) Apartment building
(3) Other (SPECIFY)

(130) At the above dwelling do you...
(1) Own
(2) Rent
(3) Live with someone, other than your husband/wife, who owns or rents the dwelling?

(131) Just for statistical purposes, would you mind telling me about how much money you and your family received last year from all sources, before taxes were deducted? (GIVE RESPONDENT QUESTIONNAIRE TO ALLOW HIM/HER TO CIRCLE APPROPRIATE INCOME)
(1) 5000-9,999
(2) 10,000-14,999
(3) 15,000-19,999
(4) 20,000-24,999
(5) 25,000-29,999
(6) 30,000 and above
(7) Refused
POST INTERVIEW ITEMS TO BE FILLED IN AFTER LEAVING HOUSEHOLD

(132) Record Race - Ethnic Characteristics of Respondent:

(1) Caucasian
(2) Oriental
(3) Native Indian
(4) East Indian
(5) Black
(6) Other

(133) Record sex of respondent:

(1) Male
(2) Female
APPENDIX E

ELDERLY FEAR LEVEL SURVEY

Telephone Screening Instrument (1)

Hello, may I speak to___________ (Respondents name)

IF YES. ..(Go to Telephone Screening Instrument (2))

IF NO. ..(Continue)

My name is Beth de Beer. I am calling from the department of criminology at Simon Fraser University. We are conducting a confidential study concerning criminal victimization of the elderly. This study is being done with the knowledge of the New Westminster Police Department (Mike Kelly) and under the supervision of Dr. Pat Brantingham (Criminology Department, Simon Fraser University). Is___________ 55 years of age or older?

IF NOT 55 OR OLDER:

Their participation is not required then. Thank you very much for your cooperation in answering my question. Goodbye.

IF YES; 55 OR OLDER:

Can you please tell me what a convenient time to call back? His/her participation in the study would be enormously helpful.

Call Back Arrangements

Respondant:

Date:

Time:

Phone Number:

Thank you very much, I will call back then.
Hi, my name is Beth deBeer. I am calling from the department of criminology at Simon Fraser University. We are conducting a confidential study concerning criminal victimization of the elderly. This study is being done with the knowledge and approval of the New Westminster Police Force (Mike Kelly) and under the supervision of Dr. Pat Brantingham (Criminology Department, Simon Fraser University). Can you tell me, are you 55 years old or older?

IF NOT 55 YEARS OR OLDER:
Your participation is not required then. Thank you.

IF YES; 55 YEARS OR OLDER:
Would you be willing to be interviewed in depth, either at your home or at a place of your choice? Your participation in this study would be enormously helpful. If you are concerned about the authenticity of the study, please feel free to call Dr. Pat Brantingham at 291-3213 or Mr Mike Kelly at 525-5411. In addition, if you do agree to participate we will send you letters from Simon Fraser University and the New Westminster Police Force.

IF WILLING TO PARTICIPATE:
Great, can you tell me what would be a convenient time and place for you?

Respondants Name:
Address:
Phone Number:
Convenient Interview Date:
Convenient Interview Time:

Thank you very much. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.
June 13, 1983

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

I am pleased to introduce Miss Beth deBeer who is a graduate student in Criminology at Simon Fraser University. Miss deBeer is presently doing research for her Master's thesis, the topic being: Victimization of the Elderly. In order to conduct this research Miss deBeer has employed several students from the undergraduate program in Criminology to conduct personal interviews within New Westminster.

As Miss deBeer's Senior Supervisor I have discussed the research with her and the project meets with my full approval.

The purpose of this letter is to confirm that Miss deBeer's proposal has met with my approval and it is hoped that it will meet with your full approval and support.

Yours sincerely,

Patricia L. Brantingham, Ph.D.
Associate Professor.
Letter Introducing Interviewer

September 10, 1983

To Whom it May Concern:

This letter is to introduce Beth deBeer, a graduate student in Criminology from Simon Fraser University. The purpose of the study is to determine victimization and fear of crime in persons over 55. It may have implications in terms of policies programs set up by the police and the government. This study meets with the approval of the New Westminster Police Department and the Department of Criminology, Simon Fraser University.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated. Feel free, however, to refuse to answer any question on the questionnaire. What I put down will be added in with replies from others and therefore the answers won't be identified with names of people in any way. All the answers you give will be strictly confidential.

Your cooperation in this interview is greatly appreciated. If you should have any further questions, please feel free to contact Dr. Pat Brantingham, Simon Fraser University, 291-3213 or Mike Kelly, New Westminster Police Department, 525-5411.

Sincerely,

(Signed) Beth deBeer

Graduate Student
Department of Criminology
Simon Fraser University
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