Approval

Name: Magdalena Marczak
Degree: Master of Arts
Title of Thesis: Victimization and the Fear of Crime in Vancouver

Examining Committee:
Chair: Neil Madu
Professor
School of Criminology
Simon Fraser University

Dr. Robert Gordon
Senior Supervisor
Professor School of Criminology
Simon Fraser University

Dr. Brian Burtch
Committee Member
Professor School of Criminology
Simon Fraser University

Chief Constable Kash Heed
External Examiner
West Vancouver Police Department,
West Vancouver, B.C.

Date Defended/Approved: June 19, 2008
Declaration of
Partial Copyright Licence

The author, whose copyright is declared on the title page of this work, has granted to Simon Fraser University the right to lend this thesis, project or extended essay to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users.

The author has further granted permission to Simon Fraser University to keep or make a digital copy for use in its circulating collection (currently available to the public at the "Institutional Repository" link of the SFU Library website <www.lib.sfu.ca> at <http://ir.lib.sfu.ca/handle/1892/112>) and, without changing the content, to translate the thesis/project or extended essays, if technically possible, to any medium or format for the purpose of preservation of the digital work.

The author has further agreed that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by either the author or the Dean of Graduate Studies.

It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without the author’s written permission.

Permission for public performance, or limited permission for private scholarly use, of any multimedia materials forming part of this work, may have been granted by the author. This information may be found on the separately catalogued multimedia material and in the signed Partial Copyright Licence.

While licensing SFU to permit the above uses, the author retains copyright in the thesis, project or extended essays, including the right to change the work for subsequent purposes, including editing and publishing the work in whole or in part, and licensing other parties, as the author may desire.

The original Partial Copyright Licence attesting to these terms, and signed by this author, may be found in the original bound copy of this work, retained in the Simon Fraser University Archive.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, BC, Canada

Revised: Fall 2007
STATEMENT OF ETHICS APPROVAL

The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

(a) Human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics,

or

(b) Advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University;

or has conducted the research

(c) as a co-investigator, in a research project approved in advance,

or

(d) as a member of a course approved in advance for minimal risk human research, by the Office of Research Ethics.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed at the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Bennett Library
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, BC, Canada
Abstract

This thesis explores whether past victimization, age, gender, community attachment and media exposure influence a person's fear of crime. A fear of crime survey was administered to 118 respondents in Vancouver. The sample was divided into two groups: victims of violent offences, and the victims of property offences. The findings suggest that past victimization significantly influences a person's fear of crime. Fear of crime is also significantly related to gender and age: females, the elderly, and the youngest respondents in the sample are the groups exhibiting the highest level of fear. Lastly, the findings of this study indicate that community attachment and media exposure had a negligible impact on the respondents' fear of crime. A gap between the police and the community could be the underlying cause of heightened levels of fear of crime. This is a policy issue that should be addressed by the Vancouver Police.
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CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

Almost all people experience a fear of crime at some point in their lives, whether this fear is constant, or fleeting. A fear of crime may severely limit a person’s life as they may spend too much time worrying about crime and may be too frightened to carry out normal activities (McCrea, Shyy, Western & Stimson, 2005:8). Additionally, for some, a fear of crime may come from frustration with respect to crime in general.

Fear of crime has been a popular research area (Ferraro, 1995; Schafer, Huebner & Bynum, 2006; Scott, 2003); some of the most researched variables with regards to fear of crime are age, gender, and past victimization, while other well-researched variables include community attachment and exposure to images of violence portrayed by the media.

Scholars have completed numerous comprehensive studies regarding fear of crime and found that respondents across all age groups, regardless of sex, view youth as a particular source of threat in public places. For example, the elderly often feel unsafe in public places where young adults congregate, as they associate youth with crime (Loader, Girling, & Sparks, 1998; Pain, 2001). In the report Fear of Crime in Canada: Taking the Pulse of a Nation, (1995), prepared by The Church Council on Justice and Corrections for the Department of Justice Canada, Doob observes that “fear of crime is a polite, neutral, depoliticized term masking Canadians' real fears of very particular types of criminals” (Doob, 1995:3). Doob argues that people do not fear crime per se, but rather they fear the criminals themselves, especially young offenders and sex offenders.

Gender plays a role as it influences the types of crimes that are differentially
feared by males and females. Researchers have determined that young women fear sexual assaults, while young men view themselves as potential targets for property victimization as a result of robbery (Fisher and Sloan, 2003; Scott, 2003; Stanko, 1990). Schafer, Huebner and Bynum (2006) argue that women's fear of crime is overshadowed by a fear of sexual assault, while men are more concerned about property victimization.

Age is also an important indicator of perceived risk and anxiety about crime. Middle-aged respondents perceive themselves to be at the greatest risk of property crime, while young people see themselves at greater risk of becoming victims of violent crimes (e.g., assault, robbery), and thus have a higher level of concern about this kind of crime.

Persons over the age of 65 tend to feel more vulnerable, even though they are the least likely to be victimized since they do not tend to place themselves in risky situations. Research conducted by Statistics Canada in 2006 also indicates that crime against the elderly is generally committed by family members (Turcotte & Schellenberg, 2007). Common assaults are the most frequently reported crimes against the elderly and male adult children along with their spouses are most often responsible for “family-related violence of seniors” (Turcotte & Schellenberg, 2007:72). The research results are ironic as the elderly are victimized by their children yet are afraid of strangers, particularly teenagers who congregate in public places (Pain, 2001).

It has been established that gender and age are strong predictors of a fear of crime; however, Theodori and Luloff (2000) also suggest that people who feel detached from their communities are more likely to fear crime, as they are less likely to see social control in their neighborhoods. As a result, people tend to feel unsafe in their own area which leads some researchers to believe that neighborhoods are no longer places of
refuge, but rather places of fear (Theodori & Luloff, 2000). For example, Schafer and his colleagues found that respondents who felt that their neighborhood was "good" felt safe overall (Schafer, Huebner & Bynum, 2006). Additionally, Schafer and his colleagues (2006) discovered that respondents who perceived high levels of disorder in their neighborhood were more likely to fear personal victimization. Strong community ties suggest that people feel safer as they are more likely to interact with neighbours and participate in community events which enable them to be aware of both their immediate surroundings and other residents (Schafer et al., 2006).

Community attachment along with the other variables plays an important role in a person's fear of crime; however, research also suggests that past victimization influences a person's levels of fear (Keane, 1995). In fact, Keane (1995) argues that females report higher levels of fear of victimization even though males experience higher rates of victimization. Further, Macmillan, Nierobisz and Welsh (2000) indicate that those who have been victimized through harassment by strangers are more likely to experience higher levels of fear. Determining whether a correlation exists between past victimization and a fear of crime will be examined in this exploratory study.

Finally, the media have taken an enormous step forward in reporting daily events. News is swiftly disseminated worldwide via satellites, Internet, television, and radio. Information-sharing plays a vital role in contemporary society; however, it may be potentially harmful to the recipients, especially when reports of crime are presented by the media. Although research findings are inconclusive as to whether the media directly influences a fear of crime among the populace (Chadee & Ditton, 2003; Rice & Anderson, 1990), researchers such as Roberts and Doob (1986) indicate that public
knowledge about crime comes directly from the media. Interestingly, Koomen, Visser and Stapel (2000) found that the more credible a newspaper’s source, the more likely it is that people are going to fear crime in general. Lastly, Callanan (2005) argues that “heavy consumers” of “crime-related media” are more fearful of crime. According to Callanan (2005), these heavy consumers believe that crime is increasing and are more likely to support the “three strikes 1” sentencing policy in the United States. Given the ongoing debate among researchers, it is imperative to examine the media’s influence on people’s fear of crime to determine the extent to which the media is an influential factor.

This thesis examines the following questions about a fear of crime: are women truly more fearful of crime than men; and are the elderly more fearful than the young? In addition, the study will analyze whether both past victimization of violent and property crime and community attachment have a bearing on an individual’s fear of crime, as well as the way in which the media influences people’s perceptions of crime. To the author’s knowledge, this research is the first study to explore all these variables simultaneously.

This research is unique as the study sample was obtained with the assistance of the Vancouver Police Department (VPD) and participants were all victims of crime. In the past, research regarding a fear of crime has been conducted by consultants hired by the VPD using a different methodology (NRG Research Group, 2006). For instance, the sampling frame for a previous survey conducted by the NRG Research Group was generated using a list of all households with a residential telephone service within the VPD patrol district boundaries. Next, random digit dialing (RDD) was used to ensure

---
1 The “three strikes” sentencing policy was the first mandatory sentencing policy which was first adopted in California in 1994. The sentencing policy gained widespread publicity and was subsequently adopted in most of the United States jurisdictions. This policy mandates life imprisonment for a third criminal conviction (Callanan, 2005).
coverage of unlisted telephone numbers. Finally, to ensure a random selection of adults 18 years of age or older within households, the NRG Research Group (2006) utilized the “next birthday randomizer” method. By way of contrast, the present study focuses on victims of crime who have filed a report with the VPD.

The outline of these chapters is as follows. In Chapter One an overview of the study is provided and some of the most important research variables with regards to fear of crime are discussed. These variables include: age, gender, past victimization, community attachment, and exposure to images of violence portrayed by the media. Additionally, this chapter identifies the objectives of this study.

In Chapter Two, the available literature on the relationship between age, gender, past victimization, community attachment and media exposure and a fear of crime is examined. The discussion includes a review of obstacles that researchers have encountered when trying to produce a definition of a fear of crime. The literature also shows that while there are multiple variables that affect a person’s fear of crime, age and gender are the strongest predictors of increased levels of fear. Other variables discussed in the literature review include past victimization, community attachment, and media exposure. The literature also demonstrates how a fear of crime can be measured using multiple techniques.

In Chapter Three, research methods used to interview the victims of crime are described and the data collection instrument is reviewed. Detailed research findings are presented in Chapter Four. The combined results from both the victims of violent offences and the victims of property offences are set out and discussed. The respondents’ quantitative and qualitative responses are also examined and discussed.
In Chapter Five, a comparative analysis of the views of the victims of violent offences and the views of victims of property offences is presented. The analysis of the data reveals various statistically significant relationships between variables such as age, gender, past victimization, community attachment, and media exposure. This chapter discusses whether or not females are more fearful than men, and whether past victimization is an influencing variable when studying a fear of crime.

In Chapter Six, the findings of the study are discussed. Recommendations are provided which suggest that more resources are needed for victims of crime with respect to services offered in the event of victimization. Many victims of crime are offered minimal guidance from the police after being victimized. Finally, areas for future research are identified, especially pertaining to policy and practice.
CHAPTER TWO: Fear of Crime

Defining a Fear of Crime

Despite decades of research and debate, researchers have been unable to agree on a definition of a fear of crime (Sacco, 2005; Stanko, 1995; Warr, 2000). Ferraro and LaGrange (1987:73) initially defined a fear of crime as “negative emotional reactions generated by crime or symbols associated with crime.” However, the use of this definition makes it “difficult to distinguish fear from sadness, anger, or despair” (Warr, 2000:453). Indeed, the confusion over a standard definition is a direct result of a failure to distinguish the differences between perception, cognition, and emotion (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987). Warr (2000:453) argues that “fear is not a perception of the environment, but a reaction to the perceived environment.”

Various agencies and researchers have attempted to define a fear of crime. The John Howard Society (1999:1) defines fear as “anticipation of victimization, rather than fear of an actual victimization.” Research on this type of fear focuses its attention on analyzing the vulnerable person and the causes of fear. According to the Church Council on Justice and Corrections, which published a monograph titled Fear of Crime in Canada: Taking the Pulse of a Nation (1995:7), this type of fear is an “… emotional reaction characterized by a sense of danger and anxiety produced by the threat of physical harm … elicited by perceived cues in the environment that relate to some aspect of crime” (Doob, 1995:7).

Sacco (2005) believes that the definition of fear for research purposes consists of three dimensions: cognitive, affective, and behavioral. Cognitive dimensions of a fear of
crime explore the respondent's beliefs about victimization and crime, while affective dimensions focus explicitly on the respondent's feelings about crime. Behavioral dimensions examine what people do in response to crime. Sacco (2005) believes that these three dimensions connect the components of a fear of crime together, and account for the ways people behave when they experience fear.

For the purpose of this thesis, Pain's (2001) definition of a fear of crime will be used. Pain (2001) defined a fear of crime as “…the wide emotional and practical response to crime and disorder made by individuals and communities” (Pain, 2001:901). Pain's (2001) definition emphasizes people’s reactions and concerns about crime and focuses on “rates” or “levels” of crime but not on people’s reactions. More importantly, these reactions and concerns about crime can be measured, which results in “…establishing whether, when, and for whom, fear of crime is a tangible social problem” (Pain, 2001:902).

Debates over the definition of a fear of crime continue. Researchers however, have been able to agree on various techniques to measure a fear of crime. An in-depth examination of these techniques is presented to assist the reader in understanding how research on a fear of crime is undertaken.

**Measurement of Fear**

According to Jackson (2005), doubts have been raised for many years regarding the validity and reliability of fear of crime measurements. Girling, Loader and Sparks (2000) conducted studies on crime and social control in England and argued that surveys and questionnaires are blunt instruments that ineffectively tap into public perceptions about crime. Nevertheless, there are several ways in which a fear of crime can be
measured. These techniques include: self-reports from individuals; a monitoring of psychological processes that are associated with fear; surveys; and behavioral indicators of fear.

According to Thomson (1979), the involuntary psychological changes that occur with the development of fear can be used to measure the intensity of fear. For example, a participant may experience different levels of fear at night in an underground parking lot versus during the day in the same parking lot. Furthermore, psychological measures help to eliminate problems with self-reports, which may include errors in the recall of information (Warr, 2000).

Nonetheless, there are limitations to psychological measures of fear. First, psychological measures of fear cannot directly reveal the source of the fear. For example, researchers cannot determine whether the fear is caused by a person or an event (Warr, 2000). Second, psychological measures of fear cannot differentiate fear in general from a specific fear of crime. Although, criminologists have attempted to “isolate a fear of crime, to assume that it is different in some fundamental way from other ordinary fears, such as fear of traffic accidents or fear of falling, there is no evidence that a fear of crime is qualitatively different from other forms of fear” (Warr, 2000:454). For example, psychological measures cannot help us differentiate between fear of being in a car accident and fear of bad weather. These limitations can become problematic when the experiment is conducted in a laboratory, as participants may react differently to cues that are associated with fear of crime. Warr (2000) argues that researchers must be able to differentiate between “personal fear (e.g., fear for one-self) from altruistic fear (e.g., fear for others)” (Warr, 2000:455) in order to measure successfully the actual levels of a fear
of crime. Finally, certain psychological changes associated with fear can also accompany other emotional states (Mayes, 1979; Thomson, 1979).

Surveys are another technique for measuring fear of crime. Surveys can be complex and diverse, as the range of questions can vary according to each survey (Jackson, 2006). Some surveys focus attention solely on a fear of crime during the day rather than at night, while others ask questions pertaining to a fear of crime in neighborhoods versus in urban areas (Warr, 2000).

Although surveys represent the most popular technique used to measure a fear of crime, they can be controversial, especially with respect to how the researchers choose to paraphrase the questions. Sutton and Farrall (2005) point out that social scientists have struggled with self-report surveys for decades. One problem associated with self-report scales is the inability to determine how participants shape their responses (Jackson, 2005; Jackson, 2006; Sutton & Farrall, 2005). The earliest types of questions used to measure a fear of crime asked how safe an individual felt in their local area and included the following variants: “How safe do you, or would you feel safe walking alone in this area after dark?” and “Is there any place around here where you feel unsafe walking at night?” (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987; Jackson, 2005) These kinds of questions have been criticized for failing to mention crime and for referencing an imprecise geographical area, namely “the neighborhood.” Ferraro and LaGrange (1987) also highlight that these questions inquire about a person’s activities (e.g., walking alone after dark), which many people rarely, if ever, do. Furthermore, Farrall and Ditton (1999) indicate that such questions fail to refer to a specific time period. The respondent in this situation does not know if the question is referring to his/her fears five years ago, today, or yesterday.
Additionally, Jackson (2005) supports Farrall’s and Ditton’s (1999) findings and adds that these standard questions create confusion as the respondent may not know how to provide an accurate summary of their feelings.

Finally, fear can also become evident through behavior. Kenny (1963) found that fear has a profound effect on human behavior. Through his research, Kenny (1963) argues that if one is afraid of flying or being in a car accident, an individual will take extraordinary precautions to avoid being in places where they would be exposed to such activity. However, Sluckin (1979) argues that there are problems with behavioral indicators of fear. Specifically, it is difficult to determine what people are doing (or not doing) out of fear. For example, it is hard to tell whether a person who is afraid of flying avoids flying intentionally, or because they have no need to travel. Jackson (2005) argues that beliefs about crime are embedded within our day-to-day activities and that crime may operate as a symbol of deterioration, given that it may halt or curb a person’s activities.

Ferraro (1995) has conducted extensive research on a fear of crime and perceived risk. According to Ferraro (1995), fear and perceived risk are two related concepts, but also two distinct phenomena. Ferraro (1995) argues that perceived risk entails cognitive judgment, while fear is more emotionally driven. A person may perceive that they are at risk of becoming a victim of crime, but at the same time they may not be fearful. The emotion of fear prepares the body for fight or flight, through the release of adrenaline.

Ferraro (1995:27) argues that perceived risk is a "...predictor of a fear of crime." Ferraro (1995) surveyed more than 1,000 respondents across the United States about their perceived risk, their fear of crime, and demographic and neighborhood characteristics.
Analyzing perceived risk, he found that higher risk perceptions are related to higher levels of community crime, signs of incivility and disorder, both direct and indirect victimization, being female and being non-Caucasian.

These measurement techniques aid in the research on a fear of crime, however each technique contains flaws, and further research is needed to improve the ability to study a fear of crime. It is also important to recognize that previous victimization plays an important role in the measurement of a fear of crime.

Victimization in General

According to the John Howard Society (1999), although most people have a low chance of being victims of crime, the number of fearful people remains high. In the General Social Survey (GSS) in 1993, one in four Canadians did not feel safe. Women were four times more fearful of crime than men, and people over the age of 65 were twice as afraid of crime as those who were between the age of 15 and 24 (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 1994:1). Interestingly, however, a more recent study conducted through the General Social Survey (GSS) and entitled “Criminal Victimization in Canada, 2004” (Statistics Canada, 2004) indicates that more Canadians are satisfied with their overall safety, compared to the results of a similar type of study conducted by GSS in 1999 (Gannon & Mihorean, 2005).

According to the 2004 GSS study, the Canadian population has a high rate of victimization. For example, the rate of personal property thefts increased in 2004, climbing from 75 to 93 incidents per 1,000 between 1999 and 2004. Similarly, the rate of violent offences remained high, but stable. Figure 1, below, displays the rates of violent victimization in 1999 and in 2004. According to the 2004 GSS study, for every 1,000
Canadians aged 15 years and over, there were 106 incidents of violent victimization, compared to 111 incidents for every 1,000 in 1999. Overall, the absence of statistically significant change can be attributed to relatively stable rates of sexual assaults, robbery, and physical assault (Gannon & Mihorean, 2005).

**Figure 1: Rates of Violent Victimization 1999 and 2004**

Rate per 1,000 population 15 years and over

**Note:** Includes incidents of spousal sexual and physical assaults.
**Source:** Statistics Canada, General Social Survey, 1999 and 2004.

