5-2002

Fear of Crime and Perceptions of Law Enforcement Among American Youth

Bruce K. Bayley
Utah State University

FEAR OF CRIME AND PERCEPTIONS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AMONG AMERICAN YOUTH

by

Bruce K. Bayley

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Family Life/Family and Human Development

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

2002

ABSTRACT

Fear of Crime and Perceptions of Law Enforcement

Among American Youth

by

Bruce K. Bayley, Doctor of Philosophy

Utah State University, 2002

Major Professor: Dr. Brent C. Miller
Department: Family and Human Development

Fear of crime and the public's satisfaction with police has been a focus of criminologists for a number of years. Most studies, however, have focused on the general population as a whole. What is not known is how fearful American youth are of the crime in their neighborhoods and how they perceive those in law enforcement. The purpose of this study was to explore this subgroup of the population and to begin the investigation of youths' fear of crime and their perceptions of law enforcement.

Using a national sample of 1,897 youth ages 16-25 collected from 12 cities throughout the United States, data were analyzed to explore the strength of demographic and community variables as they related to youths' fear of crime and perceptions of law enforcement.

Results for fear of crime indicate that in general, American youth are not very fearful of crime in their neighborhoods. Older youth (18-25) tended to be more fearful

than younger youth (16-17), females were more fearful than males, married youth were more fearful than non-married youth, youth living in the Northeast census region were the most fearful of the four census regions, and all non-White youth were more fearful of crime when compared to Whites. Youths' overall satisfaction with police indicated that in general, American youth were satisfied with police in their neighborhoods, with White youth and those youth with some college education being most satisfied with police.

When addressing the variance explained by demographic and community variables, youths' perceptions regarding their quality of life accounted for the most variance in both fear of crime and satisfaction with police. The strength of this predictor variable was so strong in fact, that other demographic and community variables were negligible by comparison.

(152 pages)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

No individual acquires an advanced degree without a team of supporters. I would like to begin by thanking my committee members: to my major professor, Brent C. Miller, for bringing my family and me to Utah State University, supporting my goals and aspirations, and above all, having the confidence in me to succeed; to Randy Jones for his supportive nature and friendship, and of course his weekly movie reviews; to Marcelo Diversi for his encouragement, friendship, and positive way of addressing both life and adolescence; to Gary Kiger for help and advice whenever asked; and finally, Richard Krannich for his critical eye and positive conversations at the gym.

Most of all, however, I must thank my family: to my wife, Heather, and our son, Erik, whose love, support, and encouragement made this degree our degree -- without you, none of this would have been possible; to my parents, Don and Mary, for never giving up on me and constantly showing the world the epitome of good parenting; to my brother Brian, for his never ending quest for excellence; and finally, to my mother-in-law, Kathleen and grandfather Morris for reminding me of how truly special people can be.

Bruce K. Bayley

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Crime, and the criminal justice systems charged with overseeing perpetrators, are important elements in contemporary society (Siegel, 1983). While serious crime rates in the United States have declined for nearly a decade (Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI], 2001), there is continuing concern for developing more effective means to investigate the nature and extent of criminal activities, and to improve the lives of youth and the ways they interact with local law enforcement. One such method used to gauge these relationships is the administration of public opinion polls.

Public opinion polls are, in essence, a reflection of "The citizenry's desire to make its will known and its leaders' desire to understand the will of the people" (Flanagan, 1996, p. 2). These "powerful democratic symbols in contemporary society" (Herbst, 1993, p. 38) are so persuasive "that they work symbolically on two levels at once. They can provide scientifically derived data, and they are representative of general public sentiment" (p. 38).

Originally designed to measure the American political climate during the 1820s (Moore, 1992), public opinion polls are now used by researchers and the criminal justice community to provide historical records of public sentiment towards matters central to crime and justice (Hindelang, 1974). Hindelang (1974) further argued that the investigation of public opinion could provide insights into impending public pressure for legislative changes within the criminal justice system. These sentiments, along with public opinion regarding the causal factors of criminal activities, have been "a central feature of

social control policy for centuries" (Rennie, 1978, p. 34). Through the use of national survey data, this study investigated youths' perceptions of fear of crime and their satisfaction with law enforcement, thereby shedding light on a topic that is not well understood.

Problem Statement

Public opinion polls and surveys probing societal sentiments about crime and satisfaction with law enforcement have traditionally focused on the general population. No survey to date, however, has specifically addressed the views and concerns of the growing youth population within the United States. Very little is known, therefore, about how young people feel regarding this established social institution and their attitudes about crime. With an estimated 42,928,430 youth, ages 15-25, currently living in the United States (U.S. Census, 2001a), there is a growing need to understand perceptions of crime and law enforcement among these younger members of society, and the impacts their attitudes and perceptions could have on future public policy (D. R. Longmire - professor of criminal justice at Sam Houston State University, personal communication, October 23, 2001). To this end, local police and sheriff departments have begun to acknowledge the importance of improving police/youth interactions through the implementation of over 12,577 school resource officers (SRO) and community oriented programs such as Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) (U.S. Department of Justice, 2001a, 2001b). Baseline data on youths' perceptions of crime and law enforcement, however, are lacking. Without a better understanding of how youth view crime and those charged with its

suppression, training programs (such as the school resource officer) and community resources (such as D.A.R.E.) may fail to address the needs and concerns of those they are intended to serve. Likewise, through the continual collection of such data, a systematic evaluation of programs and resources can both evaluate existing efforts and ultimately improve the lives of American youth by more effectively targeting their fears of crime and improving their interactions with those who enforce the laws. The purpose of this study, therefore, was to lay a foundation from which further research on youths' fear of crime and perceptions of law enforcement can be established.

Definition of Crime

Individuals who study crime often align themselves with particular schools of thought and because of this diversity, they define criminal actions differently (Hagan, 1987; Siegel, 1983). For example, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) prefer to focus on the nature of crime, defining a criminal action as "acts of force or fraud undertaken in pursuit of self-interest,"while Herman and Julia Schwendinger (1975) have suggested that crimes are violations of the historically determined rights of individuals. Sociologist Emile Durkheim (1950) went as far as to suggest that criminal activity may be a normal, positive product, necessary to a healthy society, characterizing crime in the following manner:

> Imagine a society of saints, a perfect cloister of exemplary individuals. Crimes, properly so-called, will there be unknown; but faults which appear venial to the layman will create there the same scandal that the ordinary offense does in ordinary consciousness. If then, this society has the power to judge and punish, it will define these acts as criminal and will treat them as such (p. 69).

For the purposes of this study, crime will be defined using the more popular position of linking crime with criminal law. As stated by Sutherland and Cressey (1970, p. 8):

> Criminal behavior is behavior in violation of criminal law...it is not a crime unless it is prohibited by the criminal law [which] is defined conventionally as a body of specific rules regarding human conduct which have been promulgated by political authority, which apply uniformly to all members of the classes to which the rules refer, and which are enforced by punishment administered by the state.

For the purposes of this study, therefore, crime is a legal rather than a social concept where acts that violate criminal law are punishable by the state, rather than violations of societal norms or mores than have not been codified by the legislative system.

While the term "crime" is often seen as a universal construct, an important distinction must be made when discussing violations of criminal law by adults and minors (in most states, those under the age of 18). In a technical sense, minors cannot commit crimes, they commit delinquent acts (Conklin, 2001; Hagan, 1987). Their acts are often identical in nature to those committed by someone 18 or older, with the exception of status offenses – violations of the law only because the offender's age is under that required to be considered a legal adult.

Other exceptions are extreme violations of criminal law that allow a juvenile to be tried as an adult. Many states require the offenders to be a minimum age for this to occur, and once their case has been transferred to the adult system, they are no longer viewed as minors in the eyes of the law (Cox & Conrad, 1996; Siegel & Senna, 1994). For the purposes of this study and for the sake of simplicity, the operational definition for the term "crime" will be used interchangeably between adults and minors.

Law Enforcement

Law enforcement at the local, state, and federal levels, is often identified by the jurisdictional powers of each agency. Jurisdictional powers refer to the geographic and legal boundaries from which officers are charged with maintaining public order, deterring criminal activities, and the enforcement of criminal law (Schmalleger, 1997). Local law enforcement primarily consists of police departments that have jurisdiction over incorporated areas, and sheriff departments, that have jurisdiction over unincorporated areas. State law enforcement often aids local agencies and typically maintains jurisdiction over criminal offenses that encompass a statewide focus (such as patrolling state highways). Federal law enforcement is primarily charged with overseeing crimes against the federal government. Federal agencies can, however, claim jurisdiction from state or local agencies when such jurisdiction might benefit the federal government, or when a crime requires expertise and or resources unavailable to state or local officers (Conklin, 2001).

Theoretical Framework

Human perceptions do not have a universally accepted definition. Defined loosely, "a percept is "symbolized"; it represents a constructed bit of information created from the synthesis of present sensory experience with past memory and generalizations contained within experientially derived mental models" (Siegel, 1999, p. 166). In other words, perceptions are a comparison of "incoming information with memories from prior

experience" that are then categorized by the brain (p. 166). These categorizations of information, or perceptions, form a subjective reality that may or may not be based upon objective reality. In either case, however, a perceived experience or impression is still viable and as such, offers a glimpse into how people view their environment and those around them (Dryfoos, 1990).

Ecological Theory

This study used Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory to address the order in which groups of predictor variables were entered into multiple and hierarchical multiple regression analyses. Individual variables were entered first, followed by neighborhood and community variables.

Ecological theory addresses interactions through multiple contexts (Bronfenbrenner, 1989; Martin & Colbert, 1997). As such, ecological theory assumes that interactions among individuals are interdependent, where two or more members of one system will affect and be affected by other system elements.

Among the major assumptions of ecological theory are:

1. Individuals and groups are both biological and social in nature - This assumption places an emphasis on the biophysical environment in which people live. A biological and geographical orientation, rather than a mechanistic perspective, is placed on individuals and groups.

2. Human beings are social and thus are interdependent on other human beings - As previously stated, human interaction is social and as such, facilitated by "human" traits,

such as language.

3. Humans are dependent on their environment for sustenance - Humans can only survive in environments that support their biological needs.

4. Human interactions are spatially organized - Human beings tend to organize their interactions within their environment, often defined by distinct social arrangements.

In light of these major assumptions, ecological theory is based on a series of levels. The two most common levels are that of the individual and the population. Each of these levels operates and develops within an ecosystem or an arrangement of mutual dependencies within a population. Because of this, the whole functions as a unit, thereby maintaining a viable environmental state. For Bronfenbrenner, these mutual dependencies exist within five major systems: (1) the individual, (2) the microsystem, (3) the mesosystem, (4) the exosystem, and (5) the macrosystem. Typically, systems closets to the individual will have the greatest effect on his/her development and perceptions.

Individual

The individual is the simplest system in ecological theory. In this study, demographic characteristics, use of public transportation, and prior victimization were elements of the system measured at the level of the individual.

Microsystem

The mircosystem consists of individuals within a youth's immediate environment, such as family members, neighbors, and classmates, who have a direct influence on the

youth's life. Due to limitations of the available data, there were no variables relevant to this system in the present study.

Mesosystem

The mesosystem defines the connections between members of the two previous systems that influence the individual. In this study, no variables were measured at this system level.

Exosystem

Exosystems are settings that do not contain the individual or those close to them, but which influence the individual. Exosystem elements for this study include their awareness of serious crimes in their neighborhood, awareness of community crimes, the youths' quality of life, and their awareness of community disorder.

Macrosystem

The concept of a macrosystem includes the cultural ideals, values, and laws that influence the individual. Because law enforcement contacts of an official nature were the most common type of interaction between neighborhood police and youth, that is contact initiated through the enforcement of society's ideals, values, laws, these interactions were the only element of this system present in this study.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this research was to explore youths' fear of crime and their perceptions of law enforcement in the United States. Initially, youths' fear of crime was compared by age, gender, race, education, marital status, and geographic region. Similar comparisons were made between youths' perceptions of law enforcement and the same demographic variables.

Additionally, use of public transportation, prior victimization, community crime indicators, quality of life, community disorder indicators, police contact, and personal demographics were used to explain youths' fear of crime and their perceptions of law enforcement.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Fear of Crime and Perceptions of Criminal Justice Systems

The majority of research about fear of crime and perceptions of law enforcement has dealt with the general population as a whole. When age differences were explored, they were ancillary analyses that typically began at 18 years of age and continued in increments of about 10 years (i.e., 18-30, 31-40, 41-50, etc.). The following is a summary of key findings as they relate to fear of crime and perceptions of law enforcement.

Fear of Crime

Fear of crime and a person's concern for becoming a victim have attracted substantial interest from criminologists in recent years (Haghighi & Sorensen, 1996; Smith & Hill, 1991). In spite of this fact, however, "fear of crime is a very important problem about which we know very little" (Liska, Sanchirico, & Reed, 1988, pp. 835-836).

The term "fear of crime" is somewhat ambiguous. Warr (1984) has gone so far as to say that the conceptual meaning for fear of crime has so many competing definitions that the concept is at risk of losing any specificity. Disagreement as to an accepted meaning for fear of crime revolves around three main methodological problems: "interpreting perceived crime risk as fear of crime, emphasizing fear of violent victimization while neglecting the more common non-violent victimizations, and using ambiguous indicators of crime fear" (Haghighi & Sorensen, 1996, p. 17).