With respect to neighborhood safety, the NRG Research Group (2007) recently published a study for the Vancouver Police Department entitled “Community Policing Assessment 2006 – Residential Results.” Among other things, this study showed that residents generally feel safe in their neighborhoods. Overall, about two-thirds of Vancouver residents rate their neighborhoods as “relatively safe,” and less than ten percent feel “unsafe.” These findings are important as they reveal that satisfaction levels with respect to safety have improved in the past decade.

Even though Vancouver residents feel relatively safe, the rates of victimization in the City continue to be high (Gannon & Mihorean, 2005). Indeed, a comparison of the
2004 GSS and the 1999 GSS data reveal that the incidents of violent victimization have declined marginally (see Figure 1). This can be attributed to the stability of violent offence crime rates over time. However, it must be recognized that household victimization continues to increase. Figure 2 below displays the rates of household property theft from 1993 – 2004. The 2004 GSS results showed that household victimization was 14 percent higher than the 1999 GSS results. Gannon and Mihorean (2005) attribute this increase in household victimization to theft of household property and vandalism. Finally, the rate of personal property theft continues to increase. In 2004, the rate of property theft was 93 incidents for every 1,000 which resulted in a 24 percent increase since 1993.

**Figure 2: Rates of Household Property Theft and Vandalism**

Rate per 1,000 households

![Rates of Household Property Theft and Vandalism](image)


In addition, Table 1 below indicates that women and men experience similar rates of victimization.
### Table 1: Number and Rate of Violent Victimization by Victim Characteristics, 2004

#### Number and rate of violent victimization by victim characteristics, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim characteristics</th>
<th>Total incidents</th>
<th>Rate per 1,000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total violent</td>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 24</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common law</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow or widower</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated or divorced</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not stated</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working at a job</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for work</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A student</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household work(^\d)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^#)</td>
<td>104(^#)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not stated</td>
<td>4(^#)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening activities (# per month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 29</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and more</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not stated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 14,999</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 to 29,999</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 to 39,999</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 to 59,999</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000 and over</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not stated</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations of home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures may not add to total due to rounding.

0 true zero or a value rounded to zero
\(\d\) use with caution
\# too unreliable to be published
\(^\d\) includes all incidents of personal sexual and physical assault
\(^\#\) includes taking care of children and maternal/paternal leave
\(^\#\) includes long-term illness and volunteering


15
Women are more likely than men to become the victims of sexual assaults (35 per 1,000 women versus seven per 1,000 men), while men experience higher levels of victimization due to physical assaults (91 per 1,000 men versus 59 per 1,000 women). Since the 1999 GSS survey, the rates of violent victimization have remained relatively the same for both men and women (Gannon & Mihorean, 2005).

Interestingly, the data in Table 1 also indicate that the elderly (65 years of age and older) are the least likely to become victims of crime. Most often, victims of crime are single and are between the ages of 15 and 24.

**Variables Affecting Fear of Crime**

Research has found that certain characteristics such as gender, age, previous victimization, community attachment (Ferraro, 1995; Garofalo, 1981; Meyer & Post, 2006; Schafer, Huebner & Bynum, 2006; Stanko, 1992; Scott, 2003; Sutton & Farrall, 2005; Ziegler & Mitchell, 2003) and exposure to media can increase fear of crime (Callanan, 2005; Dowler, 2003; Koomen, Visser & Stapel, 2000; Roberts & Doob, 1990). In the following section, each variable described above will be examined in detail.

**Gender**

Killias (1990) attributes this gender difference to vulnerability. Women have consistently been found to fear crime more than men, although their risk of victimization seems to be lower. Young men report feeling the safest, yet they experience the greatest proportion of violent victimization from strangers (Pain, 2001; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981; Stanko, 1992; Scott, 2003; Sutton & Farrall, 2005; Schafer et al., 2006).

Skogan (1987) believes that a woman’s fear of crime often is misperceived as “irrational.” Stanko (1992) agrees with Skogan’s (1987) arguments, and adds that criminology tends to focus on street crime, not on crimes that happen behind closed doors between intimates. Although Meyer and Post (2006) agree with these findings, they also believe that women experience more severe consequences after victimization, as they are more likely to experience psychological distress which may include Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). Kaysen and her colleagues (2005) found that women are more prone to developing PTSD than men after a traumatic experience, especially when they have been sexually assaulted (Kaysen, Morris, Rizvi & Resic, 2005).

Overall, research indicates that men are less likely than women to be forced to engage in unwanted sexual acts (Kaysen et al., 2005; Meyer & Post, 2006; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Research conducted on women’s fear of crime has shown that women fear crime more than men, because they are ten times more likely to be sexually assaulted (Crowell & Burgess, 1996; Ferraro, 1996; Gordon & Riger, 1988; Kaysen et al., 2005; Maxfield, 1984; Meyer & Post, 2006; Schafer et al., 2006; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998; Warr, 1984, 1985). Their fear of becoming a victim is due to sexual aggression which male’s exhibit on a daily basis towards females. Warr (1984:35) argues that “it may well be that [for women] . . . fear of crime is fear of rape.” Gordon and Riger (1988),
extending their earlier work (Riger, Gordon & Le Bailly, 1978) go further by naming women's fear of rape as "the female fear." Since women's fear of crime is related to women's fear of rape, then one would assume that the number of reported rapes would be extremely high, but this is not the case. As a result, Maxfield (1984) speculates that women are more concerned about the consequences of rape, but this concern is based merely on Maxfield's speculation.

Similarly, other scholars suggest that fear of rape is transferred onto other types of crimes (Ferraro, 1996; Schafer et al., 2006; Warr, 1984, 1985). Women start to feel that if they are more likely to be victims of a sexual attack, they would also be more susceptible to other forms of crime (Ferraro, 1995; Schafer et al., 2006; Warr, 1984, 1985). Moreover, Ferraro's (1995, 1996) research found that both women and men reported the same levels on fear of non-violent crimes. However, when rape was added to the category, women's fear of crime increased significantly (Ferraro, 1995, 1996; Schafer et al., 2006:286).

More recently Schafer and his colleagues (2006) found that women express greater levels of fear. Schafer and his colleagues suggest that women are "overshadowed by their fear of sexual victimization, even when respondents were prompted to consider non-personal and non-violent offenses" (Schafer et al., 2006:285). Meyer and Post (2006) agree with Schafer's findings, but also acknowledge that not much research has been conducted on older women's fear of violence. Meyer and Post (2006) argue that most research focuses narrowly on single women with young children, and fails to acknowledge that older women are also susceptible to violence.

Smith and Tortenson (1997) suggest that there are multiple explanations as to why
women fear crime more than men. They argue that women’s increased fear of crime may be the result of one of four main issues. First, it has been hypothesized by Skogan (1987) that women’s fears are “irrational,” since victimization against women is lower than that of men. Research indicates that women and the elderly are less likely to be victimized than men (Meyer & Post, 2006; Schafer et al., 2006; Smith & Torstenson, 1997; Scott, 2003; Sutton & Farrall, 2005). Pain (2001) argues that it is possible that data may be skewed as women are less likely to report certain types of victimization to the authorities, which may in turn parallel their victimization with that of males. Therefore, women are not “irrational,” but their fear of crime is a direct result of “hidden” victimization (Scott, 2003; Skogan 1987; Smith & Torstenson, 1997).

The second issue that Smith and Tortenson (1997) discuss is that women are more likely to generalize their situation or past victimization across circumstances, which may heighten their fear of crime in general. Women tend to experience a wider range of offensive behavior, which may not be criminal but which may still provoke fear (Smith & Torstenson, 1997). Sexual harassment (verbal or physical), inappropriate comments regarding sexuality, gender oppression, and discrimination can all contribute to a woman’s overall feeling of vulnerability and thereby increase her fear of crime (Crowell & Burgess, 1996; Maxfield, 1984; Meyer & Post, 2006; Pain, 2001; Smith & Torstenson, 1997; Warr, 1985).

The third issue that Smith and Torstenson (1997) discuss is women’s susceptibility to harm. Research has shown that women are more predisposed to harm because they are not as able as men to physically escape, resist, or inhibit attacks. To protect themselves from this harm, women attempt to reduce the risk of victimization by
being protective and by avoiding certain situations (Garofalo, 1981; Scott, 2003).

Lastly, it is possible that males have a tendency to neutralize their fears, which leads to a skewed view of who fears crime the most (Smith & Torstenson, 1997). Stanko and Hobdell (1993) view women’s fear of crime as “rational,” while men’s fear of crime is “irrationally low.” According to Urban Studies done by Pain (2001), young males seem to experience the greatest level of victimization, yet they also tend to report the lowest fear of crime. This may be due to the fact that many men are unwilling to speak or think of themselves in ways that (even on anonymous surveys) may “challenge [their sense of] invulnerability” (Pain, 2001:905). Fear is not as acceptable for males in our society as it is for females. From childhood, males are taught to be brave and to be protectors, and fear undermines this role (Pain, 2001; Stanko & Hobdell, 1993). Men are taught to deny their fears, act as if they are immune from harm, believe in machismo, place a high value on physical abilities, and are thus often reluctant to admit fear, even to themselves (Smith & Torstenson, 1997). With heightened victimization, gender oppression, generalization and the “downplaying” of fear among men, women are consistently found to be more fearful of crime than men (Agnew, 1985; Smith & Torstenson, 1997).

Sutton and Farrall (2005) agree with Smith’s and Torstenson’s (1997) argument. Sutton and Farrall (2005) argue that male fear of crime is as high as female fear of crime; however, when participating in research, males generally give gender-driven, socially desirable answers. A pattern seems to have developed where gender is affected by social pressures and males “downplay” their fears. This is consonant with Agnew’s (1985) view that males “neutralize” their fears of crime. This is an especially important factor
with respect to masculine status. This type of status differs culturally, but for an individual to prove their masculinity, they may resort to a neutralization of fears to avoid ostracism (Agnew, 1985).

Sutton and Farrall (2005) acknowledge that there are serious flaws in self-report surveys regarding the collection of data on a fear of crime. Society embraces the view that “boys don’t cry,” and, as a result, males are less willing to speak about their fear of crime. This phrase captures the traditional features of masculinity, which prevent males from revealing their true feelings. Hegemonic masculinity encourages males to be aggressive, ambitious, fearless, and self-reliant. According to Connell & Messerschmidt (2005) hegemonic masculinity, in some cultures, views men as the dominating sex, while women are considered to be subordinate to men. At the same time, society does not discourage women from displaying their emotions or showing sadness and, in fact, at times encourages it (Bem, 1981; Sutton & Farrall, 2005).

To tackle the problems with self-report surveys, it is necessary to measure how one responds to questions that are socially desirable. Measurements used in such surveys are often called the “lie scales,” as it assesses participants’ “systematic distortion of their attitudes” (Sutton & Farrall, 2005). Lie scales such as the Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) “L Scale” or the Crowne and Marlowe (1964) “Social Desirability Scale” have been used to improve the validity of clinical and survey data. The lie scales measure the genuineness of responses by considering factors that can distort the responses. During self-report surveys, respondents tend to minimize their fear level. The lie scales serve as indicators to test validity, and are primarily intended to detect subjects who present themselves in an unrealistically positive fashion (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964; Eysenck &
Eysenck, 1975; Sutton & Farrall, 2005).

Age

A range of studies reveals that elderly women are the most fearful group in society (Baumer, 1985; Bennett & Flavin, 1994; McGarrell et al., 1997; Tulloch, 2000). Advanced age is the second predictor of a fear of crime (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1992), which contrasts with a range of studies that have indicated that adults over the age of 65 are less likely to become victims of crime than younger adults (Bachman, Dillaway & Lachs, 1998; Cutler, 2001; Pain, 1995, 1997, 2001; Turcotte & Scellenberg, 2006; Ziegler & Mitchell, 2003;). Many elderly people live alone, have few family members or close friends living nearby, and may feel that they have no one to call for assistance during the aftermath of a crime. According to McGarrell and his colleagues (1997), the elderly are socially isolated from their support networks that are more common among younger members of the population, which in turn increases their levels of a fear of crime.

Recently, Meyer and Post (2006) from Michigan State University interviewed 32 women over the age of 50 to determine how elderly women perceive violence in their neighborhood. Overall, the study revealed that elderly woman did not feel safe in their neighborhoods. A large proportion of the respondents commented that their residential neighborhoods are no longer safe, compared to the neighborhood dynamics of 30 years ago (Meyer & Post, 2006).

Ferraro (1996) further argues that the fear of crime among women varies by age. Younger women, especially those under the age of 35, fear becoming victims of sexual assaults more than older women (Ferraro, 1996; Warr, 1985). As women age, their fear
of crime begins to decrease to some degree; however, as women get older (i.e., over the age of 60), their fear of crime increases again (Ferraro, 1996). According to Scott (2003), as women age, their fears are no longer associated with sexual assaults, but are more concerned with personal injury. Older women are more afraid of personal injury because they are physically more vulnerable and the risk of being injured is much greater. Furthermore, the physiological process of aging brings a decreasing ability to heal after injury both physically and emotionally. Therefore, elderly victims may never fully recover from the trauma of their victimization. Further, the trauma that elderly victims suffer is often worsened by their financial situation. Because many elderly people live on low or fixed incomes, they often cannot afford the professional services and products that could help them in the aftermath of a crime (Ferraro, 1996; Scott, 2003).

Although the victimization of elderly people tends to be less frequent than that of younger people, it may be that crimes are more damaging to the elderly and this may fuel their fear (Pain, 2001; Ziegler & Mitchell, 2002). Being victimized can limit an older person's mobility and affect their overall quality of life. The aftereffects of possible victimization can be much greater than the victimization itself. Finally, many elderly people worry that upon learning of their victimization, family members will think they are incompetent, which will create a feeling of guilt among family members associated with allowing their loved one to be victimized. All these factors contribute to increased fears in the elderly (Pain, 1995).

Pain (2001) also explains that many older people find the presence of youth in public places to be intimidating. The elderly associate youth with crime, and consider too closely the highly publicized but rare instances of youth being involved in serious, violent
crimes. Elderly people's concerns about youth activities reflect their views regarding the lessening social control in society, and may further contribute to their fears. The presence of youth in public places creates a panic among the elderly and increases their fear of crime in public places (Loader, Girling & Sparks, 1998; Pain, 2001).

As is the case with women, elderly people are often found to be less at risk for crime than younger people (Pain, 1995, 1997, 2001). National crime surveys both in North America and in Britain indicate that people between the ages of 16 and 24 are four times more likely to be the victim of a burglary, as compared to people over the age of 65. The differences are even greater with respect to violent crime. According to the official crime statistics in Britain, the elderly represent only two percent of the victims of violent crime. These crimes involve violence against another person, assault and rape (Mirrlees-Black, Budd, Partridge & Mayhew, 1998; Pain, 2001; Watson, 1996).

The elderly are also more likely to experience victimization in private places, as opposed to public places (Turcotte & Schellenberg, 2007). Although research indicates that the elderly are more vulnerable in places such as group homes and care facilities, elderly people often fear public places where youths congregate, because their fear of victimization has been built up through the media and other sources (McCreadie, 1996; Pain, 2001). Also, the elderly generally face greater physical disadvantage in crime situations. Most offenders are young males who are physically stronger. The perceived potential for physical harm is greatly enhanced when the victim and the offender have dramatically different levels of physical and social power (Ferraro, 1995).

Research by Turcotte and Schellenberg (2007) for Statistics Canada entitled "A
Portrait of Seniors in Canada," reveals that elderly\(^2\) women are more likely to be victims of family violence than elderly men. Their research suggests that common assaults are the most frequently reported violent crime against the elderly. These common assaults do not result in serious injury, but include behavior such as slapping, pushing, and threatening. Approximately 55 percent of common assaults on the elderly person are committed by family members, while 33 percent of assaults are committed by someone outside the family.

Further, Turcotte and Schellenberg (2007) suggest that male adults along with their spouses are often perpetrators “in family-related violence involving seniors” (Turcotte & Schellenberg, 2007:72). Indeed, a total of 33 percent of adult male children were responsible for “family-related violence” of seniors, followed by 30 percent of their spouses (including current and ex-spouses). Finally, 15 percent of extended family relatives, such as brothers and uncles, were responsible for “family-related violence” against seniors. Turcotte’s and Schellenberg’s (2007) research supports McCreadie (1996) and Pain’s (2001) findings that the elderly tend to be victimized in their homes, in situations where the victim and the accused share living quarters. Approximately eight out of ten elderly victims live with their adult children who are also the assailants.

Finally, Turcotte and Schellenberg (2007) found that robbery is the second most frequently crime reported by the elderly. Robbery accounts for a total of 19 percent of all crimes committed against the elderly, while only one percent of robberies were committed by family members. In 2003, 36 percent of elderly victims sustained minor injuries from robberies inflicted by family members, while only three percent of victims sustained a major physical injury (Turcotte & Schellenberg, 2007). Overall, research

\(^2\) Statistics Canada defines elderly as a “person aged 65 years and over.”
supports the claim that the elderly are victimized by their family members, and not by young people on the street.

Although research reveals that the elderly are the most fearful, other research indicates that young people are more fearful than the elderly (Chadee & Ditton, 2003; Ferraro & LaGrange, 1992; Moore & Shpeherd, 2006). Ferraro and LaGrange (1992) were the first scholars to conduct a study in which young people were found to be more fearful of crime than the elderly. Ferraro and LaGrange (1992) conducted a telephone survey of 1,100 respondents from 830 communities across the United States of America. Respondents were asked to rate their levels of fear based on ten different crimes which included: rape, murder, assault, break and enter (while at home or away), vandalism, car theft, fraud, robbery, and illegal panhandling. Ferraro’s and LaGrange’s (1992) study contradicts the common belief that the elderly are more fearful of crime than young people. Ferraro and LaGrange (1992) found that fear and risk are related, and that young people proved to be more fearful than the elderly, especially of violent crimes. Respondents between the ages of 18 and 24 years of age displayed higher levels of fear as their risk of victimization is high.

A study by Chadee and Ditton (2003) revisited Ferraro and LaGrange’s (1992) work. Although, Chadee and Ditton (2003) selected data from the Caribbean island of Trinidad, they adopted similar methods and statistical analyses. A multi-stage cluster design was used with 728 randomly selected adults. The sample was representative of the Trinidadian population, specifically for age, occupation, and geographical location. Additionally, Chadee and Ditton (2003) replicated questions from the General Social Survey and used a 10-point scale to rate fears about becoming a victim of crime, just like
Ferraro and LaGrange (1992) did in their study. Chadee and Ditton (2003) found that respondents between the ages of 18 and 24 were more fearful of crime than respondents over the age of 55. Chadee and Ditton's (2003) work contradicts the literature which suggests that the elderly feel like “prisoners” in their own homes, as they found that the elderly are the least afraid. The study also offered no evidence that a fear of crime increases with age (Chadee & Ditton, 2003).

Lastly, a study conducted by Moore and Shepherd (2007) demonstrates that a fear of crime is reducible to two elements: a fear of personal harm; and a fear of property loss. The findings of this study are consistent with those of Ferraro and LaGrange (1992) and Chadee and Ditton (2003): respondents between the ages of 16 and 25 years of age exhibited the highest levels of fear of personal harm. However, Moore and Shepherd (2007) found that respondents between the ages of 40 and 60 years of age exhibited the highest levels of fear of property loss, while respondents between the ages of 16 and 25 exhibited the lowest levels of fear of property loss. Low levels of fear of property loss among younger respondents can be attributed to their lack of property ownership.

Although most research suggests that a fear of crime increases with age, it is important to take into consideration the three studies mentioned above. Further, some of the more obvious methodological differences between studies of a fear of crime must be considered which include: the way age is categorized and the way a fear of crime is measured. Specifically, there is no consistency across studies on how age categories are defined (e.g., one study may use the age category 20-24 years old and another may use the category 18-25 years old). This is problematic because the categorization of the age groups impacts on the pattern of results and how they are interpreted. Additionally, the
age categories affect the definition of 'older persons.' For example, individuals in the oldest age group in a study are usually considered 'older persons.' This means that in one study 'older persons' could be those aged 50 years and over and in another study they may be 65 years and over (Chadee & Ditton, 2003).

According to Moore and Shepherd (2007), these measurement problems "have led to conflicting views on whether elderly people are more or less fearful" (Moore & Shepherd, 2007:155) than their younger counterparts. To avoid this problem, they conducted a study whereby age was measured in numerical terms (e.g., 17 years old) rather than in categorical terms (e.g., 15-19 years old). Moore and Shepherd (2007) found that a fear of crime varied by the type of crime (property versus violent) as well as by age. For example, for property crime, the highest levels of fear were reported by those aged between 40 and 60 years. For violent crime, reported levels of fear of crime were greatest for those aged between 16 and 25 years of age. Fear of violent crime then decreased rapidly with age, with the oldest people reporting the lowest levels. These results suggest that fear of crime does not increase consistently with age. Clearly, age is a very important variable with respect to a fear of crime. What remains to be established through empirical study is whether the elderly are more fearful than the young.

**Past Victimization**

Many studies have also examined past victimization and a fear of crime. Some studies have found no differences between victims of crime and non-victims, while others have found statistically significant results (Keane, 1995). Keane (1995) argues that although males experience higher rates of victimization than females, females report higher levels of fear of victimization. These findings "suggest that women's fear is
rooted in subjective, rather than objective experience” (Keane, 1995:432). However, research conducted by Gannon and Mihorean for Statistics Canada (2005) reveals that women and men experience comparable rates of violent victimization. Although the rates are comparable, males tend to be victims of assaults and robberies, while the rate of sexual assault for women is five times higher than the rate for men (Gannon & Mihorean, 2005).

Sacco (1990) argues that research on the gender-victimization-fear relationship exhibits inconsistencies because women are more likely to be victims of sexual assaults, and are more likely to be victimized by someone whom they know. As a result, such offences are often not reported to the police. Sacco (1990) believes that, in earlier research, domestic crimes and sexual crimes were excluded from surveys, thus suggesting that women are less likely to be victimized but more fearful. However, Sacco (1990) maintains that women are as likely to be victimized as men.

According to Skogan and Klecka (1997), being a victim of a certain type of crime may affect a person's level of fear. For example, being a victim of a robbery generates high levels of fear. Robbery usually involves contact with a stranger, a weapon, an assault and potential monetary loss. Break and enters also generate high levels of fear, as victims feel that their privacy has been invaded and they no longer feel safe in their own homes (Skogan & Klecka, 1997). In addition, Sprott and Doob (1997) found that victims who were at home during a break and enter experienced the highest levels of fear because such events are akin to robberies.

Scott (2003) argues that fear of crime may be indirectly influenced by victimization. Macmillan, Nierobisz and Welsh (2000) indicate that those who have been
victimized through harassment by strangers are more likely to experience higher levels of fear. Although stranger victimization is uncommon, the results of this study imply that threatening strangers generate more fear. Macmillan and his colleagues (2000) found that stranger harassment reduces feelings of safety. Women who participated in the study reported being fearful of walking alone at night, using public transportation, or walking alone in a parkade at night. These findings were particularly interesting as women who experienced sexual harassment by non-strangers reported a lower fear of crime (Macmillan et al., 2000).

Keane (1995) found that experiencing certain offences can be a better predictor of fear than others. Through his study, Keane (1995) found that psychological victimization was associated with fear. Those who had been victims of sexual harassment and emotional abuse tended to be more fearful than others. Keane suggests that there is a difference between sexual assaults and psychological victimization. Sexual and physical assaults are considered to be acute stressors, while psychological victimization is seen as a chronic stressor. According to Keane (1995:451) “...all types of victimization are harmful;” however, chronic stressors elevate a fear of crime because past victimization operates as a reminder of vulnerability. Finally, Keane (1995) argues that for many women a fear of crime is a fear of rape. Women displace their fear of rape onto other types of crime, thus resulting in increased levels of fear.

**Community Attachment**

As discussed in the preceding section, there are many explanations as to why women fear crime more than men, why elderly people are more fearful than the young, and how past victimization can shape a fear of crime. Nonetheless, community
attachment also plays an important role in a person’s fear of crime.

According to Theodori and Luloff (2000), community attachment is a difficult variable to measure. Many researchers have used social bonds and sentiments to measure attachment, while others have used measures of satisfaction, social interaction, community evaluation and physical rootedness (Connerly & Maran, 1985; Cowell & Green, 1994; Kasarda & Janowitz, 1974). Some researchers have also used measures of social participation and friendship concentration. Although there is little consensus as to the actual definition of community attachment and how to measure it, many researchers have concluded that attachment relates mostly to a sense of belonging and caring about the surrounding community (Theodori & Luloff, 2000).

Levels of personal integration into networks and communities have a great impact on the human perception of danger. According to Wolfe, Lex and Yancey (1968), people who are not integrated into their communities express more concerns about crime than those who have strong networks within the community. Respondents felt that it was unsafe for their children to play outside in the community, expressed concerns that it was unsafe at night in their community and said that the youth in their community were out of control (Wolfe et al., 1968). Rainwater (1966) argues that poor living conditions influence community attachment, provide a perception of danger, and cause neighbors to become over-protective and more fearful.

In the early 20th century, Shaw and McKay formulated a social disorganization theory, which has become, in criminology, a primary way of explaining neighborhood crime and delinquency (Sun, Triplett, & Gainey, 2004; Triplett, Sun & Gainey, 2005). Social Disorganization Theory concentrates on the inability of a neighborhood to achieve
common goals and the inability of the residents to sustain effective social control. Kasarda and Janowitz (1974), and Krohn (1988), developed a two-stage model of social disorganization. The model posits that low socio-economic status, family disruptions, and racial heterogeneity are factors that lead to the disruption of social organizations in neighborhoods. These disruptions are characterized by unsupervised teenage groups, weak local friendship networks and low levels of participation. The two-stage model demonstrates that social disorganization leads to disruption in the neighborhood, which causes higher crime rates (Kasarda & Janwitz, 1974; Krohn, 1988; Sun et al., 2004; Triplett et al., 2005).

In a study of social disorganization, Sampson and Groves (1989) tested the two-stage model and found that crime rates were higher in neighborhoods that experienced weak friendship ties, low organizational participation and had teenage youth left unsupervised on the streets. These indicators of social disorganization displayed a correlation between neighborhood structural characteristics (i.e., family disruptions, low socioeconomic status and ethnic heterogeneity), and crime rates and victimization rates (Sampson & Groves, 1989).

Warner and Rountree (1997) discuss Social Disorganization Theory and explain that poverty, residential mobility, and ethnic and racial diversity can increase the probability of crime, due to a reduction in informal social controls. These factors challenge neighborhood networks and weaken social bonds, which may raise the crime rate and heighten people's fear of crime (Sampson & Groves, 1989; Sun et al., 2004; Warner & Rountree, 1997). Neighborhoods which are more socially bonded may share an understanding of societal norms and appropriate behavior, which more closely mimic
societal definitions of legal behavior, thus lowering the crime rate. Therefore, communities which have higher levels of attachment within them are more likely to experience lower crime rates, and those who feel they have more attachment to their communities may be less likely to fear crime than their unattached counterparts (Warner & Rountree, 1997).

Ferdinand Ronnies, Georg Simmel and Louis Wirth were some of the more prolific early twentieth century writers who were concerned with the effects of modernization and increasing urbanization on community attachment and integration. These writers argued that the smaller the community, the stronger the levels of solidarity and integration which would, in turn, improve community attachment (Theodori & Luloff, 2000).

Interestingly, it seems that Wirth’s (1938) theory has received widespread consideration as it is used most commonly when assessing the effects of urbanization on individuals (Christenson, 1979; Fischer, 1972, 1982; Theodori & Luloff, 2000). According to Wirth (1938), a city is defined by key characteristics: size; density; and heterogeneity. In some cases these variables can lead to a weakening of kinship bonds, which ultimately has an impact on the social organization of the local community and, in turn, may escalate to deterioration and a loss of community attachment.

According to Renauer (2007), a fear of crime is inhibited when residents feel that their neighbors can be trusted and local police are responsive to neighborhood needs. Fear results when residents become concerned that they have lost the ability to control neighbourhood order. In his study, Renauer (2007) found that residents who exhibit increased levels of trust, and social cohesion among their neighbors are less likely to fear
crime. Renauer (2007) points out that social cohesion plays an important role, as building a strong community even in the most disadvantaged neighborhoods can assist in lowering levels of fear. Overall, the research literature supports the claim that the levels of social control in neighbourhoods plays an important role in determining fear of crime levels in individuals.

The Media

Research by Roberts and Doob (1990) and Callanan (2005) demonstrates that public knowledge about crime comes directly from the media. Research has revealed a strong relationship between a fear of crime and television viewing (Callanan, 2005; Barille, 1984; Morgan, 1983). More recently, a study found that local news stations have an impact on a fear of crime, in high crime neighborhoods (Chiricos, Padgett & Gertz, 2000). Dowler’s (2003) research discovered that regular viewers of drama are more likely to fear crime and that gender, age, and perceived neighborhood problems are statistically related to a fear of crime. Finally, Callanan (2005) discusses how heavy consumers of “crime-related media” are more fearful of crime. Callanan (2005) points out that these consumers believe that crime is increasing and they do not support the rehabilitation of offenders.

Crime incidents often make good stories. Consequently, the media is quick to report the negative incidents that occur, while ignoring the success stories, and increasing their focus on stories of violence and crime. This creates the perception that there is a higher risk of encountering crime than there really is (Altheide, 1997). This is perhaps best highlighted in incidents involving older people, which seem to attract a dramatically disproportionate amount of media coverage in proportion to the reality of occurrences,
thereby significantly increasing the fear of crime among people in this group. Altheide (1999) suggests that the media transforms crime into entertainment. Every news program is properly planned out and it is molded into what the larger culture wants to see and hear. The public seems to enjoy news that is crime-related, rather than success stories (Altheide, 1997, 1999; Cavender & Bond, 1993).

Doob and MacDonald (1979) indicate that residents who live in high crime areas and watch large amounts of television are more likely to fear crime and victimization than those who do not. It seems that the media have a greater impact on those individuals who have never been victims of crime. Females, Caucasians and the elderly seem to be most influenced by the media, even though these segments of the population have the least likelihood of being victimized (Dood & MacDonald, 1979; Liska & Baccaglini, 1990).

Studies of television drama have revealed that gender plays a significant role in the images presented in the media. Men tend to significantly outnumber women as aggressors, whereas women are more frequently features as victims of violence. Women are rarely violent, and in real life, they are most often at risk at home and from the men they know (Scott, 2003). Violent encounters involving men and women in the media often include sexual components. Newspapers, for example, focus disproportionately on sex-related attacks. The news media prefers to report on stranger violence against women, even though the greatest proportion of sexual attacks on women are perpetrated by the men they know, thus resulting increased fear of crime among women (Gunter, Harrison & Wykes, 2003).

In another study, Chiricos, Eschholz and Gertz (1997) found a correlation
between television watching, listening to the news on the radio, and an increased fear of
crime. In addition, the study found that television consumption was related to fear in
Caucasian females between the ages of 30 and 44. The results of this study are similar to
the findings of the study by Liska and Baccaglini (1990) which, among other things,
showed that Caucasian females are mostly influenced by the media. Gerbner, Gross,
Morgan and Signorielli (1980) also support this finding, indicating a strong correlation
between media consumption and a fear of crime in Caucasian females. Finally Koomen
and his colleagues (2000) found that women reported generally higher levels of a fear of
crime and higher levels of fear of robbery than men (Koomen, Visser & Stapel, 2000).

More importantly, Skogan and Maxfield (1981) point out that there is a
relationship between a fear of crime through direct or indirect victimization and through
media accounts. Although prior victimization is a weak predictor of a fear of crime
(Rountree & Land, 1996), Skogan and Maxfield (1981) suggest that there is a strong
correlation between past victimization and a fear of crime. Further, the research also
indicates that when the media reports serious local crimes fear of crime levels increase.
Koomen and his colleagues (2000) also found that when a credible news source was
reporting crime, viewers were more likely to be influenced by the reports, reporting
increased fear of crime levels (Koomen et al., 2000).

Rice and Anderson (1990), however, found a weak, positive association between
a fear of crime and television viewing. Their findings failed to support their hypothesis
that television viewing had a direct impact on fear of crime. Moreover, a recent study
suggests that the actual relationship between television watching and a fear of crime is
weaker than was originally believed (Chadee & Ditton, 2005; Ditton, Chadee, Farrall,
Gilchrist & Bannister, 2004). In fact, Ditton and his colleagues analyzed 167 respondents and found that respondents' reactions were not influenced by the media. The results were the same when male and female responses were analyzed separately. The study concluded that, overall, varying levels of media consumption did not influence a respondent's fear of crime (Ditton et al., 2004).

Chadee and Ditton (2005) followed-up with a study that examined the relationship between a fear of crime and the media in Trinidad. This was the first study of this nature conducted in Trinidad. A total of 705 respondents participated in the study and data collection involved face-to-face interviews. The study found no relationship between a fear of crime and media consumption. Overall, the study identified a weak correlation between TV news and a fear of crime in the entire sample (Chadee & Ditton, 2005).

Due to these conflicting research findings, it is imperative to examine the media's influence on a person's fear of crime, particularly since some research indicates that the two factors are correlated (Roberts & Doob, 1990).

Summary

This Chapter discussed the many different factors that affect a person's fear of crime. While no two situations are the same due to the effect of several key variables (e.g., gender, age, past victimization, community groups, and media exposure) women, as a group, tend to be more fearful of crime than men, the elderly tend to perceive themselves to be more vulnerable and more affected by crime, and those with low community attachment tend to have less confidence in their safety. The next Chapter describes the method employed to gather data in an effort to address whether some
variables play a more significant role than others in determining levels of a fear of crime among victims of crime in Vancouver.
CHAPTER THREE: Method

The objective of this research was to determine whether age, gender, past victimization, community attachment, and exposure to the media impact a person's fear of crime. The Fear of Crime Survey (see Appendix A) was launched on the Vancouver Police Department (VPD) Intranet using Select Survey ASA Advanced Software. Upon contacting the respondents of the survey an informed consent (see Appendix B) was read. Those respondents who agreed to participate in the survey were informed that their participation was voluntary and that all responses were confidential and anonymity was assured. Those respondents who were not willing to participate were thanked and the conversation was terminated.

Since the interviews were conducted over the phone, the participants' responses were entered into Select Survey Software by the interviewer. The interviewer introduced herself as a Vancouver Police Department (VPD) employee, as the research study was conducted for the VPD. To satisfy the SFU research ethics board, the VPD permitted the interviewer to discuss the findings of this survey as secondary data collection (see Appendix C).

Extrapolation of Data

An extrapolation of data from occurrence reports from the Police Records Information Management Environment (PRIME) was conducted. A time period of September 1st – September 30th, 2006 was downloaded from PRIME and a sample was generated. Below is a detailed explanation of how the data was extracted into an Excel spreadsheet, which contained information from two separate tables; the "general
occurrences” table which contained report information and the “persons” table which contained entity information linked to the report. The data could not be extracted together and had to be extracted separately from each table and married later.

The first extract pulled personal information from the Persons table for the role code 12 (Victim), role code 77 (Witness/Victim) and role code 3 (complaint) for the time period September 1 – September 30, 2006. The role code 77 is usually used in bank robberies where the teller has been robbed, and plays a role of both a witness and a victim. Information regarding youth victims was downloaded, however it was deleted as the survey did not intend to question victims below the age of minority.

Based on the Uniform Crime Reporting\(^3\) terminology, a victim is defined as “a person who is the target of an intended/unintended violent action and criminal traffic violations.” On the other hand, a complainant is defined as “a person who has been victimized as a result of lost property, either through damage or theft.”

The second extract pulled the offence information from the General Occurrence table. The two tables were blended based on matching the case_file_number. The table below depicts the variables that were selected in order to extrapolate the data into an Excel spreadsheet.

---

\(^3\) Uniform Crime Reporting – “Was designed to measure the incidence of crime in Canadian society and its characteristics. The information is used by federal and provincial policy makers as well as public and private researchers. UCR data reflect reported crime that has been substantiated by police. Information collected by the survey includes the number of criminal incidents, the clearance status of those incidents and persons-charged information. The UCR Survey produces a continuous historical record of crime and traffic statistics reported by every police agency in Canada since 1962” (Statistics Canada, 2007).
Table 2: Fields Selected from Persons and Occurrence Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields from the Persons Table</th>
<th>Fields from the Occurrence Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case_file_number</td>
<td>Case_file_number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report_date</td>
<td>Incident_start_date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual_surname</td>
<td>Weekday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given_one</td>
<td>Founded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given_two</td>
<td>UCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given_three</td>
<td>Ext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender_code</td>
<td>UCR2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street_name</td>
<td>Ext2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality_name</td>
<td>UCR3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prov_state_code</td>
<td>Ext3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal_zipcode</td>
<td>UCR4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date_of_birth</td>
<td>Ext4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year_of_birth</td>
<td>Family_violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home_telno_area</td>
<td>Most_ser_weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home_telno</td>
<td>Weapon_status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus_telno_area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus_telno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role_code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role_description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the extrapolation was completed, it was determined that for the period of September 1st to September 30th, 2006 a total of 9,522 Police General Occurrence (GO’s) reports were written. The variable role code was selected in Excel and filtered. Only role codes 12 (Victim), 77 (Witness/Victim) and 3 (Complainant) were selected. The remaining role codes were deleted and only the list of victims, witnesses/victims and complainants was saved.
The samples were divided into two groups: victims of violent offences (role codes 12\(^4\) and 77\(^5\)) and victims of property offences (role code 3\(^6\)). From the total of 9,522 GO's, a total of 727 victims of violent offences and 14 witnesses/victims were selected. Since these victims were being contacted via telephone it was necessary to select only those victims who provided the VPD with their contact information. As a result, from the total sample of 741, only 100 victims provided their telephone contact information. Further, one victim in the sample was a police officer and subsequently was removed from the list. Finally, a sample of 99 victims with contact information was generated and added to an Excel spreadsheet.

Sample Selection

A total of 99 victims of violent offences were contacted via telephone, however only a total of 58 (58.5 percent) respondents participated. A total of 27 (27 percent) respondents were not willing to participate, while 13 (13 percent) telephone numbers were out of service. One respondent was deceased.

The sample of participants included victims of the following violent offences: 19 victims of assault Level I (no visible or minor physical injury); 17 victims of uttering threats (any gesture or vocal indication that conveys to the victim a threat that is constructed to imply that death or injury is possible); nine victims of assault with weapon; eight robbery victims; two victims of extortion; one sex assault victim; one victim of a robbery with offensive weapon (this may include a gun or knife); and one victim of criminal harassment.