Perceived Risk Versus Fear of Crime

Misinterpretation of fear of crime versus perceived crime risk (i.e., personal security or victimization) is a common problem in criminological research (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987). Many studies focus on the perception of personal safety as an indicator for fear of crime (Wiltz, 1982). Used interchangeably, this approach neglects the need to distinguish fear of crime and perceived safety risk as two separate constructs (LaGrange & Ferraro, 1989; Silverman, 2001).

For example, questions about a person's safety (How safe to you feel walking alone in your neighborhood at night?) or crime concern (Is there an area near your home where you are afraid to walk alone at night?) do not reflect the individual's fear of crime (LaGrange & Ferraro, 1989; Taylor & Hale, 1986; Warr, 1984). Instead, these types of questions are fear provoking (Cohen & Felson, 1979) and tend to measure a person's general safety concerns (Lee, 1982). Warr (2000) extended this line of thinking by suggesting that these types of questions do not even adequately measure fear for personal security, but instead, anxiety over future or past events. In either case, this outdated and inaccurate methodological approach of consolidation is rapidly being replaced by the realization that fear of crime and perceived safety risk need to be defined and examined separately (Haghighi & Sorensen, 1996; Silverman, 2001).

Violent Victimizations Versus Nonviolent Victimizations

Ferraro (1995) defined fear of crime as an "emotional response of dread or anxiety to crime or symbols that a person associates with crime" (p. 4). This definition suggests

that a person must sense some level of threat or danger to themselves or those around them (Silverman, 2001). Ferraro did, however, go on to make a distinction between fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization by stating that "fear is a fundamentally different psychological experience than perceived risk," and that "fear involves an emotional, and sometimes physiological, reaction to perceived danger (Ferraro, 1995, p. 24).

Robinson (1998) also separated fear of crime from personal safety, stating that fear of crime is an emotional response to a threat to one's safety, real or perceived, while perception of risk is a more cognitive assessment of the chance that physical harm will actually take place. In essence, individuals who believe their surroundings are unsafe may not actually be fearful of crime (Silverman, 2001).

Warr (2000) also differentiated between the concepts of fear of crime and risk perception, stating that fear is a "reaction to the perceived environment" (p. 454). This reaction is an emotional state that can cause an increased heart rate, rapid breathing, sweating, decreased salivation, and an increase in the skin's galvanic response.

Ferraro, Robinson, and Warr all highlight a strong connection between fear of crime and an emotional response to one's personal safety. Because violent crime is the greatest threat to one's personal safety, these definitions support the proposition that most studies focus on the violent, personal natures of criminal activity and fail to capture the individual's sentiments on the non-violent and less fear provoking property crimes (Haghighi & Sorensen, 1996).

Ambiguous Indicators of Crime Fear

The third and final methodological issue confounding the investigation of fear of crime lies in the use of ambiguous indicators. While Ferraro, Robinson, and Warr operationalized fear of crime in terms of an emotional response to one's safety, others, such as Rountree (1998), believe that fear of crime is a combination of cognitive and emotional fears of victimization. Still others, such as Winkel and Universiteit (1986), and Skogan (1987) disagree entirely, negating the need for an emotional response and defining fear of crime as simply an unsafe feeling or concern about becoming a victim of a criminal act. Maxfield (1984) synthesized the operational definitions of Rountree, Skogan, and Winkel and Universiteit by acknowledging that both perceived threats to personal safety and emotional concerns about crime, either real or imagined, must be considered. Maxfield went on to define fear of crime as feeling threatened by crime, with the threat lying at the "nexus between concern and personal risk" (Maxfield, 1984, p. 3).

Ambiguity over the measurement of fear of crime is further confounded when studies rely on single-item indicators for fear of crime (Haghighi & Sorensen, 1996). This is especially true in cases where the definition for fear of crime is worded in a broad and generic sense, such as Cordner's (1986) use of emotional and attitudinal indicators, or when the operationalization of the fear of crime variable differs from the stated definition, as in Skogan's 1987 study on personal victimization.

Gender and Age

Despite the difficulties in defining fear of crime, the relationship between age,

gender, and an individual's fear has been continually examined (LaGrange & Ferraro, 1989). A comparison of studies conducted over the last twenty years has produced several consistent findings. For instance, women and older persons are more fearful of crime when compared to men and younger persons (Borooah & Carcach, 1997; LaGrange & Ferraro; Parker, 1993; Reiss & Tonry, 1986; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981). These relationships exist in spite of the fact that women and older persons are less likely to become victims of crime (Garofalo, 1981; Yin, 1980). For example, from 1992-1998, the rate for violent victimization was higher for males than females (55.8 versus 39.3 per 1,000 persons) and persons between the ages of 12-24 were nine times more likely to be a victim of a violent crime and 14 times more likely to be injured as a result of a violent crime when compared to individuals 50 or older (Simon & Mercy, 2001).

Women also tend to be more fearful than men when compared across multiple crime categories (Bennett & Flavin, 1994; Ferraro, 1995; Warr, 1984). In fact, gender may be the best predictor for fear of crime (Silverman, 2001). Fear of crime is highest among women under the age of 30, and it gradually declines after age 45 (Maxfield, 1984). There is disagreement, however, as to why women feel more vulnerable than men.

Junger (1987) believed that women are more fearful because of their inability to handle dangerous situations, while Maxfield (1987) focused on their perceived versus actual vulnerability. Warr (1984, 2000) and Maxfield (1984) directly linked women's fear of crime to the vulnerability of being raped and sexually assaulted, with rape being the central focus of their fear. These possibilities are reflective of victimization statistics that indicate that while men are 42% more likely to be a victim of a violent crime, 125% more

likely to be robbed, and 159% more likely to be the victim of an aggravated assault than women, women are 210% more likely to be a victim of a rape or sexual assault than men (Rennison, 2001). When fear of rape is statistically controlled for, women's fear of other crimes is equivalent to that of mens' (Ferraro, 1995).

Fear of rape and sexual assault among female juveniles mirror that of older females. Overall, juvenile victims constitute 71% of all sex crimes reported to law enforcement. Young women are predominately the victims of sex offenses and kidnaping, while young men dominate all other victim categories (Finkelhor & Ormrod, 2000).

The connection between age and the fear of crime may also be tenuous, as some researchers believe this relationship may be over-estimated (Ferraro, 1995; LaGrange & Ferraro, 1989). Fear of crime among the elderly is dependent on both the crime location and specific crime categories (Ferraro, 1995). Urban residents are more fearful of crime than are rural residents, and elders who live in high crime areas are more fearful than those who live in low crime areas. Older persons do have higher levels of fear when asked about personal safety (Borooah & Carcach, 1997), but when compared to younger persons on specific measures of crime, fear of crime actually declines until age 75 (when it increases slightly), with younger persons having the greatest fear of crime (Ferraro, 1995; LaGrange & Ferraro, 1989).