---

\(^4\) 12 – Denotes Victim  
\(^5\) 77 – Denotes Witness/Victim  
\(^6\) 3 – Denotes Complainant which is defined as “People who have been victimized as a result of lost property, either through damage or theft.”
On the other hand, from the 9,522 GO’s there was a total of 4,122 complainants (victims of property offences). Since the complainants were also being contacted via telephone it was necessary to select only those who provided their contact information. From the 4,122 complainants 384 respondents provided their contact information. In order to reduce the sample size and to match the sample size of the victims of violent offences, a random sampling\textsuperscript{7} method was utilized. Every fifth respondent on the list was selected and a sample of 76 respondents was generated and added to an Excel spreadsheet. While the sample may be reasonably representative of the victimized population in the City of Vancouver, it was not representative of the general population in the City of Vancouver, since the sample was obtained through PRIME reports: each respondent had to have direct contact with the police. However, if this study were to be replicated, utilizing similar sampling techniques and a similar population, the study should yield similar findings.

The sample included victims of the following property and other offences: eleven victims of residential break and enters; eight victims of theft other category (which included theft of purses, money, and/or personal property); seven victims of mischief under $5000; six victims of theft from auto; five victims of domestic dispute, no assault; four victims of commercial break and enter; three victims of fraud; and three victims of theft of auto.

A total of 76 victims of property offences were contacted and 60 (80 percent) participated in the study. A total of ten (14 percent) respondents were not willing to

\textsuperscript{7} Random Sampling is a sampling technique where a group of subjects (a sample) is selected for a study from a larger group (a population). Each individual is chosen entirely by chance and each member of the population has a known, but possibly non-equal, chance of being included in the sample.
participate, while five (7 percent) phone numbers were out of service. One respondent was deceased.

Study Limitations

Self-selection was a limitation in this study, which can affect the internal validity\(^8\) of survey data. Self-selection may be common among telephone surveys because participants may be especially motivated or interested in the research topic, exacerbating the problem of sample representativeness. When the respondents were contacted via the telephone they were given the option of participating in the survey. Consequently, a self-selection process took place; some respondents refused to participate, while others were eager to provide their responses.

A Fear of Crime Survey

A Fear of Crime Survey contained a total of 54 questions. The survey was divided into six sections: “Background Information,” “Definition of Fear,” “Safety,” “Community Attachment/Neighborhood,” “Media,” and “Satisfaction with the Vancouver Police Department (VPD).”

The first three questions gathered background information. Given that the background information was extrapolated from PRIME General Occurrence Reports, the respondents were not asked the first three questions which were relating to gender, age, and ethnic background.

The next six questions asked the respondents about definition of fear. This set of questions was intended to ascertain how victims defined fear. The respondents were

\(^8\) Internal Validity is “concerned with whether you are investigating what you claim to be investigating (Ritchie & Lewis, 2004:273).”
given the opportunity to define fear of crime. In addition, the respondents were asked if they had become more fearful of crime since victimization, and if they feared becoming a victim of crime again.

Eighteen questions were related to safety. In this section respondents were presented with scenarios designed to shed light on their levels of concern about safety. In addition, to determine levels of safety, using a Likert-Scale, the respondents were asked how safe or unsafe they felt in certain situations.

Seven questions were set out to gauge levels of community attachment. Both quantitative and qualitative questions were utilized in this part of the survey. The objective of these questions was to establish if those who had been victimized had a strong sense of community attachment and if they did, whether their fear levels were lower. Respondents were asked to define “community,” and whether they felt a sense of connection with the larger community. Additionally, respondents were asked if they trusted their neighbors, and if they interacted with their neighbors.

The next thirteen questions asked respondents about media and crime. Respondents were asked how often they watched television, read newspapers, listened to the radio and read news on the internet. Furthermore, the respondents were asked what they watched the most on television, what they listened to the most on the radio and what they read in the newspaper or on the internet. In addition, the respondents were also asked if they thought the media portrayed accurate information about crime. The objective of these questions was to determine how the media impacts a person’s fear of crime.
The Operationalization of Variables

In order to answer the proposed research questions an effective operationalization of the variables within the survey was critical. While the variable “sex” (either male or female), “age” (how many years you have been alive), and “past victimization” were easily operationalized, “fear of crime,” “community attachment,” and “exposure to media” were harder to operationalize. For the purposes of this research project, fear of crime was conceptualized as emotions and anxieties, which may result from the perceived or direct threat of violence, physical harm, and loss of property in relation to crime.

Community attachment was conceptualized as the personal feelings, neighborhood networks and social ties, which a person had developed with and among people and places in the geographical area surrounding their residence, and where they conducted most of their everyday activities (e.g., grocery shopping). To determine a person’s community attachment the survey asked the respondents how long they had lived in a particular neighborhood and how safe they felt in their neighborhood. The next step was to determine how affiliated the person was with their community, by asking the respondents if they spoke to their neighbors and if they felt that their community was a place where they really belonged, or just a place to live.

Finally, exposure to media was conceptualized as daily consumption of television, radio and newspapers. To determine if a respondent’s fear of crime was influenced by high exposure of the media, the respondents were asked how often they watched television, listened to the radio or read the newspaper. Based on that information the respondents were asked if they believed the media depictions of crime, and if their
exposure to the media impacted their fears of crime.

In order to determine the statistical significance among the discussed variables, the researcher conducted independent $t$-tests, and cross-tabulations using SPSS. Each statistical analysis was explained in detail and snapshots of the findings are presented in Chapter Four.

Summary

This Chapter has examined the methods used to gather data from 118 victims of crime. Chapter Four reports the results of research conducted in February 2007 in Vancouver that tests the hypothesis that age, gender, past victimization, low community attachment and high exposure to certain forms of media affect a person’s levels of fear of crime. The views of complainants who were the victims of property crime and the views of the victims of violent offences were analyzed to determine whether these variables had an impact upon their levels of fear.
CHAPTER FOUR: Victims of Crime and their Fear of Crime

Introduction

This Chapter presents some of the findings of a fear of crime survey conducted in Vancouver in February 2007. A total of 118 respondents participated in the survey. The objective of the survey was to establish if past victimization affects a person’s fear of crime and if variables such as age, gender, community attachment and media exposure influence that fear. The sample was divided into two groups: one being the victims of violent offences and the other the victims of property offences. To differentiate between victims of violent offences and the victims of property offences, two surveys were administered, but the same questions were used for both groups.

The findings of the survey are presented in this Chapter based on the variables identified and discussed in Chapter Two. The next Chapter (Chapter Five) sets out the results of a comparative analysis of fear levels between the victims of violent offences and the victims of property offences before and after victimization.

The Views of Victims of Violent and Property Offences

Background Information

Background information about the victims in the sample was obtained from the Vancouver Police Department (VPD) Police Records Information Management Environment (PRIME) reports. When background information was missing from the reports, the interviewer asked respondents for the information. Of the 118 victims of violent and property offences, 63 respondents (53 percent) were males and 55 respondents (47 percent) were females. The comparative analysis set out in Chapter Five
will assist in establishing whether females are more fearful than males because, as Schafer and his colleagues (2006) have shown, the research indicates that women are more fearful of crime than men. Moreover, as the discussion in Chapter Two indicates, research has demonstrated that elderly women are the most fearful group in society (Baumer, 1985; Pain, 2001; Ziegler & Mitchell, 2003). Consequently, the analysis in Chapter Five specifically examines whether older respondents exhibited higher levels of fear.

**Fear of Victimization**

One of the key objectives of the survey was to determine whether respondents feared victimization before they became victims of crime. To this end, the respondents were asked to define fear. A total of 116 responses were provided. Generally, 65 percent of the respondents used the word "scared" to define fear. For example, for one respondent "fear is being scared and intimidated. It is a feeling of distress and constant worry that something bad is going to happen (R9)." Another defined fear as "an overwhelming sense of anxiety...being scared and alarmed all the time (R11)," while another victim felt that "fear is the presence of imminent danger. It is a feeling of anxiety and being scared (R34)."

While some respondents had difficulty defining fear, in general, victims defined fear as "being scared and worried about their well being." Further, respondents not only expressed concerns about their well-being, but also felt apprehensive and uneasy. For others, fear was "the feeling of being afraid about something. The constant thought of panic and alarm (R23)."

---

9 (R9) denotes the respondent’s response from the survey.
The literature demonstrates that victimization may indirectly affect a person's fear of crime (Scott, 2003). According to Kury (1998), a fear of crime increases uniformly with the seriousness of the offence. Kury (1998) argues that the victims of violent offences have a statistically significant higher fear of crime than non-victims. This homogeneity of results speaks for the victimization perspective; that is the assumption that victims of crimes are more afraid as a consequence of their victimization experience than non-victims. The victims of violent offences suffer from the effects of their victimization for many years or even for the rest of their lives. Proper absorption of the trauma of victimization also offers the greatest chance of combating a fear of crime (Kury, 1998).

It was important, to establish the levels of fear before and after victimization. The survey revealed that, overall, 75 respondents (64 percent) expressed a lack of fear of crime before victimization, while 43 respondents (36 percent) were fearful prior to victimization. This lack of fear of crime before victimization can be attributed to the lack of exposure to crime. In order to establish why some respondents were fearful of crime before victimization, respondents were asked to provide the reasons for their fears. Interestingly, 34 percent of the respondents attributed their fears to the past victimization experiences of their friends or family members. This is an interesting finding because most of the literature on victimization (see, e.g., Keane, 1995; Scott, 2003) does not point to having a close relative or friend who has been victimized as something that affects a person's levels of fear of crime.

The analysis suggests that 76 percent of the 43 respondents who feared becoming a victim of crime had been previously victimized. This is consistent with previous
research which indicates that those who have been victimized in the past tend to fear re-victimization (Kury, 1998; Scott, 2003; Skogan & Klecka, 1997). It is also important to note that certain types of crimes such as robbery, assaults, and sexual assaults generate higher levels of fear of future victimization, because of the direct physical contact between the victim and the assailant (Skogan & Klecka, 1997).

Further, the respondents were asked if they “fear becoming a victim of crime again.” Overall, the results indicate that 60 respondents (51 percent) were fearful of becoming a victim of crime again, while 58 respondents (49 percent) were not fearful. The results are interesting as the sample is almost split 50/50, suggesting that previous victimization may not affect a person’s fear of crime to a significant degree. However, it must be noted that of the total sample of victims of violent offences (N=58), 38 respondents (66 percent) indicated a fear of re-victimization. On the other hand, of the total sample of victims of property offences (N=60), 22 respondents (37 percent) indicated a fear of re-victimization. Clearly, the victims of violent offences are more fearful of re-victimization than victims of property offences; a finding that is consistent within the current literature in the area. As discussed in Chapter Two, researchers have established that the victims of violent offences tend to be more fearful than those who have been victims of property crime (Macmillan et al., 2000; Scott, 2003; Skogan & Klecka, 1997).

Finally, a majority of the respondents attributed their current fear of crime to their victimization. A total of 53 respondents (45 percent) indicated that they were now fearful of becoming a victim of crime because they have been victimized once, and could be victimized again. Additionally, 42 respondents (36 percent) felt that they were now an
“easy target” and therefore felt afraid. Clearly, past victimization influences a person’s level of fear. Arguably, past victimization predisposes a person to psychological distress, resulting in a constant concern for his or her safety (Schafer et al., 2006).

Some respondents felt they were more fearful because of their age, while others attributed their heightened fear of crime to their histories as victims. The majority of respondents believed that they were more likely to be re-victimized, thus increasing their sense of vulnerability.

Safety

Feelings of safety, along with community attachment, play an important role in determining a person’s fear of crime. Renauer (2007) found that residents who felt safe in their neighborhood were less likely to fear crime. To confirm or refute Renauer’s (2007) findings, the respondents were asked to indicate how safe or unsafe they felt around their neighborhood in four given scenarios which were designed based on a five-point Likert Scale\(^\text{10}\). Furthermore, the respondents were asked to identify their levels of concern regarding different crime types. Table 1 below sets out the respondents’ answers with respect to the levels of safety in their neighborhood.

\(^{10}\) The Likert Scale is a rating scale measuring the strength of agreement with a clear statement. It is often administered in the form of a questionnaire used to gauge attitudes or reactions. Subjects are asked to express agreement or disagreement of a five-point scale. Each degree of agreement is given a numerical value from one to five. Thus a total numerical value can be calculated from all the responses. Example of a five-level Likert item: 1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 neither agree nor disagree, 4 agree, and 5 strongly agree.
In the first scenario, the respondents were asked “how safe or unsafe [they felt] outside in their neighborhood during the day.” A total of 118 responses were received, of which 66 respondents (56 percent) responded “very safe,” followed by 38 respondents (32 percent) who responded “fairly safe.” A total of 12 respondents (10 percent) responded “neither safe nor unsafe,” while only two respondents (2 percent) responded “fairly unsafe.” Overall, the majority of the respondents felt safe outside in their neighborhood during the day.

The second scenario asked the respondents “how safe or unsafe [they felt] outside in their neighborhood after dark.” A total of 118 responses were received, and not surprisingly, only 31 respondents (26 percent) indicated that they felt “very safe” outside in their neighborhood after dark. A total of 50 respondents (43 percent) felt “fairly safe,” while 18 respondents (15 percent) felt “fairly unsafe.” A total of 16 respondents (14 percent) felt “neither safe nor unsafe,” while three respondents (3 percent) felt “very unsafe.” By and large, the results suggest that the time of day influences people’s
feelings of safety. Respondents demonstrated higher levels of safety during the day than at night, probably because of a perception that crime flourishes at night.

The third scenario asked the respondents “how safe or unsafe [they] felt inside their home during the day.” The results indicate that 62 respondents (53 percent) felt “very safe,” while 48 respondents (41 percent) felt “fairly safe.” In general, the respondents did not report feelings of fear while inside their homes during the day.

Finally, the respondents were asked “how safe or unsafe [they felt] inside their home after dark.” Overall, respondents felt safe inside their home after dark. A total of 56 respondents (47 percent) felt “fairly safe,” while 51 respondents (43 percent) felt “very safe.” Interestingly, only one respondent felt “fairly unsafe” and one respondent felt “very unsafe.” The respondents who expressed feelings of fear inside their home after dark had been victims of home invasions and their fear can be attributed to the loss of privacy, feelings of vulnerability, and an overwhelming sense of helplessness during the home invasion. Skogan and Klecka (1997) argue that break and enters generate high levels of fear because of the violation of privacy associated with such crimes. Nevertheless, the respondents demonstrated feeling high levels of safety overall in their homes, during both the day and the night. Some respondents felt unsafe outside after dark in their neighborhoods, but it might be that some people may fear the darkness, as opposed to the neighborhood per se.

Respondents were also asked to rate their levels of concern about crime in the area where they lived on a Likert Scale. The list of concerns included the following: “having your home broken into;” “theft from outside property (e.g., garden/grounds, shed, garage),” “having a car or vehicle stolen;” “vandalism or damage to property;”
“drunken people causing problems at night;” “being harassed by street people;” “being assaulted;” and “being sexually assaulted.” Table 4 below sets out the respondents’ answers.

Table 4: Levels of Concern about Crime for Victims of Violent and Property Offences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>Not at all Worried</th>
<th>Not Very Worried</th>
<th>Total Percentage of “Not Worried”</th>
<th>Fairly Worried</th>
<th>Very Worried</th>
<th>Total Percentage of “Worried”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Break &amp; Enter</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20 (17%)</td>
<td>18 (15%)</td>
<td>38 (32%)</td>
<td>65 (55%)</td>
<td>15 (13%)</td>
<td>80 (68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from outside property</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>42 (35%)</td>
<td>29 (25%)</td>
<td>71 (60%)</td>
<td>44 (37%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>47 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Auto</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>12 (10%)</td>
<td>7 (6%)</td>
<td>19 (16%)</td>
<td>76 (64%)</td>
<td>23 (19%)</td>
<td>99 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism of Property</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>42 (36%)</td>
<td>15 (13%)</td>
<td>57 (49%)</td>
<td>56 (47%)</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
<td>61 (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Drunkenness</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>51 (44%)</td>
<td>22 (19%)</td>
<td>73 (63%)</td>
<td>37 (31%)</td>
<td>8 (7%)</td>
<td>45 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment by “Street People”</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>39 (33%)</td>
<td>15 (13%)</td>
<td>54 (46%)</td>
<td>49 (42%)</td>
<td>15 (13%)</td>
<td>64 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>30 (25%)</td>
<td>12 (10%)</td>
<td>42 (35%)</td>
<td>55 (47%)</td>
<td>21 (18%)</td>
<td>76 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>66 (56%)</td>
<td>11 (9%)</td>
<td>77 (65%)</td>
<td>27 (23%)</td>
<td>14 (11%)</td>
<td>41 (34%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although, the respondent’s demonstrated satisfaction with the levels of safety in their neighborhoods, the results suggests that, overall, respondents were concerned about crime. This tends to refute Renauer’s (2007) findings, as he argues that residents who feel safe in their neighborhood are less likely to fear crime.

Interestingly, theft of auto raised the most concern among respondents, followed by residential break and enters. According to the Vancouver Police Department (VPD), thefts of autos had been a problem in the city in both 2006 and 2007. From January 1st, 2007 to December 31st, 2007, a total of 3,875 vehicles had been stolen, compared to 4,281 vehicles stolen in 2006. These thefts of autos were taking place all over the City of
Vancouver, and therefore it was not surprising that the level of concern was high among the respondents.

Respondents were not asked to rate their levels of concerns with respect to theft from auto because, on average, approximately 30 - 40 percent of victims of theft from auto are tourists. Contacting tourists would have been a challenge, and beyond the capacity of this study. Furthermore, throughout the work week, the City of Vancouver experiences a huge influx of commuters who, overall, have a higher chance of becoming a victim of theft from auto as they leave their vehicles unattended during work hours. Since this study was particularly interested in victims who reside in the City of Vancouver, these victims were also excluded from the study.

In the context of violent crime, assaults as opposed to sex assaults and harassment generated high levels of concern. Overall, victims of violent offences were mainly victims of assaults and their concerns were attributed to past victimization and a fear of re-victimization. Harassment by street people or homeless people was also a concern and respondents noted the increase in aggressive panhandlers in Vancouver. Respondents also expressed concern about vandalism to property, while some respondents expressed frustration with mischief to vehicles and city property.

Public drunkenness along with theft from outside property (e.g., sheds and garages) did not generate high levels of concern. This lower level of concern can be attributed to the lack of victimization within these crime types. Very few respondents have had their outside property stolen and none of the respondents mentioned being attacked by a “drunk.”
Finally, sexual assaults did not generate high levels of concern, as the majority of the respondents were males who did not report a fear of sexual assaults. Some women exhibited concern regarding sexual assaults because they were the victims of domestic abuse, assault, and sexual assault. For the domestic abuse cases, the women feared re-victimization by their spouses. This is an interesting finding because most of the literature on victimization (see, e.g., Scott, 2003; and Stanko, 1992) discusses the susceptibility of women to physical abuse and sexual violence in a domestic setting. Further, Scott (2003) argues that women are most afraid of surprise sexual attacks by strangers, despite the fact that research indicates that women are more likely to be victimized by individuals who they know.

**Community Attachment/ Neighborhood**

Although researchers have found that community attachment is a difficult variable to measure (Theodori & Luloff, 2000), some have shown that community attachment and personal integration in community networks play an important role in establishing levels of fear (Wolfe et al., 1968). In fact, Renauer (2007) suggests that residents who do not trust their neighbors and have poor community attachment are more fearful. As a result, seven questions in the survey were devoted to the issue of community attachment and neighborhood in an attempt to determine if a heightened fear of crime is associated with poor community attachment.

Establishing a clear definition of community was very important; however some respondents expressed difficulty with the definition of community and opted to skip the question. Of the 113 definitions received, 18 respondents indicated that they did not know how to define community. The uncertainty about the definition of community is
not surprising, since Theodori & Luloff (2000) argued that community attachment is a difficult variable to measure and there is also little consensus on the actual definition of community.

Once a definition of community was clarified, various themes emerged in the study. First of all, the majority of the respondents believed that community was comprised of the neighborhood and neighbors who lived around the individual. For example, one respondent stated that “community is the group of people who live together on the same street and who share common interests (R27).” Another felt that community is “the neighbors that live on the same street. Community is the surrounding group of people in the neighborhood (R36).” For another respondent “the neighbors are the community where friendship and trust among neighbors has been established (R50).”

Some respondents also believed that community is “a small group of people who share similar interests.” For one respondent “community is a group of people that live in the same vicinity and share similar interest (R13).” Finally, some respondents believed that a community is something associated with personal attachment and belonging. For example, one respondent stated that community “is a place where [they] belong or at least feel [that] they belong (R7).” For another respondent “community is a sense of belonging. A place were one feels attached to those people around them (R29).”

Based on the comments received from the respondents and the emerging themes, it is clear that community was being defined as a place where people belong, share common interests with those surrounding them, and interact with their neighbors on a regular basis. Overall, a large proportion of the respondents commented that community
is about those who live around them, whether those people are family members or neighbors.

Respondents were also asked to provide the total length of residence in their current community. Establishing length of residence was important, since levels of personal integration into networks and communities have a great impact on the human perception of danger (Wolfe et al., 1968). As a result, length of residence would aid in determining if respondents who have lived in the area for extended periods of time had a strong community attachment, and thus exhibited lower levels of a fear of crime. On average, respondents had lived in their current communities for nine years. Surprisingly, when asked if they "knew and interacted with their neighbors," 57 respondents (48 percent) answered "No," while 61 respondents said "Yes" (52 percent). The results were interesting because only about one half of the respondents stated that they had any interaction with their neighbors, even though the respondents had lived in their neighborhoods for extended periods of time. Further, respondents were asked if they trusted their neighbors. A total of 72 respondents (61 percent) answered "No," while 46 said "Yes" (39 percent). Even though the average respondent had lived in his or her community for nine years, the majority exhibited distrust towards their neighbors.

Overall, the respondents were not engaging in community activities and did not trust their neighbors. These results are revisited in Chapter Five, where a comparative analysis explores whether community attachment has an impact upon a person's level of fear. Other research suggests that neighborhood interaction reduces a fear of crime (Renauer, 2007). Additionally, Renauer (2007) argues that when residents feel safe in their neighborhoods they are less likely to fear crime. Further, Wolfe and his colleagues
(1968) discuss how levels of personal integration into networks and communities have an impact on human perceptions of danger. Accordingly, the results of this study, along with the current literature suggest that when people have low levels of community attachment they have heightened levels of a fear of crime.

Lastly, respondents were asked if they felt "a sense of connection with the community." A total of 68 respondents (58 percent) indicated that they did not feel a sense of connection with their community, while 50 respondents (42 percent) indicated that they did feel a sense of connection. In this regard, the type of dwelling where respondents resided was also considered. A total of 55 respondents (47 percent) indicated that they lived in an "apartment," while 63 respondents (53 percent) indicated that they lived in a "house." Even though the majority of respondents resided in a house, the results of this study indicate that, overall, the respondents lacked community attachment. These results are not surprising, given the fact that the majority of the respondents did not trust their neighbors and did not participate in community events.

Since the survey participants lived in Vancouver and the reported crimes occurred in Vancouver it was also important to plot the incidents on a map to visualize incident location; that is, the community within which the crime were occurring. With respect to community attachment, the map reveals that most of the crime being reported by participants took place in high crime concentration areas, where residents were exposed to disruptions of social organization in the neighborhood. Figures 3 reveals that the majority of respondents, who were the victims of violent offences, were victimized in
District Two, specifically in the Strathcona area, which includes the Downtown Eastside (DTES) and Grandview-Woodlands areas. Additionally, a concentration of hot spots was noted between the border of the Central Business District and Strathcona. On the other hand, Figure 3 reveals that a larger proportion of respondents, who were victims of property offences, were victimized in District Three and Four.

According to Christoff and Kalache (2007), the DTES is considered to be the poorest postal code in Canada. In fact, this area is renowned for violence, sex trade activity, drug trafficking and addiction, and it maintains the highest HIV infection rate in North America. Homelessness is also a problem in the DTES. Since 2002, the homeless population has doubled to approximately 2,000. Therefore, it is not surprising that the DTES records the highest number of violent offences as the bulk of the crime is fueled by a 24 hour “open-air market” for drugs (Christoff & Kalache, 2007). Since most of the violent crime reported by participants took place in the poorest area in Vancouver; it would not be surprising that fear levels among these victims were high. Research has shown a direct association between neighborhood safety and fear levels (Renauer, 2007).

For policing purposes the City of Vancouver is divided into 4 geographical zones (also known as Districts). These Districts vary in size and are unique to the types of crimes that take place within each. For example: District One includes the neighborhoods of the West End, Yaletown, Coal Harbour and the Central Business District of Vancouver. The residential population in District One is approx 80,000 people, mostly in high rise apartments. District Two occupies the Downtown Eastside (DTES), as well as Strachona, Grandview-Woodlands and Hastings-Sunrise corridor. District Three is the South East quadrant of the City. Within District Three there is a diverse mix of population, income groups, industries and businesses. District Four is the largest of the Patrol Districts encompassing the communities of Kitsilano, Marpole, Shaughnessy, Kerrisdale, Riley Park, Dunbar, Oakridge, Arbutus Ridge, South Cambie, Fairview and Musqueam. This area comprises 48% of the geographic area of Vancouver. It also has approximately 210,000 residents living in the area or 36% of Vancouver’s population (www.vpd.ca).
The Media

The last section of the survey examined the extent to which respondents were exposed to media images of crime (especially, violence) and the impact that this exposure may have upon their fear of crime. As discussed in Chapter Two, Callanan (2005) and Robert and Doob (1990) have indicated that public knowledge about crime comes directly from the media. The literature also reveals that local news stations have an impact on a fear of crime in high crime neighborhoods (Chiricos et al., 2000). Romer, Jamieson, and Aday (2003) conducted a survey of over 2,300 Philadelphia residences and found that viewing local television news is related to increased fear of and concern about crime. These findings support the current “cultivation theory” which suggests that a
widespread fear of crime is fueled, in part, by heavy exposure to violent dramatic programming on prime-time television.

Chadee and Ditton (2005) suggest that the actual relationship between television watching and a fear of crime is weaker than originally believed. Further, Rice and Anderson (1990) argue that television viewing does not have a direct impact on a fear of crime. In the light of these unclear findings, one objective of this study was to ascertain if the media influences peoples’ levels of fear. The questions in this section were aimed at establishing if people are more fearful when they believe that the news media portrays accurate information about crime.

Respondents were asked how often they watched television, read newspapers, listened to the radio and read news on the Internet. Table 5 provides a breakdown of the respondents’ answers.

Table 5: Frequency of Media Consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Media</th>
<th>FREQUENCY OF USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>76 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>14 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>18 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>50 (42%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, the results indicate that television is the most frequent type of media consumed by the respondents, followed by the Internet. A large percentage of respondents stated that they never used the Internet, because of their age. Some respondents were over 70 years of age, and commented that computers were “over their heads.” These respondents indicated that they watched television, read newspapers, and listened to the radio.
Next, the respondents were asked if “they thought the media portrayed accurate information about crime.” This question was administered to gauge respondent’s attitudes towards the news media. A total of 118 responses were received of which 18 respondents (15 percent) answered “strongly agree,” while 47 respondents (40 percent) answered “agree.” Twenty-six respondents (22 percent) answered that they “neither agreed nor disagreed” that the news media portrayed accurate information about crime. Only 25 respondents (21 percent) answered “disagree,” while two respondents (2 percent) answered “strongly disagree.” Overall, the results suggest that the respondents believed that the news media portrayed accurate information about crime.

Additionally, the respondents were asked how they felt when they heard or read news media reports about crime. A total of 118 responses were received and 56 respondents (48 percent) indicated that they were more aware of their surroundings, especially when crime occurred near their residence. Interestingly, Doob and MacDonald (1979) found that those who watched large amounts of television, and watched crime news, are more likely to fear crime. Further, the results suggest that the news media has an influence on people as 24 respondents (20 percent) indicated that they took the news media reports seriously. Additionally, in the “other” category some respondents stated that the news media over-exaggerates reporting about crime.

Although, the respondents demonstrated that they took news media reports seriously, the majority of respondents were not influenced by the entertainment media (i.e., television shows or video games depicting violence). A total of 97 respondents (82 percent) answered that the entertainment media had no impact, while only 20 respondents (17 percent) indicated that they took the entertainment media programs seriously.
Finally, no one indicated that they were more fearful of becoming a victim after watching entertainment media. This is interesting, as the results contradict the findings of Dowler (2003) and of Romer and his colleagues (2003), that regular viewers of crime dramas are more likely to fear crime.

Even though this study does not demonstrate a correlation between viewing entertainment violence and a fear of crime, the question remains whether the effects of watching TV violence are brief or lasting. Since television can be a powerful influence in developing behavior and much of today's television programming is violent, the question is, then, whether the respondents in this survey have become 'immune' to the horror of violence and whether the respondents have accepted violence as a way to solve problems? The threshold for violence for each respondent was different, as some believed that dramas like CSI and Dog the Bounty-Hunter were not violent, while others did. This study, however, did not ask the respondents to rate television shows based on perceived violence. Such an analysis could, perhaps, be conducted in a follow-up study.

By and large, the research suggests that news media crime reports cause the respondents to be more aware of their surroundings when crime has occurred near their residence. Interestingly, the study finds that the respondents were not influenced by entertainment programs that portrayed violence. The comparative analysis in Chapter Five will help clarify whether those who take news media reports seriously are more fearful but, in general, news media exposure is an influential variable when it comes to a fear of crime.
Summary

This Chapter presented some of the findings of the survey that was administered to victims of violent offences and victims of property offences in Vancouver. The results demonstrate that respondents who most feared becoming a victim of crime had been previously victimized, or had family members or friends who had been victimized. The majority of respondents attributed their current fear of crime to their victimization. Further, the respondents indicated that they took media reports seriously, but entertainment programs on TV that portrayed violence had no impact on their levels of fear of crime.

The next Chapter presents a comparative analysis of the views of victims of violent offences and those of the victims of property offences to determine if one group is more fearful of crime than the other, and if age, gender, community attachment and media exposure affect a person’s fear of crime.
CHAPTER FIVE: A Comparison of the Views of Victims of Violent Offences and the Victims of Property Offences

This Chapter presents a comparative analysis of the views of victims of violent offences and the views of victims of property offences. An analysis was conducted to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between the variables examined and an overall fear of crime. A $t$-test was used in this analysis which assesses whether the means of two groups are statistically different from each other. This analysis is appropriate whenever the means of two groups are compared. For consistency throughout the research a two tailed $t$-test was conducted with alpha (.05). Thus, the decision rule was as follows: if the significance values were less than alpha (.05), reject the null hypothesis ($H_0$); if it was greater than alpha, do not reject ($H_0$). The data below is presented in the order in which it was gathered during the survey.

**Fear Levels of Victims of Violent Offences and Victims of Property Offences before Victimization**

In order to determine if the victims of violent crime were more fearful than victims of property crime before victimization an independent $t$-test was conducted on the mean scores of the two groups. However, prior to the actual $t$-test examination, the results for Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances$^{12}$ were observed. The results of the analysis are set out in Table 6 below.

---

$^{12}$ Levene’s Test assesses whether the variances of the two groups are significantly different from each other (i.e., whether the homogeneity of variance assumption has been violated). If the $p$ value for the Levene’s test (in the “Sig.” column) is greater than .05, then the variances are not significantly different from one another (i.e., the homogeneity of variance assumption has been satisfied), the $t$ value and degrees of freedom in the row marked “equal variances assumed” will be used. If the significance value for Levene’s Test is less than .05, values reported in the row labeled “equal variances not assumed” will be used. Note that the observed $t$ value is the same in either case; the bottom row just uses adjusted df (Sanders et., 2005).
Table 6: Independent *T*-Test for Fear Levels of Victims of Violent Offences and Victims of Property Offences before Victimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>14.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>2.269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the data in Table 6 indicate, the mean score for victims of violent offences was 0.53 and the mean score for victims of property offences was 0.73. In a fear of crime survey, the respondents were asked to answer the following question: “before you were victimized, did you fear becoming a victim of crime?” with a “Yes” or “No” response. The mean indicates that on average victims of property offences were more likely to answer that they were not fearful of becoming a victim of crime prior to victimization.

The standard deviation\(^{13}\) for the victims of violent offences was .503 with a standard error of mean\(^{14}\) of .066. The large standard deviation indicates that the data

---

\(^{13}\) Standard Deviation is defined as “the square root of the average of the squared deviations of the individual data items about their mean (Sanders, Smidt, Adatia, & Larson 2005:76).” In other words, standard deviation is a measure of how far away items in a data set are from their mean.
points were far from the mean. The standard error of mean of .066 indicates that the true proportion of people who were victimized before becoming a victim of crime was close to the estimated true value of 0.53. On the other hand, the standard deviation for the victims of property offences was .446 with a standard error of mean of .058. Since the standard deviation for victims of property offences was smaller it suggests that the data points were clustered closely around the mean. Given that the standard error of mean was .058, this suggests that there was less chance of an error, therefore the results were more precise.

Since the variances were not significantly different, the $t$ test results from the row labeled “equal variances assumed” were selected. In this row, $t$ was -2.274 with $df = 116$. Next, a comparison of “Sig. (2-tailed)” values to alpha (.05) was conducted. The decisions rule was as follows: if the significance value was less than alpha, reject $H_0$; if it was greater than alpha, do not reject $H_0$. In this case, because the significance value of .025 was less than alpha = .05, the null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore, the results of this $t$-test indicate that there was a significant difference between the victims of violent offences and property offences before victimization, $t(116) = -2.274$, $p = .025$. The results indicate that victims of property offences were less fearful of victimization than victims of violent offences. Overall, victims of violent offences were more likely to fear crime before they were victimized.

14 Standard Error of Mean is defined as “the standard deviation of the sampling distribution of sample means (Sanders et al., 2005).” It is the standard deviation of the difference between the measured or estimated values and the true values.
Gender and Levels of Fear before Victimization

Next, an independent t-test on the mean scores was conducted to determine if gender affects the levels of fear before victimization. Additionally, a cross-tabulation was conducted to determine any significant differences between gender and levels of fear before victimization. As mentioned in Chapter Two, the literature suggests that gender is an important variable when examining a fear of crime (Meyer & Post, 2006; Scott, 2003).

Table 7: Independent T-Test for Gender and Levels of Fear before Victimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before you were</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victimized, did you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear becoming a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victim of crime?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before you were</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victimized, did you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear becoming a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victim of crime?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>17.199</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.729</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.703</td>
<td>107.887</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the fear of crime survey, the respondents were asked to answer the following question: "before you were victimized, did you fear becoming a victim of crime?" with a possible "Yes" or "No" response. As the data in Table 7 indicate, the mean score for
male respondents was 1.75 with a standard deviation of .439, while the mean score for female respondents was 1.51 with a standard deviation of .505. Since the standard error of mean for male respondents was smaller, it suggests that the data points were clustered around the mean. Therefore, the mean scores indicate that on average males were not fearful of becoming a victim of crime prior to victimization. The standard deviation for female respondents suggests that females were more likely to be afraid of crime since the standard error of means was not close to the estimated value of 1.51.

The data in Table 7 indicate that the results of the t-test were 2.729 with df = 116. The decisions rule was as follows: if the significance value was less than alpha, reject $H_0$; if it was greater than alpha, do not reject $H_0$. Thus, in this case, because the significance value of .007 was less than alpha = .05, the null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore, the results of this t-test indicate that there was significant difference between the genders, $t(116) = 2.729, p = .007$. Males were less fearful of crime than females before they were victimized.

A cross-tabulation was conducted between genders to determine whether females were more fearful before becoming victims of property crime. Only those respondents who were victims of property crime were selected for this cross-tabulation. The data in Table 8 indicate females who were victims of property offences were more fearful of crime than males. Only one male respondent indicated that he was fearful before victimization.
Table 8: Gender and Levels of Fear before Victimization for Victims of Property Offences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, a cross-tabulation was conducted between genders and levels of fear before the respondents became victims of violent crime. Once again, only those respondents who were victims of violent crime were selected for this cross-tabulation. As the data in Table 9 indicate, more males who were victims of violent offences stated that they were fearful of becoming a victim of crime before victimization.

Table 9: Gender and Levels of Fear before Victimization for Victims of Violent Offences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>Before you were victimized, did you fear becoming a victim of crime?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, in this group, the majority of respondents were males; therefore the results can be attributed to the sample size. Interestingly, the female responses were split 50/50, thus indicating that female fear levels were not overwhelmingly high. However, when these numbers were compared as percentages, the female victims of violent
offences were found to be more fearful: 15 male respondents (41 percent) indicated being fearful, compared to 12 female respondents (50 percent).

**Age and Levels of Fear before Victimization**

As the literature reviewed in Chapter Two indicates, the elderly and women are the most fearful in society (Baumer, 1985; Tulloch, 2000). According to Ferraro and LaGrange (1992), age is the second largest predictor of a fear of crime. Therefore, a cross-tabulation was conducted to determine whether a specific age group was more likely to report their fear of crime before victimization. The cross-tabulation indicated that from the total of 23 respondents who were over 55 years of age, 14 respondents (61 percent) were fearful of becoming a victim of crime, while three respondents (43 percent) who were between the age of 18 to 24 years old indicated that they were fearful of crime before victimization (see Table 10, below).

**Table 10: Age and Levels of Fear before Victimization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your age?</th>
<th>Before you were victimized, did you fear becoming a victim of crime?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24 Years Old</td>
<td>(42.9%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 Years Old</td>
<td>(30.0%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 Years Old</td>
<td>(39.0%)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 Years Old</td>
<td>(14.8%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55 Years Old</td>
<td>(61%)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 10 suggest that respondents over 55 years of age and the youngest respondents who were between 18 to 24 years of age were the most fearful.
These findings are fascinating as the literature discussed in Chapter Two reflects results at both ends of the spectrum. Some scholars have found that the elderly are most fearful (Turcotte & Schellenber, 2007), while others suggest that young people are more fearful than the elderly, especially with respect to violent crimes (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1992). This study supports the finding that both the elderly and the youngest respondents are two groups that demonstrate high levels of fear.