Race and Ethnicity

Race is also a significant indicator for fear of crime (Silverman, 2001). African Americans are disproportionately more fearful of crime when compared to Caucasians

(Parker, 1993; Silverman, 2001; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981). Little research, however, has focused on race/ethnic fear of crime, other than the traditional Caucasian/African American comparison. One such study (Parker), which compared African American's fear of crime to that of Latinos', found that Latinos as a whole were more fearful than their African American counterparts and that Latino women in particular were most fearful.

Haghighi and Sorensen (1996) also found Latinos to be more fearful of crime than non-Latinos. On individual crime measures, Latinos were found to be twice as fearful of sexual assault than non-Latinos, and African Americans and Latinos were twice as fearful of being murdered when compared to Caucasians.

These fears are reflective of actual victimization rates for Caucasians and African-Americans. African American youth, ages 12-24, are 12 to 32 % more likely to experience crimes of violence (rape, sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault, and simple assault) and serious crimes of violence (all other serious acts of violence other than those mentioned under crimes of violence) than their Caucasian counterparts (Rennison, 2001). Victimization rates for Latinos are unavailable because the U. S. Department of Justice categorized offenses as Hispanic or non-Hispanic, allowing for multiple categories, such as White Hispanic and Black, non-Hispanic.

Victimization Experience

The relationship between prior victimization and fear of crime is inconclusive (Haghighi & Sorensen, 1996). Skogan and Maxfield (1981) suggested that a causal relationship between prior victimization and fear of crime does exist, while Liska et al.

(1988) found no relationship between the two constructs. Further research indicates that actual experience may not be necessary and that those people know about or who have witnessed victimizations will also exhibit high levels of fear of crime (Belyea & Zingraff, 1988; Lee, 1983; Stafford & Galle, 1984).

The Media

The media are powerful facilitators in the development of an individual's fear of crime (Garofalo, 1981; Haghighi & Sorensen, 1996). Traditionally thought of as television, radio, newspapers/magazines, and movies, the term "media" now includes video and computer games, the Internet, and other types of electronic interactive media (Borenstein, 2000). Williams (1993) compared various forms of media in relation to fear of crime levels and found that overall, television viewers had the lowest levels, newspaper readers had moderate levels, and tabloid readers had the highest levels. The relationship between newspaper readership and fear of crime was also investigated by Gordon and Heath (1981). During a 2 year study that investigated the relationship between the amount of crime reported by newspapers and the readers' fear of crime, they found that the readers of newspapers that allocated more print space to criminal activities reported higher levels of fear of crime than readers of those whose papers who had less crime coverage. Additionally, media effects on fear of crime appear to be greater for urban residents, when compared to those who live in small towns, rural areas, or suburbs (Finely, 1983).

Effects of the media on fear of crime appears to be especially salient among youth. It is estimated that the typical American youth watches approximately 28 hours of television per week (Borenstein, 2000) and that overall media use is around 38 hours per week (Woodard & Gridina, 2000). Because of their varied developmental stages, however, some individuals may have difficulty separating what they see on the screen and what they perceive as real (Groebel, 1998). Because of this, youth may have exaggerated perceptions of societal violence and increased fears of crime and victimization (Borenstein; Grier, 2001).

Perceptions of Law Enforcement

The public's perceptions of law enforcement are important because perceptions influence how people respond to law enforcement officials, the degree to which they participate in anti-crime programs, the amount of cooperation they give law enforcement officers in the execution of their duties, and the amount of support they provide with funding issues (Radelet & Carter, 1994). Additionally, as the concept of community oriented policing (where officers work in conjunction with community members to address crime and their associated fears) continues to spread across the United States, interactions with and perceptions of law enforcement by the public will become increasingly important (Smith, 1994).

In general, the public's overall perception of law enforcement is positive (Decker, 1985; Huang & Vaughn, 1996; Langan, 1994; Smith, Steadman, Minton, & Townsend, 1999; Walklate, 1992). More specifically, in the year 2000, 62% of individuals felt "a

great deal" or "quite a lot" of confidence in law enforcement's ability to protect them from violent crime, 60% respected law enforcement officers in their area "a great deal," and 55% believed that law enforcement officers had "very high" or "high" ethical standards (Maguire & Pastore, 2001). High school seniors, when asked how good of a job law enforcement was doing in the United States, responded "very good" or "good" 36.6% of the time, up 6% from 1996 (Maguire & Pastore). The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) also found that, during a 1998 survey of victimization and perceptions of community safety in 12 major U. S. cities, 80% of the 13,918 respondents were satisfied with law enforcement in their neighborhoods (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1999). It should be noted, however, that while overall perceptions of law enforcement in the United States are positive, these sentiments differ by demographic and experiential factors.

Gender

As with perceptions of law enforcement by race, research on gender perceptual differences is also inconclusive. Traditionally, females are more likely to view law enforcement officials favorably than are men (Huang & Vaughn, 1996; Lasely, 1994; Radelet & Carter, 1994). Other research, however, has found no clear difference between male and female perceptions of law enforcement (Dunham & Alpert, 1988; Murty, Roebuck, & Smith, 1990). This lack of differences between males and females is supported by figures in the 2001 edition of the Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics where 56% of males and 58% of females reported having a "great deal/quite a lot" of confidence in police.

Race

As with fear of crime, race is one of the strongest predictors of the public's perception of law enforcement (Peek, Lowe, & Alston, 1981; Radelet & Carter, 1994). Historically, minorities in general, and African Americans in particular, view law enforcement less favorably than do Caucasians (Garofalo, 1977; Huang & Vaughn, 1996; Langan, Greenfeld, Smith, Durose, & Levin, 2001). According to the 2001 edition of the Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics, 16% of non-Whites and 19% of Blacks had "very little" confidence in police. Among White respondents, only 10% reported similar sentiments. In contrast, 59% of Whites expressed "a great deal/quite a lot" of confidence in law enforcement, while 44% of non-Whites and 38% of Blacks reported similar feelings (Maguire & Pastore, 2001). The BJS 12-city study also found similar, but slightly higher, levels of dissatisfaction among minority populations. Twenty-four percent of Blacks were dissatisfied with local police, while 22% of other minority races and 10% of Whites expressed similar sentiments (Bureau of Justice Statistics , 1999).

Research on Latino perceptions of law enforcement is limited and conflicting. Carter (1985) found that Latino sentiments appeared to be very similar to other minority populations, especially African Americans. In particular, Latino attitudes towards police become less positive as fear of crime, police contact, and victimization increases. Carter also found that Latino perceptions of law enforcement varied geographically, with lower degrees of satisfaction occurring in populations with a high concentration of Latino residents.