**Fear Levels of Victims of Violent Offences and Victims of Property Offences after Victimization**

Having established that the victims of property offences were less fearful of crime than the victims of violent offences, and that females were more fearful before victimization, it was necessary to determine whether the victims of violent offences and property offences were fearful of becoming victims of crime after victimization. To determine this, an independent t-test on the mean scores of the two groups of victims after victimization was conducted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you now fear of becoming a victim of crime again</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the data in Table 11 indicate, the mean score for victims of violent offences was 1.34 and the mean score for victims of property offences was 1.63. In the fear of crime survey the respondents were asked to answer the following question: “do you now fear becoming a victim of crime again?” with a possible “Yes” or “No” response.

The standard deviation for victims of violent offences was .479 with a standard error of mean of .063. The standard deviation for victims of property offences was .486 with a standard error of mean of .063. The results of the analysis of the two groups suggest that the true proportion of people who fear becoming victims of crime was close to the estimated values of the mean. Therefore, victims of property offences are less fearful than victims of violent offences.

The results of the independent \( t \)-test were \(-3.245\) with \( df = 116\). The decisions rule was as follows: if the significance value was less than alpha, reject \( H_0 \); if it was greater than alpha, do not reject \( H_0 \). In this case, because the significance value of .002 was less than alpha = .05, the null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore, the results of this \( t \)-test indicated that there was a significant difference between the groups, \( t(116) = -3.245\).
3.245, \( p = .002 \). The results support the hypothesis that the victims of property offences were less fearful of crime than the victims of violent offences after victimization.

**Gender and Levels of Fear after Victimization**

Since the results indicated that, overall, the victims of property offences were less fearful of crime than the victims of violent offences, it was imperative to determine whether gender affected the levels of fear after victimization. An independent \( t \)-test was conducted on the mean scores of gender and current levels of fear of crime. Additionally, a cross-tabulation was also conducted to determine whether there were significant differences between gender and levels of fear after victimization.

As the data in Table 12 indicate, the mean for male respondents was 1.63 while for female respondents it was 1.33. In the fear of crime survey, the respondents were asked to answer the following question: “do you now fear becoming a victim of crime again?” with a possible “Yes” or “No” response. The mean scores suggest that, overall; females were more likely to fear becoming a victim of crime after victimization.
Table 12: Independent T-Test Gender and Levels of Fear after Victimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: 735.393, df = 116, Sig. = .393

T-test for Equality of Means:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>3.474</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>3.480</td>
<td>114.549</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standard deviation for male respondents was .485 with a standard error of mean of .061. The standard deviation for female respondents was .474 with a standard error of mean of .064. Both standard deviations were relatively small, thus suggesting that the data points were clustered closely around the mean. The standard error of mean for both groups was also small indicating that the estimate was close to the actual value observed.

Finally the results from the t-test were 3.474 with df = 116, with the following decisions rule: if the significance value was less than alpha, reject $H_0$; if it was greater than alpha, do not reject $H_0$. In this case, the significance value of .001 was less than alpha = .05 and the null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore, the results of this $t$-test indicate that there was a significant difference between genders and levels of fear after
victimization, $t(116) = 3.474, p = .001$. Males were less fearful of crime than females after victimization.

Finally, a cross-tabulation indicated that females were more fearful after victimization. As the data in Table 13 indicate, more males in violent offences reported that they were fearful of becoming a victim of crime after victimization. However, when compared as percentages, the cross-tabulation data indicates that females were more fearful, since 18 female respondents (75 percent) answered that they were fearful, compared to 20 male respondents (59 percent). In general, more male respondents answered that they were fearful, because the overall sample had more male participants.

Table 13: Gender and Levels of Fear after Victimization for Victims of Violent Offences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next cross-tabulation, set out in Table 14 below, indicates the relationship between gender and levels of fear after victimization for victims of property offences. These data indicates that females who were victims of property offences were more fearful of re-victimization than males. A total of 19 female respondents (61 percent) reported being fearful after victimization, compared to only three male respondents.
Table 14: Gender and Levels of Fear after Victimization for Victims of Property Offences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age and Levels of Fear after Victimization

Since the results from the previous t-test indicated that there was no statistical significance between age and levels of fear before victimization, it was important to determine whether age affected the levels of fear after victimization. A cross-tabulation was conducted to determine whether the value of the age variable was associated with, or "contingent" upon, that of fear of victimization.

The cross-tabulation set out in Table 15 indicate that of the 23 respondents who were over 55 years of age, 18 respondents (78 percent) were fearful after becoming a victim of crime. Interestingly, the respondents who were between 18 and 24 years of age also expressed a fear of crime after victimization. When these percentages are compared to the results of the analysis of fear levels before victimization, it is not surprising that these two groups exhibit the highest levels of fear. The results reveal that before and after victimization, the eldest and the youngest groups of respondents demonstrated the highest levels of fear. These findings are consistent with the literature in Chapter Two. Ziegler and Mitchell (2002) have found that crimes against the elderly are more damaging than crimes against other victims because the quality of life of the victims is affected and because it usually takes longer for elderly victims to recover from any
physical injury that may result from, in particular, a crime of violence. However, Moore and Shepherd (2007) have found that respondents between the ages of 16 and 25 exhibit the highest level of fear of personal harm.

Table 15: Age and Levels of Fear after Becoming a Victim of Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your age?</th>
<th>Do you now fear of becoming a victim of crime again</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24 Years Old</td>
<td>Yes: (57%) 4, No: 3, Total: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 Years Old</td>
<td>Yes: (40%) 8, No: 12, Total: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 Years Old</td>
<td>Yes: (51.2%) 21, No: 20, Total: 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 Years Old</td>
<td>Yes: (33.3%) 9, No: 18, Total: 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55 Years Old</td>
<td>Yes: (78.3%) 18, No: 5, Total: 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Yes: 60, No: 58, Total: 118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender and Levels of Concern Regarding Crime

The literature reviewed in Chapter Two indicates that women are more fearful of crime than men (Schafer et al. 2006). As a result, this study provided the respondents with eight scenarios that would enable them to identify their levels of concern, and to determine whether gender was an influencing factor. Of the 118 victims of violent and property offence, 63 respondents (53 percent) were males and 55 respondents (47 percent) were female.

The first scenario asked the respondents whether they were concerned about having their home broken into.

As the data in the Table 16 indicate, females were more worried about having their homes broken into than males. A total of 33 females answered that they were “fairly worried,” while 11 females answered “very worried.” By comparison, 31 males
answered that they were “fairly worried” about having their home broken into, 15 males responded that they were “not at all worried,” and 13 males were “not very worried.”

Table 16: Gender and Levels of Concern Regarding Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>Not at all worried</th>
<th>Not very worried</th>
<th>Fairly worried</th>
<th>Very worried</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, the respondents were asked to identify their level of concern regarding theft from outside property.

As the data in Table 17 indicate, females exhibited higher concern than males. A total of 27 females indicated that they were “fairly worried,” compared to 17 males who indicated that they were “fairly worried” about theft from outside property. Only one male respondent indicated that he was “very worried,” whereas two females indicated they were “very worried.”

Table 17: Gender and Theft from Outside Property (i.e. garden/grounds, shed, garage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>Theft from your outside property? (i.e. garden/grounds, shed, garage)?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all worried</td>
<td>Not very worried</td>
<td>Fairly worried</td>
<td>Very worried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were also asked about their level of concern regarding theft of auto. The literature reviewed in Chapter Four indicated that theft of auto has been a problem
for City of Vancouver residents, so it was important to explore the levels of concern among the respondents.

As the data in Table 18 indicate, overall males reported higher levels of concern than females regarding theft of auto. It seems that males were more concerned about their property, especially their cars, than females. Indeed, a total of 41 males indicated being “fairly worried,” while 11 males indicated being “very worried.” These results are consistent with research conducted by Schafer and his colleagues (2006) who found that men are more concerned about property victimization, than violent crime.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>Having your car or other vehicle stolen?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all worried</td>
<td>Not very worried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, with respect to property damage both genders had mixed responses. Some respondents felt worried, while others were not worried about having their vehicle stolen. In the next scenario, respondents were asked about their levels of concern regarding vandalism and property damage.

As the data in Table 19 indicate, almost an equal number of male and female respondents displayed a lack of concern for vandalism and property damage; in general, no particular group demonstrated elevated levels of concern with respect to these types of crimes. This lack of concern can be attributed to low reported levels of mischief in the City of Vancouver. Based on the statistics produced by the Vancouver Police Department, in 2007 mischief was down 7.7 percent for the entire City of Vancouver.
Table 19: Gender and Vandalism or Damage to your Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vandalism or damage to your property?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all worried</td>
<td>Not very worried</td>
<td>Fairly worried</td>
<td>Very worried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, respondents were asked about their level of concern regarding public drunkenness at night. Overall, the data in Table 20 indicate that the majority of male respondents were not worried about public drunkenness at night. However, a larger proportion of the female respondents indicated being “fairly worried,” and “very worried” by such behavior. This suggests that females feel more vulnerable at night and in places where they are surrounded by drunken strangers. Further, this fear may be attributed to fear of rape, as women’s fears are “overshadowed” by their fear of sexual victimization, even though they were asked about their fears of non-violent (i.e., property) crimes (Meyer & Post, 2006).

Table 20: Gender and Concern about Drunken People Causing Problems at Night

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Drunken people causing problems at night?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all worried</td>
<td>Not very worried</td>
<td>Fairly worried</td>
<td>Very worried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were also asked about their level of concern regarding harassment by homeless people and/or panhandlers. As the data in Table 21 indicate, female respondents by far indicated higher levels of concern.
Table 21: Gender and Fear of Being Harassed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>Not at all worried</th>
<th>Not very worried</th>
<th>Fairly worried</th>
<th>Very worried</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female respondents indicated a great deal of concern regarding harassment. A total of 67 percent of female respondents reported being either “fairly worried” or “very worried” about harassment. Indeed, a total of 30 females reported being “fairly worried,” while seven females reported being “very worried.” Male respondents also exhibited concern, but it was not as significant when compared to the females. Only 19 male respondents (30 percent) indicated being “fairly worried.”

Assault is considered to be the most common violent offence reported to the police. Assault can take place on the street, or at home, between family members, friends or complete strangers. As a result, it was important to determine whether both genders were concerned about being assaulted. As the data in Table 22 indicate, over 50 percent of male and female respondents were “fairly worried,” or “very worried” about being assaulted. Although both genders expressed concern, during the interview males were more concerned about stranger assaults, while females were more concerned about assaults committed by their spouses.

Table 22: Gender and Fear of Being Assaulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>Not at all worried</th>
<th>Not very worried</th>
<th>Fairly worried</th>
<th>Very worried</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some of the male respondents who were the victims of violent crime were in the 18 to 24 age group and were the victims of assault during drinking episodes at bars. On the other hand, females who were victimized in the violent crime category were most often assaulted by their spouses. These findings are interesting, because they demonstrate that women are just as likely as men to be victimized; however, their victimization is considered “hidden.” It is unreported because of a fear of repeated abuse (Scott, 2003; Smith & Torstenson, 1997).

So far the results suggest that females are more concerned about crime that entails physical contact or increased levels of violence. The literature indicates that women are more likely to be forced to engage in sexual acts, thus their fear of rape is transferred onto other types of crime which results in escaladed levels of fear (Ferraro, 1996; Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998). Consequently, this study asked both males and females to express their concern about sex assault.

As the data in Table 23 indicate, overall the majority of female respondents were “fairly worried” or “very worried” about being sexually assaulted. On the other hand, the male respondents showed no concern with respect to sexual assault.

Table 23: Gender and Fear of Being Sexually Assaulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>Being sexually assaulted?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all worried</td>
<td>Not very worried</td>
<td>Fairly worried</td>
<td>Very worried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These findings support the findings in the literature that a fear of sexual assault is predominateley experienced by females and, not surprisingly, that this fear is transferred onto other types of crimes (Schafer et al., 2006; Ferraro, 1995).

**Are the Victims of Violent Offences More Afraid of Crime?**

Next, the fear of crime survey asked the respondents whether they were more afraid of crime than they needed to be. The objective of this question was to establish whether respondents were aware of their perceptions of their fear of crime.

As the data in Table 24 indicate, the mean score for the violent crime group was 2.69, with a standard deviation of 1.063 and standard error of mean of .140. The mean score for the property crime group was 2.93, with a standard deviation of 1.087 and standard error of mean of .140. Since both groups had large standard deviations, the results indicate that the data points were far from the mean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you say that you are</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probably more afraid of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crime than you need to be?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the fear of crime survey, the respondents were asked to answer the following question: “would you say that you are probably more afraid of crime than you need to be?” with the response options of “agree strongly,” “tend to agree,” “tend to disagree,” and “disagree strongly.” For SPSS coding purposes responses were coded as follows: 1 for “agree strongly,” 2 for “tend to agree,” 3 for “tend to disagree” and 4 for “disagree strongly.” The mean score for both groups indicated that, on average, the respondents tended to disagree that they were more afraid of crime than they needed to be.

The results of the t-test were -1.231 with \( df = 116 \) and the decisions rule was as follows: if the significance value was less than alpha, reject \( H_0 \); if it was greater than alpha, do not reject \( H_0 \). Since the significance value of .221 was greater than alpha = .05, the null hypothesis could not be rejected. Therefore, the results of this t-test indicate that there was no significant difference between the victims of violent crimes and property crimes and their concerns with respect to crime, \( t(116) = -1.231, p = .221 \).
Does Gender Influence Thoughts about Crime and Fear?

The above results suggest no statistical significance between the victims of violent crimes and the victims of property crimes with respect to their thoughts about crime and fear. As a result, a t-test was conducted on gender and their thoughts about crime and fear.

As the data in Table 25 indicate, the mean score for male respondents was 3.21, with a standard deviation of .986 and standard error of mean of .124. The mean for female respondents was 2.36, with the standard deviation of 1.007 and standard error of mean of .136. The female respondents had a greater standard deviation, thus indicating that the data points were far from the mean score.

Table 25: Independent T-Test for Gender and More Afraid of Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>4.585</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>4.579</td>
<td>113.19 4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>1.207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the $t$-test were 4.585 with $df = 116$ and the decisions rule was as follows: if the significance value was less than alpha, reject $H_0$; if it was greater than alpha, do not reject $H_0$. Since the significance value of .000 was less than alpha = .05, the null hypothesis was rejected. The results indicate that there was a significant difference between the groups, $t(116) = 4.585, p = .000$. Females were more likely to agree with the statement that they were afraid of crime more than they needed to be. The cross-tabulation set out in Table 26, further supports the findings that females thought they were more afraid of crime than they needed to be.

Table 26: Gender and Thoughts about Crime and Fear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you say that you are probably more afraid of crime than you need to be?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 23 female respondents (42 percent) reported that they tended to agree that they were more afraid of crime than they needed to be. Interestingly, a total of 33 male respondents (52 percent) answered that they “disagreed strongly” with the above statement. Generally, males exhibited less concern about crime than the female respondents.

**Does Age Influence Thoughts about Crime and Fear?**

A cross-tabulation was also conducted between age and the respondent’s thoughts of fear of crime. As the data in Table 27 indicate, respondents who were over 55 years old reported that they agreed that they were more afraid of crime than they needed to be.
Overall, the results show that the oldest respondents reported highest levels of concern with respect to a fear of crime.

Table 27: Age and Thoughts about Crime and Fear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your age?</th>
<th>Would you say that you are probably more afraid of crime than you need to be?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 Years Old</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 Years Old</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 Years Old</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 Years Old</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55 Years Old</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Attachment

Levels of community attachment were also examined in this study. First an independent t-test was conducted to determine if the victims of violent offences and the victims of property offences knew and interacted with their neighbors. The hypothesis was that victims of property offences were more likely to know and interact with their neighbors than victims of violent offences.

Table 28: Independent T-Test of Victims of Property and Violent Offences and Interaction with Neighbors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you know and interact with your neighbors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know and interact with your neighbors?</td>
<td>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</td>
<td>t-test for Equality of Means</td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the data in Table 28 indicate, the mean score for the victims of violent offences was 1.40, with a standard deviation of .493 and standard error of mean of .065. The mean score for victims of property offences respondents was 1.57, with a standard deviation of .500 and a standard error of mean of .065.

The results of the \( t \)-test were \(-1.860\) with \( df = 116 \) and the decisions rule was as follows: if the significance value was less than alpha, reject \( H_0 \); if it was greater than alpha, do not reject \( H_0 \). The significance value of .065 was greater than alpha = .05, and the null hypothesis could not be rejected. The results of this \( t \)-test indicate that there was no significant difference between the victims of violent offences and the victims of property offences and their interactions with their communities.

**Gender and Community Attachment**

To examine further the relationship between gender and community attachment a \( t \)-test was conducted between gender and the levels of interaction with neighbors.
Table 29: Independent *T*-Test of Gender and Interaction with Neighbors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the data in Table 29 indicate, the mean score for males was 1.49 and the mean score for females was 1.47. For SPSS purposes responses were coded as follows: 1 for “Yes” and 2 for “No.” The standard deviation for both groups was .504. The standard error of mean for male respondents was .063, while for female respondents it was .068.

The data in Table 29 indicate that the *t*-test was .208 with *df* = 116. The decisions rule was as follows: if the significance value was less than alpha, reject *H₀*; if it was greater than alpha, do not reject *H₀*. Given that the significance value of .836 was greater than alpha = .05, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The results of this *t*-test indicate that there was no significant difference between the gender of victims and their interactions with their neighbors *t*(116) = .208, *p* = .836.
Age and Community Attachment

As the literature reviewed in Chapter Two indicates, community attachment plays an important role in determining a person’s fear of crime. As a result, a t-test was conducted to determine if older victims were more attached to community. Additionally, a cross-tabulation was created to determine whether victims in a specific age group interacted more with their neighbors.

As the data in Table 30 indicate, the mean score for those respondents who interacted with their neighbors was 3.18, with a standard deviation of 1.162 and a standard error of mean of .149. The mean score for the respondents who did not interact with their neighbors was 3.49, with a standard deviation of 1.120 and a standard error of mean of .148. The mean was based on the respondents’ ages and in SPSS, age was coded as follows: 1 for “18 to 24 years old,” 2 for “25 to 34 years old,” 3 for “35 to 44 years old,” 4 for “45 to 54 years old,” and 5 for “over 55 years old.” As the analysis indicates, respondents who interacted with their neighbors were predominately between 35 and 44 years of age.

Table 30: Independent T-Test of Age and Interaction with Neighbors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your age?</th>
<th>Do you know and interact with your neighbours?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further, the data in Table 30 indicate that the \( t \)-test was -1.478 with \( df = 116 \). The decision rule was as follows: if the significance value was less than alpha, reject \( H_0 \); and if it was greater than alpha, do not reject \( H_0 \). Given that the significance value of .142 was greater than alpha = .05, the null hypothesis could not be rejected. The results of the \( t \)-test indicate that there was no significant difference between the age of victims and their knowledge of, and interactions with, their neighbors, \( t(116) = .208, p = .836 \).

As the data in Table 31 indicate, the oldest respondents did not interact with their neighbors on a regular basis, while respondents between the ages of 35 and 44 seemed to interact with their neighbours the most. This is interesting, as the literature points out that the level of personal integration into networks and communities has an impact on human perceptions of danger (Wolfe et., 1968). Nevertheless, as the findings discussed earlier in this Chapter indicate, this particular age group experienced high levels of fear following victimization. In fact, 20 respondents (49 percent) between the age of 35 and 44 indicated that they were fearful of crime after victimization, while 21 respondents (51 percent) said that they were not fearful. Although this age group reported some community attachment, overall they were fearful of crime.
Table 31: Age and Interaction with Neighbors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24 Years Old</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 Years Old</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 Years Old</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 Years Old</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55 Years Old</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Media’s Portrayal of Information about Crime

Next, an independent t-test was conducted to determine if the victims of violent crime and the victims of property crime believed that media portrayals of crime were accurate. As the data in Table 32 indicate, the mean score for victims of violent offences was 2.26, with a standard deviation of 1.001, and a standard error of mean of .131. The mean score for victims of property offences was 2.80, with a standard deviation of .988, and standard error of mean of .128.