Lasley (1994), however, disagrees and believes Latino's take a "middle ground" between White and African American sentiments with respect to their attitudes towards police. A 1988 survey of 1,147 New York City residents supports this contention where 69% of African Americans, 53% of Latinos, and 37% of Whites believed law enforcement officers favored one race over another during the administration of their duties (Huang & Vaughn, 1996).

Research on the perceptions of law enforcement among other minority groups is also isolated. One such study, conducted during a survey of Asians in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, reported a strong difference in opinions even among different Asian groups (Song, 1992). For example, Vietnamese refugees consistently rated all police related problems as "more serious" than did Chinese immigrants.

Age

A person's age is also a predictor of perceptions of law enforcement. In general, persons under the age of thirty tend to have less favorable perceptions of law enforcement than do those who are older (Garofalo, 1977; Hurst, Frank, & Browning, 2000). Additional research, however, has suggested a curvilinear relationship between age and police satisfaction. Zevitz and Rettammel (1990) found that youth and the elderly view of law enforcement less favorably than did middle-aged respondents. Current figures do not support these findings, showing that individuals age 18-29 are overwhelming less satisfied with police than their older counterparts (24% versus 9%) (Maguire & Pastore, 2001).

Education

Typically, those with less education have lower levels of satisfaction with police when compared to those with more education (Huang & Vaughn, 1996; Murty et al., 1990). Maguire and Pastore (2001) stated the relationship between educational attainment and police satisfaction is not as clear, reporting that 8% of college graduates had "very little" confidence in police, compared to 12% of those with a high school diploma or less. Prior research (Peek et al., 1981), however, has found that those individuals with college educations, particularly Whites, are more likely to have negative perceptions of police. As with many of the variables related to the public's perceptions of law enforcement, there is no research consensus of opinions concerning the relationship between education and perceptions of law enforcement.

Police Contacts

Outside of an individual's personal characteristics, the number and type of police contacts has also been reported to be related to their perceptions of law enforcement (Zevitz & Rettammel, 1990). In fact, as far back as 1958, Claudine Gibson Wirths reported that "...the actions and attitudes of law enforcement people themselves probably constitute the greatest single cultural influence on public attitudes toward law enforcement" (p. 60). These sentiments were echoed by Scaglion and Condon (1980), and by Rusinko, Johnson, and Hornung (1978) who also reported that negative police interactions could be nullified or reduced by subsequent positive interactions. This suggests that law enforcement officers must be cognizant of the number of positive and

negative contacts they have with the general population (Huang & Vaughn, 1996).

For example, based on a 1999 national study of 80,543 respondents, an estimated 43.8 million contacts occurred between one of the nation's 622,041 sworn full-time law enforcement officers and the general public, ages 16 and older (Langan et al., 2001). Of these, 52% were for motor vehicle stops, 19% were to report a crime, 12% were calls for assistance, and the remaining contacts ranged from witness to a traffic accident (5%) to attending a crime prevention meeting (1%). Additionally, the law enforcement contact rate for males was 20% higher than females, with Whites experiencing 17% more contacts than Blacks and 32% more than Latinos. Overall, young people, ages 16-19, experienced a contact rate twice that of any other age group. Individuals between the ages of 18-19 years old experienced a contact rate that was 150% higher than those 50 years or older. The most likely reasons for high contact between law enforcement and those age 16-19 were motor vehicle stops and motor vehicle accidents.

Additional contact data between law enforcement and those under the age of 18 (juveniles) focuses on arrests versus just contacts (as above). According to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), during 1999 there were an estimated 2.5 million arrests of juvenile offenders (Snyder, 2000). The greatest number of these were for larceny-theft (380,500), assault (237,300), drug abuse violations (198,400), and disorderly conduct (176,200).

Community

People who live in rural and suburban communities tend to have more favorable

perceptions of law enforcement when compared to those who live in urban areas (Benedict, Brown, & Bower, 2000; Center for Public Policy, 1988; Huang & Vaughn, 1996). Zamble and Annesley (1987) also found that residents in smaller metropolitan areas perceive law enforcement officers more favorably than those in larger metropolitan areas. This may be due, in part, to the increase in officer/citizen familiarity often afforded by smaller municipalities (Radelet & Carter, 1994). These results are consistent with recent data that show 62% of those who live in rural areas have "a great deal/quite a lot" of confidence in police, as opposed to 58% in suburban areas and 51% in urban areas (Maguire & Pastore, 2001).

Quality of Life

In general, quality of life issues affect both an individual's fear of crime and their satisfaction with police. For example, Brantingham and Brantingham (1993) found a negative correlation between one's fear of crime and perceptions regarding quality of life. As indicators, such as a sense of well-being, awareness of neighborhood crime, housing, and personal health improved, the respondents fear of crime in their neighborhood decreased. Similar findings regarding the negative correlation between fear of crime and perceptions of quality of life were found by Kratcoski, Verma, and Das (2001), using such quality of life indicators as employment, housing, personal health, and Walsh, Vito, and Tewksbury (2000) using personal safety, housing, and community services.

Quality of life issues are also related to an individual's satisfaction with police. Zero-tolerance policies that are sometimes implemented by agencies often have negative

effects on an individual's quality of life (Bass, 2001). For example, indiscriminate speed traps within a particular neighborhood may reduce the number of speeding violations within that area, but leave the residents of that community feeling trapped and their ability to move about freely, inhibited, thereby lowering their perceived quality of life.

The inability of police to stop or deter crime in a particular area may also have negative effects on an individual's perceived quality of life (Kratcoski et al., 2001). For example, a 1996 study by Walsh et al. (2000) found that a majority of residents within 14 public housing units blamed police for the rise in illicit drugs and their decreased sense of personal safety. Conversely, a study conducted by the U.S. Attorney's Fifth District addressing community policing issues within the Washington, DC area found that as officers became more aggressive regarding serious drug and violence cases, crime decreased and the residents' expressed quality of life increased.

Summary

There are two prominent themes in the literature about fear of crime and perceptions of law enforcement. First and foremost is that very little is known about youths' fears and perceptions. The majority of literature addressing these issues focuses on the general adult population, only making mention of youth's fears and perceptions when they are statistically different from other age groups. What is known is that:

1. In general, younger persons tend to be less fearful of crime than older persons. This dynamic may reverse itself, however, when fear of specific crimes is investigated.

2. Youth also tend to have lower levels of satisfaction with law enforcement when compared to older persons.

Second, there is a lack of consensus regarding the general populations' fears of crime and perceptions of law enforcement. This may arise from such confounding factors as a lack of uniformity in identifying and measuring the constructs, temporal and regional differences, or historical events that dramatically alter previous perceptions. In addition to the patterns mentioned above, in general:

1. Women are more fearful of crime than men and also tend to have a slightly more positive perception of law enforcement.

2. When compared to Whites, non-white ethnic groups tend to be more fearful of crime and less satisfied with law enforcement.

3. The relationship between prior victimization and fear of crime is inconclusive.

4. There is a positive correlation between fear of crime and the amount of media exposure to crime.

5. Negative contacts with police are associated with less positive perceptions of law enforcement.

6. People who live in less densely populated areas tend to view police more favorably than those in large cities.

7. Increased use of public transportation increases the likelihood of becoming a victim of crime or witnessing a criminal act (Radelet & Carter, 1994).

8. Awareness of community disorder or community decay characteristics within a neighborhood, such as dilapidated buildings, transients, or excessive trash, increase an

individual's fear of crime and lowers their overall satisfaction with the quality of their life (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993; Hunter & Jeffery, 1991).

Research Questions

In light of the previous literature and the lack of previous literature about youth's fears of crime and perceptions of the criminal justice systems, the following research questions were used to focus this research:

1. Is there a relationship between youths' demographic characteristics (age, gender, race, education, marital status, and census region) and their:

a) fear of crime

b) satisfaction with law enforcement.

2. How well do personal demographics, use of public transportation, prior victimizations, awareness of community crime, views on quality of life, awareness of community disorder, and police contacts explain youths':

a) fear of crime

b) perceptions of law enforcement.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

This study was designed to provide a foundation for understanding the fear of crime and perceptions of criminal justice systems among American youth ages 16 to 25 years old. Analyses used data from the "Criminal Victimization and Perceptions of Community Safety, 1998," a national data set currently stored in the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD), a segment of the University of Michigan's Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR).

Data Sources

The Criminal Victimization and Perceptions of Community Safety, 1998 (CVPCS) survey was developed and implemented by the United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, to investigate criminal victimization, perceptions of community safety, and satisfaction with local police. Using the standard NCVS as a base, a series of supplemental questions were asked of individuals 12 years or older in 9,327 households throughout 12 cities in the United States (Chicago, IL; Kansas City, MO; Knoxville, TN; Los Angeles, CA; Madison, WI; New York, NY; San Diego, CA; Savannah, GA; Spokane, WA; Springfield, MA; Tucson, AZ; and Washington, DC) to assess their attitudes and experiences within the past 12 months. Implementing a GENESYS Random Digit Dialing (RDD) methodology, telephone interviewers collected data at three levels: (1) Household-Level, designed to obtain basic household demographic

information, (2) Person-Level, designed to obtain personal information, as well as victimization rates, perceptions of crime, and satisfaction with local police, and (3) Incident-Level, designed to obtain specific information on incidents of victimization(s). Individual households with a published telephone number, residing within each of the four target cities, were eligible for selection. For the purposes of this study, only Person-Level and Household-Level data were used.

Based upon prior BJS research, it was estimated that approximately 870 household interviews, or 1,600 individual interviews would be required for each city. Exact figures for cities varied based upon the differences in the percent of the population age 12 or older. City household sample sizes were also increased by four types of inflation factors: (1) geographic screenouts, (2) nonrespondents, (3) ineligible respondents, and (4) nonresidential respondents. With these factors in mind, it was estimated that approximately 40,000 telephone numbers would be needed to cover all 12 cities. The response rate for the original sample of 40,000 telephone numbers was approximately 48%. Additional random telephone numbers for each city were used until the required number of cases for each site was obtained.

Smith et al. (1999), acknowledged the following nonsampling sources of error within the CVPCS:

1. It is possible respondents differ from nonrespondents
2. Errors in coding and recoding data
3. The exclusion of households without telephones or with unlisted numbers
4. Respondent recall error.

In particular, data from the CVPCS provided information about the respondents' risk factors, movement patterns, victimization(s), employment characteristics, crime prevention measures, perceptions of community crime and disorganization, perceptions of police contact/visibility, and satisfaction with law enforcement.

Sample Descripitives

Within the CVPCS 12-city data set ($N = 18,514$), 1,897 youth ages 16 to 25 were used in this study. Among this total sample 47.4% were male, 52.6% were female, and the mean age was 21.22 years. Additionally, 56.7% of the total sample were White Non-Hispanic, 17.5% Black Non-Hispanic, 17.8% Hispanic, and 8.0% were of other racial backgrounds (see Table 1). A majority of the sample were not married (87.0%), college educated (57.7%) and lived in either the Midwest (28.9%) or West (28.4%). Additional demographic information is available in Table 1.

Analysis Plan

Prior to running any analyses, frequencies were run on all variables to check for out of range values and missing data. No out of range values were found. Cases with substantial missing data were deleted from further analyses, lowering the original youth sample size of 2,070 subjects to 1,897. Exceptions were made when deletion of cases would compromise the representativeness of a racial group, leaving some cases within the total sample with missing data on some variables.

Table 1

Sample Demographic Characteristics

	Ages					
	16-17		18-25		Total Sample	
	(*N*=235)		(*N*=1662)		(*N*=1897)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Age	16.5	0.50	21.89	2.25	21.22	2.76
Sex (M=1)	0.48	0.50	0.47	0.50	0.47	0.50
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Race						
White Non-Hispanic	112	47.7	964	58.0	1076	56.7
Black Non-Hispanic	65	27.7	267	16.1	332	17.5
Hispanic	45	19.1	292	17.6	337	17.8
Other Non-Hispanic	13	5.5	139	8.4	152	8.0
Marital Status						
Married	0	0	246	14.8	246	13.0
Non-Married	235	100	1416	85.2	1651	87.0
Education						
High School	234	99.6	569	34.2	803	42.3
College	1	0.4	1093	65.8	1094	57.7
Census Region						
Northeast	48	20.4	272	16.4	320	16.9
Midwest	68	28.9	480	28.9	548	28.9
South	50	21.3	441	26.5	491	25.9
West	69	29.4	469	28.2	538	28.4

Dependent Variables

There were two dependent variables in this study: (1) Fear of crime, "How fearful are you of crime in your neighborhood?" and (2) Satisfaction with police, "How satisfied are you with neighborhood police?" Each dependent variable used a four point Likert type scale to record the respondent's attitudes and was originally coded; Very fearful = 1, Somewhat fearful = 2, Not very fearful = 3, and Not at all fearful = 4. Fear of crime was recoded so the greatest amount of fear (Very fearful) was associated with the largest number (4) and the least amount of fear (Not at all fearful) was associated with the smallest number (1). The same recoding procedure was used for satisfaction with police.