Table 32: Independent T-Test of Victims of Violent and Property Offences and Media’s Portrayal of Accurate Information of Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the media portrays accurate information about crime?</td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances -- \( t \)-test for Equality of Means -- 95% Sig. Confidence Interval of the Difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>Do you think the media portrays accurate information about crime?</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>2.956</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.541</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>-.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>2.956</td>
<td>115.742</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.541</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>-.904</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the fear of crime survey, the respondents were asked the following question: “do you think the media portrays accurate information about crime?” Participants were asked to respond using a Likert scale. In SPSS, the responses were coded as follows: 1 for “strongly agree,” 2 for “agree,” 3 for “neither agree nor disagree,” 4 for “disagree,” and 5 for “strongly disagree.” The mean score of 2.26 for victims of violent offences suggests that respondents believed, on average, that the media portrayed accurate information about crime. On the other hand, the mean score of 2.80 for victims of property offences suggest that this group of respondents believed that the media portrayed somewhat accurate information about crime.

As the data in Table 32 indicate, the results of the \( t \)-test were -2.956 with \( df = 116 \) and the decisions rule was as follows: if the significance value was less than alpha, reject \( H_0 \); if it was greater than alpha, do not reject \( H_0 \). The significance value was .004 which was lower than alpha = .05, therefore the null hypothesis was rejected. The results of this \( t \)-test indicate that there was a significant difference between the groups. The victims of
property offences in particular believed that the media did not portray accurate information about crime, \( t(116) = -2.956, p = .004 \).

**Gender and the Media’s Portrayal of Crime**

An independent \( t \)-test was conducted to determine if gender affected a person’s opinion about the media’s portrayal of accurate information about crime. As the data in Table 33 indicate, the mean score for males was 2.81, with a standard deviation of 1.045, and a standard error of mean of .132. The mean score for females was 2.22, with a standard deviation of .917, and a standard error of mean of .124.

**Table 33: Independent \( T \)-Test of Gender and Media’s Accurate Portrayal about Crime**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the media portrays accurate information about crime?</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the media portrays accurate information about crime?</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>3.496</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>3.245</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>3.274</td>
<td>115.996</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In SPSS, the responses to the question were coded as follows: 1 for “strongly agree,” 2 for “agree,” 3 for “neither agree nor disagree,” 4 for “disagree,” and 5 for
“strongly disagree.” The mean score of 2.81 for males suggests that respondents believed that, on average, the media portrayed somewhat accurate information about crime. On the other hand, the mean score of 2.22 for female respondents suggest that they believed that, on average, the media portrays accurate information about crime.

As the data in Table 33 indicate, the results of the t-test were 3.245 with $df = 116$ with the following decisions rule: if the significance value was less than alpha, reject $H_0$; if it was greater than alpha, do not reject $H_0$. Since the significance value of .002 was lower than alpha = .05, the null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore, the results of this t-test indicate that there was a significant difference between the gender of victims and their views of the media’s portrayal of crime, $t(116) = 3.245, p = .002$. In general, males disagreed with the statement that the media portrayed accurate information about crime.

The findings of the t-test were interesting, because as the data in Figure 4 indicate, a larger proportion of males than females in the sample watched television on a daily basis, yet males were less affected by the media’s reports on crime. Females on the other hand, were more likely to believe that the media portrayed accurate information about crime, even though they were less exposed to the television.

**Figure 4: Television Consumption based on Gender**
The findings in this study also demonstrate that, in general, women are more fearful of crime than men. Gunter, Harrison and Wykes (2003) suggest that, overall, the media depicts more women as victims of crime, while males are depicted as the aggressors. These acts of violence against women are usually sexual in nature. The victimization of women on television has been a concern since it cultivates anxiety among women and increases their overall fear of crime.

Age and the Accuracy of the Portrayal of Crime

A cross-tabulation was conducted to determine whether the respondents believed that the media presented accurate information about crime, based on their age. As the data in Table 34 indicate, the majority of the respondents “tend to agree” that the media portrays accurate information about crime, the largest proportion being those who were over 45 years of age. These findings are interesting, since 18 respondents (78 percent) who were over 55 years of age were fearful of crime after victimization. Gunter, Harrison and Wykes (2003) argue that, often media stories of older people who have been assaulted or robbed misrepresent the broader reality that older people are less vulnerable than other groups in the community to predatory crimes such as household robbery. After all, the results of this study suggest that watching television is correlated with an increased fear of crime among respondents who were over 55 years of age.
Table 34: Age and Media’s portrayal of Information about Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your age?</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Tend to agree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Tend to disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24 Years Old</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 Years Old</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 Years Old</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 Years Old</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55 Years Old</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender and Exposure to Media Reports of Crime**

Next, a t-test was conducted with respect to the relationship between gender and how people felt when they heard or read the media’s reports of crime. As the data in Table 35 indicate, the mean score for males was 2.40, with the standard deviation of 1.034, and standard error of mean of .138. The mean score for females was 2.83, with the standard deviation of 1.079, and standard error of mean of .140.

Table 35: Independent T-Test of Gender and Feelings when Hear Media Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do you feel when you hear or read the media reports about crime? | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>Mean Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>-.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>115.604</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In SPSS, the responses to the question were coded as follows: 1 for “it has no impact,” 2 for “I am more aware of my surroundings, especially when crime occurred near my residence,” 3 for “I take it seriously,” and 4 for “I am more fearful of becoming a victim.” The mean score of 2.40 for males suggest that they felt more aware of their surroundings when crime took place near their residence. On the other hand, the mean score of 2.83 for female respondents suggest that they took the crime media reports seriously.

The values of the t-test results were 1.101 with \( df = 116 \) and the decisions rule was as follows: if the significance value was less than alpha, reject \( H_0 \); if it was greater than alpha, do not reject \( H_0 \). Since the significance value of .273 was greater than alpha = .05, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The results of this t-test indicate that there was no significant difference between gender and the way that victims felt when they heard media reports about crime, \( t(116) = 1.101, p = .273 \). Although, the results are not statistically significant, the mean scores indicate that females take crime media reports seriously. These results are consistent with the current research which demonstrates a
positive relationship between gender, media, and a fear of crime (Gunter, Harrison & Wykes, 2003).

Victims of Violent Offences and Victims of Property Offences and their Feelings about Media Reports of Crime

Lastly, a t-test was conducted to determine if the victims of violent offences and the victims of property offences experienced similar feelings with respect to media reports of crime. As the data in Table 36 indicate, the mean score for the victims of violent offences was 2.48, with the standard deviation of 1.043, and standard error of mean of .134. The mean score for victims of property offences was 2.63, with the standard deviation of 1.062, and standard error of mean of .140.

Table 36: Independent T-Test between Victims of Violent and Property Offences and their Feelings of Media Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.238</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>107.134</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.238</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.465</td>
<td>-.112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In SPSS, the responses to the question were coded as follows: 1 for “it has no impact,” 2 for “I am more aware of my surroundings, especially when crime occurred near my residence,” 3 for “I take it seriously,” and 4 for “I am more fearful of becoming a victim.” The mean score of 2.48 for male victims suggests that they felt more aware of their surroundings when crime took place near their residence. On the other hand, the mean score of 2.63 for female respondents suggest that they took crime media reports seriously.

The results of the *t*-test were $-1.244$ with $df = 116$, and the decisions rule was as follows: if the significance value was less than alpha, reject $H_0$; if it was greater than alpha, do not reject $H_0$. Since the significance value of .068 was greater than alpha = .05, the null hypothesis could not be rejected. The results of this *t*-test indicate that there was no significant difference between the victims of violent offences and the victims of property offences and the way they felt when they heard media reports of crime, $t(116) = -1.244$, $p = .068$.

**Summary**

This Chapter has presented the results of a comparative analysis between the studied variables which include age, gender, past victimization, community attachment, and media exposure. In general, the findings support the current literature on victims' levels of fear of crime. Overall, the study found that females were more fearful and that victims of violent offences were more fearful than the victims of property offences. Age also played an important role in a fear of crime with the oldest and the youngest victims exhibiting the highest levels of a fear of crime. Additionally, this study found no correlation between community attachment and a fear of crime. Overall, the respondents
did not engage in community activities and did not trust their neighbors. More importantly, the majority of the respondents did not feel a sense of connection with their community.

Media exposure was the last variable studied, and it seems that the majority of the respondents took media reports seriously, but were not influenced by the entertainment media. Additionally, the research found that a larger proportion of males than females watched television on a daily basis. Males were less affected by media reports of crime, while females were more likely to believe that the media portrayed accurate information about crime. Lastly, the study found that males rather than females tended to disagree with the statement that the media portrays accurate information about crime; however there was no significant difference between gender and the way the respondents felt when they heard or read media reports of crime.
CHAPTER SIX: Conclusion

This study examined whether age, gender, community attachment, past victimization, and exposure to media affected a person's fear of crime. This study is unique, as the respondents were victims of crime in the City of Vancouver and all the variables discussed in the previous Chapters were studied.

In this Chapter, the findings of the survey along with a comparative analysis of fear levels among the victims of violent offences and the victims of property offences before and after victimization are briefly summarized and discussed. Through the discussion of the research findings, the research question guiding this study, namely whether age, gender, past victimization, community attachment, and media exposure have a significant impact upon, and a strong association with, a person's fear of crime is answered. The contribution of this research to the current literature is also identified and some of the policy and practice implications of this research are discussed. Finally, some directions for future research are identified.

The Research Findings

Gender

This research supports the findings of the current literature that point to women being more fearful of crime than men (Skogan & Maxfield, 1981; Stanko, 1992; Pain, 2001; Sutton & Farrall, 2005; Schafer et al., 2006). The study indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the gender of victims and their levels of fear before victimization. From the total of 118 respondents, 14 percent of male respondents indicated being fearful of crime prior to victimization, while 23 percent of female
respondents indicated that they were fearful prior to victimization. The results revealed that males were less fearful of crime than females before victimization.

Next, a comparative analysis was conducted to determine if there was a correlation between gender and levels of fear after victimization. The results suggest that females were more afraid of crime after victimization. A total of 31 percent of female respondents indicated that they were now fearful of crime after victimization, compared to 19 percent of male respondents. These findings are consistent with the literature on gender and the fear of crime. Ferraro (1995) argues that women are more fearful because they are more likely to be victims of sexual assault, thus the fear of rape is transferred onto other types of crimes. It seems that “women’s higher levels of fear generally hinge on the horror of rape, whether from strangers or acquaintances (Ferraro, 1995:86).” Schafer and his colleagues (2006) have also found that even though women are less likely to be victimized, women are more fearful because of the constant fear of sexual victimization.

Lastly, the study also reveals that overall, females reported that they were more afraid of crime than they needed to be. Within the survey, the respondents were asked to indicate their level of concern with respect to eight different crime scenarios; namely, residential break and enter, theft from outside property, theft of vehicle, vandalism, disturbances, harassment by “street people,” assaults, and sex assaults. Females were primarily concerned about sexual assaults, harassments, and assaults. The findings suggest that females who were concerned about sexual assaults ultimately believed that they are more susceptible to other forms of crime (Ferraro, 1995, Warr, 1984, 1985).
the other hand, young males in particular were concerned about assaults, while older males were more concerned about property crime such as theft of auto.

Although males exhibited concern about crime, especially property crime, their overall level of concern about crime was substantially lower than females. In general, females reported concern about every type of crime, stemming from property crime to violent assault. When women were asked to give the reasons for their heightened concern about crime, they commented that they were easy targets and were more susceptible to victimization, even though researchers have found that women’s risk of victimization is lower than males (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981; Stanko, 1992; Pain, 2001; Scott, 2003).

Age

The current literature maintains that age is a variable that directly influences a person’s fear of crime (Meyer & Post, 2006; Tulloch, 2000). This study conducted a t-test between the age and the levels of fear before victimization; age and levels of fear after victimization; and age and being more afraid of crime needed. Although, no statistical significance was found between age and levels of fear before victimization, while examining descriptive statistics, a cross-tabulation revealed that 61 percent of respondents who were over 55 years of age were fearful of crime before victimization. Surprisingly, 43 percent of respondents, who were between the ages of 18 and 24, exhibited the second highest levels of fear among the respondents. The results are interesting, because the literature reviewed in Chapter Two reveals that respondents between the ages of 16 to 25 years of age exhibit high levels of fear of personal harm (Moore & Shepherd, 2007). Further, the literature suggests that the elderly view
themselves as vulnerable targets, thus causing them to become captives in their own home. Sanderson (2004) argues that this heightened fear generates a “victimization-paradox,” because the elderly are believed to be most fearful, while statistically, the elderly are the least likely group to be victimized (Sanderson, 2004).

The results of the survey also revealed that the elderly were afraid of going out late at night because they felt vulnerable, and felt they were easy targets. According to Pain’s (1995) findings, the elderly are more afraid of public places, because of the fear of victimization. Pain (1995) also points out that the elderly are the least likely to be victimized by strangers. In fact, Turcotte and Schellenberg (2007) suggest that the elderly are more likely to be victimized in their own homes by family members.

Next, an independent t-test was conducted on the mean scores to determine if age affected the levels of fear after victimization. Surprisingly, the results revealed no statistical significance between the two variables. However, a cross-tabulation revealed that a large proportion of respondents who were over 55 years of age indicated that they now feared victimization. Interestingly, many of the youngest respondents, those between the ages of 18 and 24, also expressed fear after victimization. The results suggest that the participants who were the eldest and the youngest exhibited heightened levels of fear.

Pain (2001) argues that even though the elderly are least likely to be victimized; crimes committed against them can be more damaging, thus fueling their fears. For example, being victimized may limit the elderly person’s mobility and therefore their overall quality of life. The elderly feel that they are not able to defend themselves after an attack, and are more likely to fear crime (Pain, 2001; Ziegler & Mitchell, 2002).
Interestingly, Ferraro’s and LaGrange’s (1992) study, found that young people proved to be more fearful than the elderly, especially with respect to violent crimes. Ferraro and LaGrange (1992) argue that respondents between the ages of 18 and 24 displayed higher levels of fear as their risk of victimization is high.

Finally, a cross-tabulation indicated that the majority of respondents who were over 55 years of age were more afraid of crime than they needed to be. From the total of 23 respondents who were over 55 years of age, 16 respondents (70 percent) agreed that they are more afraid of crime than they needed to be. The results of this study indicate that age plays a significant role in a person’s fear of crime and the results are consistent with the current literature on age and a fear of crime.

**Past Victimization**

A key objective of this study was to determine if respondents feared crime prior to victimization. Many studies have examined past victimization and a fear of crime and found no difference between the victims of crime and non-victims with respect to fear levels, while others have found statistically significant results (Keane, 1995). The respondents who feared becoming a victim of crime before victimization admitted that they were fearful because their family and/or friends have been victims of crime, while some respondents indicated that they were fearful of crime because they lived in high crime neighborhoods. Nevertheless, this study, in general, found that respondents lacked a fear of crime before victimization.

Overall, the study revealed that respondents exhibited a 50/50 split, when asked if they feared becoming a victim of crime again. However, when the victims of violent crimes and the victims of property crimes were examined separately, 66 percent of
victims of violent offences indicated a fear of re-victimization, while 37 percent of victims of property offences indicated a fear of re-victimization. The findings of this study support the work of MacMillan and his colleagues (2000) who have found that the victims of violent offences are more fearful of re-victimization than the victims of property offences.

Community Attachment

The literature suggests that community attachment plays an important role in determining a person’s fear of crime (Theodori & Luloff, 2000). Wolfe and his colleagues (1968) argue that people who are integrated into their communities express less concern about crime (Wolfe, Lex and Yancey, 1968). Nevertheless, community attachment is a difficult variable to measure and there is little consensus on the actual definition of community attachment (Theodor & Luloff, 2000), and in this study the respondents had difficulty defining community attachment. For some, community was just a place where they belonged while, for others, it was the surrounding neighborhood.

In general, the majority of respondents (58 percent) did not feel a sense of connection with their community, while only 42 percent of respondents felt a sense of connection with their community. Additionally, 60 percent of respondents indicated that they did not participate in community events. According to Renauer (2007) neighbors are less likely to fear crime when there is cohesion and trust among neighbors. In this study, the results suggest that the respondents did not trust their neighbors and, based on Renauer’s (2007) findings, the respondents from this study should have a heightened level of a fear of crime. Overall, the study reveals that community attachment did not play a significant role in determining a person’s fear of crime. These findings are
somewhat contrary to the literature, since the research suggests that community attachment plays a critical role in establishing a person’s fear of crime (Theodor & Luloff, 2000).

The Media

Research indicates that public knowledge about crime comes directly from the media (Roberts & Doob, 1990). These findings are interesting since some researchers have found a weak positive association between a fear of crime and television viewing, while others strongly believe that media is an influencing factor in determining a person’s fear of crime (Altheide, 1997; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981; Rice & Anderson, 1990).

This study revealed that television was the most frequently consumed medium by the respondents. Overall, a total of 76 respondents (64 percent) indicated that they watched television on a daily basis, compared to only 14 respondents (12 percent) who indicated that they read the newspaper on a daily basis.

The study found that, generally, females believed that the media portrayed accurate information about crime. Interestingly, females were more fearful and they believed that the media portrayed accurate information about crime. Although, a total of 41 males watched television everyday compared to 35 females, the results indicate that females were more influenced by the media. The literature reviewed in Chapter Two suggests that females and the elderly are most influenced by the media (Doob & MacDonald, 1979; Liska & Baccaglini, 1990). Additionally, Chiricos and his colleagues (1997) found that females between 30 and 44 years of age were most fearful after heavy television consumption (Chiricos et al., 1997). This study supports the current literature
as it concludes that there was a positive association between a fear of crime, gender and media consumption.

Although, the literature in Chapter Two suggests that the elderly are the group most influenced by the media (Doob & MacDonald, 1979), this study reveals that overall all age groups believed that the media portrays accurate information about crime. However, more specifically, a total of 14 (61 percent) respondents from the total of 23 respondents who were over the age of 55 tend to agree that the media portrays accurate information about crime. This study indicates the elderly believe that the media portrays accurate information about crime.

Next, the results indicated that gender did not play a significant role with respect to how people felt when they heard or read media reports about crime. The results were somewhat puzzling since female respondents believed that the media reported accurate information about crime, yet media reports did not increase the respondents’ fear levels. Generally, respondents indicated that they were more aware of their surroundings, especially when crime occurred near their residences; however gender did not seem to play an influential role in their responses.

Finally, respondents were asked how they felt when they were exposed to the entertainment media (e.g., violent movies, video games depicting violence). Interestingly, none of the respondents indicated that they were fearful after being exposed to entertainment media. This study found no correlation between a fear of crime and exposure to entertainment media.
Policy Implications

The fear of crime has been a popular topic for analysts. There is no single variable that causes a fear of crime, rather there are multiple causes. Research has indicated that gender and age are the most prevalent variables that cause a fear of crime; however, variables such as past victimization, community attachment and media exposure also influence a person’s fear of crime.

The findings of this study suggest that past victimization significantly influences a person’s fear of crime. Those who reported previous victimization were more fearful than those who were not victimized. Respondents acknowledged that their past victimization made them feel vulnerable. This is problematic, as some victims of crime are unable to maintain a ‘stress free’ life because they continually worry about victimization. Overall, a fear of crime is significantly associated with gender and age. There is little doubt that females and the elderly along with the youngest respondents are most fearful.

Providing the right services to the victims of crime is critical in order to reduce overall fear among people. Further, communities must be provided with proper education by their local police agencies about crime rates, crime trends and program availability. The current gap between police and communities may be the underlying cause of heightened levels of fear of crime as the lack of communication between the two groups leads to many unanswered questions on the part of victims. In fact, the police should be the driving force behind educating communities about crime prevention techniques in order to ensure people feel safe in their homes and on the streets.
The Neighborhood Watch program was introduced, in part, with the intention of reducing a fear of crime by urging the citizens in neighborhoods to come together and discuss neighborhood problems. The objective of these meetings was to allow citizens to formulate plans and establish regular surveillance in their neighborhoods. Participation in Neighborhood Watch programs would help residents to feel less fearful since they would be more aware of the events taking place in the neighborhood. Although, Brantingham & Brantingham (1990) believe that this program is capable of reducing fear, but not crime, the majority of people when asked to participate refused. This phenomenon is puzzling, because people are concerned about fear and crime, yet they refuse to participate in such programs. Even though programs may be in place, without public participation these programs cannot function.

Additionally, foot patrol is among the various initiatives that were launched by police agencies to reduce crime and a fear of crime. The Vancouver Police Department (VPD) has designated “beat” police officers to foot patrol only. The objective of these “beat” members is to increase police visibility and to improve community safety. Rosenbaum and Lurigio (1994) believe that foot patrol officers play a vital role within the community as they attend meetings, and interact with the residents of the community. Foot patrol officers provide residents with crime prevention tips and provide accurate information about crime, thus making the community more aware of their crime problems.

Currently, there is a gap between victims, victim services and the police. Police are not providing victims with vital information with respect to victim services that are available. While attending police-related calls, police officers provide victims with a
business card with a file number. Most of the time, officers fail to mention the victim services programs that are available. A more organized system must be developed involving victim services and the police. Victims are rarely informed about the services that are available and officers rarely follow up on the well being of the victims after a report has been filed. The lack of concern by the police for the victims of crimes increases the general public's dissatisfaction with the police.

With respect to victim services, police agencies such as the VPD should revisit their policies to ensure that victims of crime are given the necessary information after victimization. Currently, the victim services unit is comprised of two case workers who work 5 days a week with regular work hours. Additionally, there is one "on call" case worker, who assists patrol members outside the work hours of the victim services unit. Staffing is insufficient in the unit, given the number of calls that patrol members attend on a daily basis. In order to address the problem, the VPD must first increase staffing in the unit, before it can provide proper services for victims of crime.

Next, patrol members need to ensure that they are informing the victims of crime about the importance of victim services programs. This, perhaps, is a training issue, with patrol members being educated by the victim services unit. It seems that patrol members in the VPD know that victim services exist, but they are unaware of the function of the unit. Providing information sessions on a regular basis is, perhaps, something that the VPD should consider in order to address the lack of knowledge that patrol members have with respect to victim services programs. Along with regular information sessions, the victim services unit should provide patrol members with pamphlets which discuss the current programs that are available for victims of crime. Currently, the victim services
unit does not disseminate any updated information with respect to available programs and services.

In order to reduce overall fear of crime among victims in Vancouver, VPD patrol members must be well informed about the various services available and the victim services unit must expand in order to provide sufficient services. Once the police are able to demonstrate to the victims of crimes that they are concerned about their well being, victims will feel less fearful since they will be re-assured that a police agency has made an effort to provide the best service.

**Future Research Directions**

Although, the results of this research study were consistent with the literature on a fear of crime and its influencing variables, additional future research should be conducted in several areas. First, this study revealed that community attachment did not play a major role in influencing a person's fear of crime. Since, the literature reviewed in Chapter Two suggests that community attachment has a major impact on a person's fear of crime, it is imperative that future research examines, in detail, a fear of crime and community attachment. Specifically, such research should explore crime reduction programs within the community (e.g., The Neighborhood Watch). The future study should explore whether people who participate in crime reduction programs are more attached to their community and whether these programs reduce a fear of crime.

Next, more research must be conducted on a fear of crime in general. Participants should be randomly selected based upon their specific age groups and questioned specifically about a fear of crime. The study should not contain respondents of various age groups, but rather of one specific age group. Further, the questions should
include topics such as: what is fear; what causes people to be fearful; how people can protect themselves; and why people are fearful? This study would provide insight into how people in specific age groups perceive a fear of crime and what actions can be taken to reduce a fear of crime. Future research on a fear of crime should focus on no more than two variables at a time, thus allowing for more precise and in-depth analysis.

More research must be conducted, with respect to crime and exposure to the entertainment media. Some studies have identified an association between exposure to violence in entertainment and violent behavior, but have not revealed that media exposure causes violent behavior (Brown, 1996). Television continues to be extremely influential, and much of today’s television programming is violent. The question thus remains, whether the respondents have become immune to violence. Further research is needed to measure violence and which television shows respondents find violent.
Introduction: Good morning/Good afternoon, my name is Magda Marczak and I am District 1 Crime Analyst with the Vancouver Police Department. The Department is surveying people who have recently been involved in incidents that required police attendance. The aim of this survey is to determine your satisfaction with the services you received and your fear of crime. Your name has been randomly selected and your responses to the survey will be recorded anonymously.

The survey consists of 54 questions and it will take approximately 20-25 minutes to complete.

Would you like to participate in this survey? YES ☐ NO ☐

Background

(The following background questions will be extrapolated from PRIME Go without asking the respondents)

1. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female

2. What is your age?
   - 18 – 24 Years Old
   - 25 – 34 Years Old
   - 35 – 44 Years Old
   - 45 – 54 Years Old
   - Over 55 Years Old

3. What is your ethnic background?
   - Aboriginal People
   - Asian
   - Black
   - Caucasian/White
   - East Indian
   - Hispanic
   - Middle Eastern
   - Other: (Please Specify)
   - Unknown
Definition of Fear

4. Before you were victimized, did you fear becoming a victim of crime?
   - Yes
   - No

5. If (yes to Q5), why did you fear becoming a victim of crime?
   - My neighborhood has a high crime concentration
   - Media’s reporting about crime
   - My family/friends have been victims of crime
   - Other: (Please Specify)

6. How did you feel right after you have been victimized?
   - Angry and upset
   - Afraid that I was going to be victimized again
   - Cautious
   - The crime had no impact on how I felt
   - Other: (Please Specify)

7. Do you now fear becoming a victim of crime again?
   - Yes
   - No

8. If (yes to Q7), why are you now more fearful of becoming a victim of crime?
   - I can be a victim again, as I have been victimized once
   - I am an easy target
   - I live in an area that has a high incidence of crime
   - Other: (Please Specify)

9. How do you define fear?
   (Open Ended)

Safety

10. How safe or unsafe do you feel outside in your neighbourhood during the day?
    - Very Safe
    - Fairly Safe
    - Neither Safe nor Unsafe
    - Fairly Unsafe
    - Very Unsafe
11. How safe or unsafe do you feel outside after dark in your neighbourhood?
   - Very Safe
   - Fairly Safe
   - Neither Safe nor Unsafe
   - Fairly Unsafe
   - Very Unsafe

12. How safe or unsafe do you feel inside your home during the day?
   - Very Safe
   - Fairly Safe
   - Neither Safe nor Unsafe
   - Fairly Unsafe
   - Very Unsafe

13. How safe or unsafe do you feel inside your home after dark?
   - Very Safe
   - Fairly Safe
   - Neither Safe nor Unsafe
   - Fairly Unsafe
   - Very Unsafe

14. Do you generally avoid going out alone after dark?
   - Yes
   - No
   - If Yes, why?

15. Do you generally avoid answering the door after dark?
   - Yes
   - No
   - If Yes, why?

16. Do you avoid groups of local young people?
   - Yes
   - No
   - If Yes, why?

17. Do you avoid using public transport alone after dark?
   - Yes
   - No
   - If Yes, why?

18. Do you avoid leaving your house unoccupied?
   - Yes
   - No
   - If Yes, why?
19. Would you say that you are probably more afraid of crime than you need to be?
   ○ Agree Strongly
   ○ Tend to Agree
   ○ Tend to Disagree
   ○ Disagree Strongly

Concerns about crime in the area where you live: -
Identify your level of concern from the following list:

20. Having your home broken into?
   ○ Not at all worried
   ○ Not very worried
   ○ Fairly worried
   ○ Very worried

21. Theft from your outside property (i.e. garden/grounds, shed, garage)?
   ○ Not at all worried
   ○ Not very worried
   ○ Fairly worried
   ○ Very worried

22. Having your car or other vehicle stolen?
   ○ Not at all worried
   ○ Not very worried
   ○ Fairly worried
   ○ Very worried

23. Vandalism or damage to your property?
   ○ Not at all worried
   ○ Not very worried
   ○ Fairly worried
   ○ Very worried

24. Drunken people causing problems at night?
   ○ Not at all worried
   ○ Not very worried
   ○ Fairly worried
   ○ Very worried
25. Being harassed by street people?
   - Not at all worried
   - Not very worried
   - Fairly worried
   - Very worried

26. Being assaulted?
   - Not at all worried
   - Not very worried
   - Fairly worried
   - Very worried

27. Being sexually assaulted?
   - Not at all worried
   - Not very worried
   - Fairly worried
   - Very worried

Community Attachment/Neighborhood

28. How long have you lived in your community?

29. Do you know and interact with your neighbours?
   - Yes
   - No

30. How often do you speak to your neighbours?
   - Very Often (more than 5 times a week)
   - Often (approx 3 times a week)
   - Sometimes (approx 2-1 time a week)
   - Rarely (once a month)
   - Never

31. Do you trust your neighbours (I.e. would you give your house keys to your neighbour?)
   - Yes
   - No

32. How do you define community?
    (Open Ended)

33. Do you participate in community events, volunteer work?
   - Yes
   - No
34. Do you feel a sense of connection with your community? (I.e. Do you interact with your neighbours?)
   - Yes
   - No

Media

35. How often do you watch television?
   - Everyday
   - 3-6 times a week
   - 1-2 times a week
   - Rarely (Once every two weeks)
   - Never

36. How often do you read the newspaper?
   - Everyday
   - 3-6 times a week
   - 1-2 times a week
   - Rarely (Once every two weeks)
   - Never

37. How often do you listen to the radio?
   - Everyday
   - 3-6 times a week
   - 1-2 times a week
   - Rarely (Once every two weeks)
   - Never

38. How often do you read the news on the internet?
   - Everyday
   - 3-6 times a week
   - 1-2 times a week
   - Rarely (Once every two weeks)
   - Never

39. What do you watch the most on television?
   - News (Local/International News)
   - Entertainment
   - Reality TV Shows
   - Soap Operas
   - Talk Shows
   - Sports
   - Other (Please Specify)
40. What do you listen to the most on radio?
   - News (Local/International News)
   - Entertainment
   - Music
   - Soap Operas
   - Talk Shows
   - Sports
   - Other (Please Specify)

41. What are you particularly interested in when you read the newspaper?
   - News (Local/International News)
   - Entertainment
   - Sports
   - Classified
   - Stock Exchange
   - Other (Please Specify)

42. What are you particularly interested in when you read the news on internet?
   - News (Local/International News)
   - Entertainment
   - Sports
   - Classified
   - Stock Exchange
   - Other (Please Specify)

43. Do you think the media portrays accurate information about crime?
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

44. How do you feel when you hear or read the media reports about crime?
   - It has no impact
   - I am more aware of my surroundings, especially when crime occurred near my residence
   - I take it seriously
   - I am more fearful of becoming a victim
45. How do you feel after watching entertainment programs on TV that portray violence and crime?
   - I has no impact
   - I am more aware of my surroundings, especially when crime occurred near my residence
   - I take it seriously
   - I am more fearful of becoming a victim
   - Other: ____________

46. Which news sources are your favourite?
   - The Province
   - The Vancouver Sun
   - BCTV
   - Global
   - CKNW
   - Other: ________________

47. What is your “One” favourite TV show?
   - Prison Break
   - CSI
   - American Idol
   - “Dog the Bounty Hunter”
   - General Talk Shows
   - Survivor
   - Friends
   - Jeopardy
   - Other: ________________

Satisfaction with the Vancouver Police Department (VPD)

48. During your dealing with the Vancouver Police Department (VPD), how satisfied were you with the service you received?
   - Very satisfied (insert comment here, why?)
   - Satisfied
   - Somewhat satisfied
   - Not satisfied at all (insert comment here, why?)

49. Were the attending Police Officers helpful?
   - Yes (insert comment here, why?)
   - No (insert comment here, why?)

50. Was the incident in which you were involved a matter that required you to call 911?
   - Yes
   - No
51. If (yes to Q33), when did the police arrive after your 911 call?
   - Within few minutes
   - Within few hours
   - Next day
   - In couple of days
   - Never

52. Did the members of the VPD inform you about the Victim Services Unit and its duties?
   - Yes
   - No

53. Did the VPD service help you to feel safe again after being victimized?
   - Yes (insert comment here, why?)
   - No

54. If (no to Q36), why not?
   - (Open-Ended)

Thank you for taking this survey
Appendix B
Consent Form

This study involves a survey designed to understand why people fear of crime. Especially it will focus on gender, age, past victimization, community attachment, ethnic background and exposure to the media as variables that impact fear of crime. The study is being conducted by District Crime Analyst, Magda Marczak from the Vancouver Police Department. No deception is involved, and the study involves no more than minimal risk to participants (i.e., the level of risk encountered in daily life).

Participation in the study typically takes 20-25 minutes. Participants in the survey will be asked a series of questions about crime, their experiences of being victims of crime, their fears and police satisfaction.

All responses are treated as confidential, and in no case will responses from individual participants be identified. Rather, all data will be transcribed and responses in the findings will not identify the respondents. The results of this study can be obtained from Ms. Marczak by contacting her at Magdalena.marczak@vpd.ca (604) 678-3797.

Participation is voluntary. Refusal to take part in the study involves no penalties and participants may withdraw from the study at any time.

If participants have further questions about this study and the results of this study, they may contact Volker Helmuth, Planning & Research Section, Vancouver Police Department (604) 717-2682.

If participants wish to file a complaint or address their concerns, they may contact Volker Helmuth, Planning & Research Section, Vancouver Police Department (604) 717-2682.
October 13, 2006

Office of Research Ethics
Strand Hall 2105
Simon Fraser University
8888 University Drive
Burnaby, B.C
V5A 1S6

Attention: Barb Ralph, Ethics Officer

Dear Ms. Ralph:

Re: Masters Program Research

I write at the request of Simon Fraser University student Ms. Magda Marczak, of the School of Criminology, Master of Arts Program. Ms. Marczak is an employee of the Vancouver Police Department. Specifically, Ms. Marczak is the Research Assistant in the Department’s Planning and Research Section, reporting directly to me.

In support of the Department’s Strategic Plan 2004-2008 goal to improve community safety, Ms. Marczak has been assigned to conduct research examining the relationship between crime victimization and fear of crime. The primary goal of the research is to assist the Department in determining solutions to prevent re-victimization.

In accordance with the provisions of the provincial Freedom of Information & Protection of Privacy Act (the "Act"), any person may, for his or her private use, access records documenting the results of Departmental research (subject to certain conditions and restrictions). Ms. Marczak has requested private use access to the records she will create in the course of her research. Ms. Marczak will be able to access the Departmental
records documenting her research methodology and results, in order to use the same to fulfill Masters program requirements in the School of Criminology. It should be noted that, pursuant to disclosure restrictions contained in the Act, the records accessible to Ms. Marczak for academic use will not disclose any personal information, i.e., names or any other personal identifiers.

Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me at your convenience. I can be reached by telephone at 604-717-2682.

Sincerely,

Volker Helmuth,
Barrister & Solicitor
A/Director,
Planning & Research Section
October 26, 2005

To: Daryl Wiebe, Inspector 1162
i/c Planning & Research Section

From: Magda Marczak, Research Assistant
Planning & Research Section

Subject: SFU Master’s Thesis

It is likely that almost all people experience some fear of crime in their lives, whether this fear is constant, or fleeting. Some of the researched variables include age and gender, and community attachment.

Many researchers have found that both women and the elderly are more fearful of crime. This occurs due to such things as oppression, insecurity, past victimization, and vulnerability. People who feel detached from their communities are also more likely to fear crime, as they are less likely to perceive social control in their neighborhoods. Some individuals feel less safe in their own areas, and rely less on the idea of accepted social norms among their neighbors.

I’m presently enrolled in the Master Program of Arts Degree in the School of Criminology at Simon Fraser University. I wish to conduct my Master’s research topic on fear of crime. My research will focus on questions such as are women in fact more fearful than men, are the elderly more fearful than the young, and does community attachment have any bearing on an individuals fear of crime? My research hypothesis is that age, gender and community attachments are factors that affect levels of fear.

This research will benefit the Vancouver Police Department (VPD) because the study will examine the relationship between the victimization and fear of crime. The Vancouver Police Department Strategic Plan 2004-2008 purports that one of the core activities of the VPD should be improving community safety. The Vancouver Police Department in conjunction with the community are working together to maintain a safe
and secure community. Programs such as Block Watch, Neighborhood Policing, and Victim Services are found in place to enhance community safety and to reduce crime and the fear of crime.

I propose to extrapolate data relating to one 24 hour period of occurrence reports from Police Records Information Management Environment (PRIME) for the study. For example: In the month of September 2005, for each day, there were 306 reports created on average. For the purpose of this thesis a day will be selected randomly to generate the sample. Each General Occurrence Report (GO) will be perused to determine offence type, victim identity (male/female), and victim age.

In order to measure fear of crime, I would like to contact each victim and conduct a telephone interview. I would present myself as an employee of the Vancouver Police Department and I would inform the victims that I am conducting a 10-15 minute survey on the fear of crime and their perception of crime. This survey would be comprised of closed-ended questions, the responses to which would remain anonymous. At no time would the name of the victim ever be placed on the survey. The questions will be submitted to VPD and Simon Fraser University Ethics Review Board for approval prior to use.

Moreover, it is necessary for me to contact each victim as this research will aid the Vancouver Police Department in finding solutions that will prevent re-victimization. When contacted, the victim will be informed that Vancouver Police Department is trying to assist them with the reported crime. At the same time, the questionnaire can be used to ask how satisfied they have been with the Police Department’s Services.

This research will assist the Vancouver Police Department Victim Services Unit, which provides assistance to victims of all types of crime and other traumatic incidents in the City of Vancouver. Their services include emotional support, general criminal justice information as well as case specific updates, practical assistance and support. The Unit can benefit from this study because it will provide an idea on how people feel after they have been victimized and whether their fears of being re-victimized remain high. It may also provide the Departments Executive with statistical information to support staffing requests for victim assistance workers.

Thank you,

Magda Marczak B.A. (Hons.)
Research Assistant
Vancouver Police Department
Planning and Research Section
604-717-2684
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