Independent Variables

Demographics. There were 12 independent variables within the demographic category. They are age, gender, White Non-Hispanic, Black Non-Hispanic, Hispanic, Other Non-Hispanic, education, marital status, northeast census region, midwest census region, south census region, and west census region. Age was collapsed from a continuous variable to a dichotomous variable (16-17 & 18-25) to allow comparisons between youth who are, in the eyes of the law, considered juveniles versus adults. Gender was either male (1) or female (0). Race variables were collapsed into one of four dichotomous subgroups (Yes=1, No=0): (1) White Non-Hispanic, (2) Black Non-Hispanic, (3) Hispanic, or (4) Other Non-Hispanic. These groupings were reflective of the four largest race groupings. Hispanic, as used in the CVPCS data set, defines a racial versus ethnic category. Educational variables were collapsed into those who responded

they had either high school or college education. City variables were recoded to reflect one of the four U.S. Census Regions to which they belonged (Northeast, Midwest, South, & West).

Public transportation. Public transportation was comprised of two variables: (1) Public transportation, "How often do you ride public transportation?" and (2) Shopping, "How often do you go shopping?" Like the independent variables, Public Transportation variables used a Likert type scale (5 point) and were originally reverse coded. Each variable was recoded so the greatest amount of the behavior was associated with the largest number (e.g., Almost everyday=5 and Never=1).

Victimization. There were four prior victimization variables (Yes=1, No=0): (1) Victim of theft or attempted theft, (2) Victim of robbery or attempted robbery, (3) Victim of assault or attempted assault, and (4) Victim of sexual attack/rape.

Community crime. Community crime variables were comprised of two sets of questions. The first set was a screening question used to determine if the respondent was aware of any serious crimes in his/her neighborhood, "Are you aware of any serious crimes in your neighborhood?" (Yes, No, & Not Aware). While "not aware" responses might be valid indicators of the individual's level of awareness, comparisons in this study were made between those who were aware of serious crimes in the neighborhood and all others. Because of this, "no" and "not aware" responses were collapsed into a single response (Yes=1, No/Not aware=0). If the respondent answered "yes" to the screening question, he/she was given a list of nine types of serious crimes: (1) People openly selling drugs, (2) People openly using drugs, (3) Crime committed with guns, (4) Murder, (5)

Auto-theft, (6) Theft of personal property, (7) Breaking and entering, (8) Violent physical attacks, and (9) Sexual assault/rape. Respondents replied "yes" (1) if they were aware of that crime.

Quality of life. Quality of life was a single variable that asked "How satisfied are you with the quality of life in your neighborhood?" Similar to the Public Transportation variables, Quality of Life also used Likert type scale (4 point) and was recoded in the same manner (e.g., Very satisfied=4, Very dissatisfied=1).

Community disorder. Community disorder contained variables that identified nine different types of community disorder. Respondents answered "yes" (1) or "no" (0) if they were aware of: (1) Public drinking/Public drug use, (2) Public drug sales, (3) Loitering/Hanging out, (4) Abandoned cars and/or buildings, (5) Rundown/neglected buildings, (6) Poor lighting, (7) Overgrown shrubs/trees, (8) Trash, or (9) Empty lots.

Police contact. The final independent variable category was Police Contact. Respondents answered "yes" (1) if they had been in contact with local police during the last 12 months or "no" (0) if no contact had taken place.

Data Reduction

Prior to analyzing each of the research questions, correlations were run to check for multicollinearity among the independent variables. Based upon these results (see Chapter 4 - Results), it was necessary to perform exploratory factor analyses to reduce the number of variables within the Victimization, Community Crime, and Community Disorder categories. The initial variable groupings for each factor analysis were based

upon the manner in which questions were grouped within the CVPCS. Because these initial groupings were logically associated, an oblique rotation was used (for tables, see Results section) to improve the interpretability and scientific utility of the factor extraction (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). In general, variables with loadings of 0.45 to 0.55 are considered fair to good (Comrey & Lee, 1992). Because the cutoff for the size of the loading is usually a matter of researcher preference (Tabachnick & Fidell), a mid-point of 0.5 was selected as a guideline. From these analyses, seven indices were formed from the 26 variables within the three categories, reducing the total number of independent variables from 41 to 21 (see Table 2). Frequency checks were run on all seven indices to check for out-of-range responses. No out of range responses were found.

Index Descriptives

Victimization. The victimization index consisted of three variables: (1) victim of theft or attempted theft, (2) victim of robbery or attempted robbery, and (3) victim of assault or attempted assault. A fourth variable, victim of sexual assault/rape, was not used because it accounted for only 0.6% of the sample. As shown in Table 2, only a small portion of the sample (M = .33, frequency of 0-3) had reported prior victimization.

Community crime. From those who answered "yes" to the screening question concerning knowledge of serious crime in their neighborhood, four community crime indices were formed: (1) Drug, (2) Violence, (3) Property, and (4) Physical. Of the four indices, people were most aware of property related crimes (M = .49, frequency of 0-3) and least aware of physical type crimes (M = .26, frequency of 0-2). It is interesting to

Table 2

Descriptive Data for All Study Variables

Variable	*N*	*M*	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Dependent variables					
How fearful are you of crime in your neighborhood?	1897	2.14	.86	1	4
How satisfied are you with police in your neighborhood?	1897	2.91	.66	1	4
Independent variables					
Demographics					
Age	1897	21.22	2.76	16	25
Gender (Male=1)	1897	.47	.50	0	1
White Non-Hispanic (Yes=1)	1897	.57	.50	0	1
Black Non-Hispanic	1897	.18	.38	0	1
Hispanic	1897	.18	.38	0	1
Other Non-Hispanic	1897	.08	.27	0	1
Education (High School=1, College=0)	1897	.42	.49	0	1
Married (Married=1)	1897	.13	.34	0	1
Northeast (Yes=1)	1897	.17	.38	0	1
Midwest	1897	.29	.45	0	1
South	1897	.26	.44	0	1
West	1897	.28	.45	0	1

(*table continues*)

Variable	*N*	*M*	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Public transportation					
How often do you ride public transportation?	1886	2.37	1.58	1	5
Victimization					
Were you a victim of attempted or committed theft, robbery, or assault?	1897	.33	.58	0	3
Awareness of serious crimes					
Are you aware of any serious crime in your neighborhood?	1897	.34	.47	0	1
Drug Index	1897	.29	.66	0	2
Violence Index	1897	.29	.62	0	2
Property Index	1897	.49	.94	0	3
Physical Index	1897	.26	.57	0	2
Quality of life					
Are you satisfied with the quality of life in your neighborhood?	1888	3.07	.71	1	4
Community disorder					
Public Index	1892	1.22	1.36	0	4
Area Index	1897	1.41	1.66	0	6
People Index	1896	.52	.77	0	2
Police contact					
Have you been in contact with local police?	1897	.25	.43	0	1

note that respondents were as aware of crimes committed with guns and murder (M = .29, frequency of 0-2) as they were of violent physical attacks and sexual assaults (M = .26, frequency of 0-2).

Community disorder. The 12 community disorder variables were collapsed into three indices: (1) Public, (2) Area, and (3) People. Respondents for the Public and Area indices were aware of slightly more than one of the possible offense categories for each index (M = 1.22, frequency of 0-4 & 1.41, frequency of 0-6), while respondents for the People index were, for the most part, unaware of any offenses within that index (M = .52, frequency of 0-2).

Research Question 1

Investigation of the relation between youths' demographic characteristics and their fear of crime, and perceptions of law enforcement was done using T tests and analysis of variance (ANOVA). Independent T tests were used for age, gender, education and marital status variables, while ANOVA was used for the race and census region variables.

Research Question 2 (a & b)

To investigate how well each of the independent variables explained youths' fear of crime and perceptions of law enforcement, Research Question 2 was analyzed using multiple and hierarchical multiple regression. Prior to running each regression, a second check for multicollinearity was performed by regressing each independent variable on all other independent variables. This second check was needed because it is possible for bivariate correlations to be low, but multicollinearity to still exist (Allison, 1999).

Data for this study were either ordinal or dichotomous. Transformations from ordinal to dichotomous data prior to analyses were also performed. Technically, multiple regression analyses are designed to examine interval or ratio data. Practically, however, ordinal or dichotomous variables (dummy variables) are often utilized. When ordinal data are used, the researcher is implicitly assuming that a one unit increase or decrease is the same for each point along the scale. Dichotomous variables are also considered acceptable as independent variables (Allison, 1999). No dichotomous dependent variables were used.

Consistent with Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory, demographic variables were entered into the regression first. Subsequent multiple regression analyses for each of the independent variables followed the same order (see Table 2 for order), controlling for demographic variables. Finally, according to ecological order, the explanatory contribution of each independent variable was analyzed using a full-model hierarchical multiple regression of all independent variables.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The results of this exploratory study investigating youths' fear of crime and their perception law enforcement are presented in three sections. First, a general overview of the descriptive sample data is presented concerning: (a) sources of crime information and (b) types of police contact. These data are presented to provide more detail regarding the sample and these youths' experiences with crime and law enforcement. Frequencies and percentages for each set of variables are displayed in tables.

The second section addresses Research Question 1, the relationship between the sample's demographic characteristics, their fear of crime, and perceptions of law enforcement. Statistical differences were explored among demographic subgroups by comparing age, gender, race, marital status, education, and census region to fear of crime and perceptions of law enforcement.

The third section addresses Research Question 2, the contribution of various independent variables as they relate to youths' fear of crime and perceptions of law enforcement. Simple linear and multiple regressions using a forced entry option were run to partition shared variance across demographics, use of public transportation, victimization, community crime, quality of life, community disorder, and police contact. The forced entry option compared beta weights with all variables remaining in the model. This type of entry was selected because other methods, such as listwise entry, drop non-statistically significant variables from the model. Since dummy variables were used in the

regression models and cannot be dropped due to a lack of statistical significance, other entry methods were not viable for these analyses.

Sources of Crime Information

Of those youth that identified the source of their information on crime, a majority reported obtaining this knowledge from indirect sources (see Table 3). Conversations with neighbors (18.8%) and the media (15.6%) were the primary sources of information, while direct contact with criminal activities, such as witnessing criminal acts (7.3%) and being or knowing a victim (5.6%), were secondary. Only 2.9% of the respondents reported that the source of their crime information came from local law enforcement.

Sources of Police Contact

Some type of contact with local police over the last twelve months was reported by 476 youth (25.1%). Of the eight possible contact categories, no single type of contact

Table 3

Sources of Crime Information

Variable	Frequency	Percent
1. Was a victim or knew a victim	107	5.6
2. Witnessed criminal acts	138	7.3
3. Conversations with neighbors or friends	357	18.8
4. From local police meetings or newsletters	55	2.9
5. Media (Newspaper, tv, radio)	295	15.6

Table 4

Sources of Police Contact

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Have you been in contact with local police during the last 12 months? (Yes)	476	25.1
1. Casual conversations with a police officer	92	4.8
2. Responded to a call for service	97	5.1
3. Gave information to police	97	5.1
4. Reported crime to police	132	7.0
5. Survey given by police department	3	0.2
6. Asked police for information or advice	13	0.7
7. Community activity that involved police	11	0.6
8. Traffic violation/traffic accident	110	5.8

was predominant (see Table 4). Four of the eight categories involved contact of an official nature, with the youth either reporting a crime (7.0%), being involved in a traffic accident/violation (5.8%), giving information to law enforcement (5.1%), or contact with police as a result of the officer responding to a call for assistance (5.1%). The least likely method of contact involved responding to a survey given by local police (0.2%).

Research Question 1a: Are Youths' Demographic Characteristics (Age, Gender, Race, Education, Marital status, and Census region) Related to Their Fear of Crime?

On average , youth were "not very fearful" of crime in their neighborhoods (M = 2.14 on a scale of 1-4). Higher fear of crime was reported by females (M = 2.30), youth with Hispanic or Other racial backgrounds (M = 2.29 & 2.25), and those youth who lived

in the Northeast ($M = 2.37$), as detailed below.

Demographic Characteristics for Fear of Crime

Overall, 66.3% of all youth were "not at all fearful" or "not very fearful" of crime in their neighborhood (see Table 5). An independent T test was used to investigate whether the levels for fear of crime differed by age, gender, marital status, and education level (see Table 6). A statistically significant difference between younger youth (ages 16 - 17) and older youth (ages 18 - 25) was identified, $T(1895) = -2.52$, $p < .05$, with older youth being more fearful of crime in their neighborhood (older: $M = 2.16$, $SD = .86$; younger: $M = 2.01$, $SD = .88$). These results, however, with a mean difference of .15 on a scale of 1 to 4, do not appear to be practically significant.

It is also possible that this difference could be reflective of the fact that older youth have higher exposure rates to potential criminal victimizations than younger youth due to the increased personal freedoms that come with age, increased likelihood of employment, and the transition to more adult roles and settings (Cox & Conrad, 1996). Another possibility is that older youth may posses items of greater value than younger youth that might increase their likelihood of victimization (cars, jewelry, etc.), thereby increasing their fear of crime.

Females were also statistically different from males, $T(1895) = -8.80$, $p < .05$, with females more fearful of crime in the neighborhood (females: $M = 2.30$, $SD = .88$; males: $M = 1.96$, $SD = .81$). These results are consistent with the current literature on gender differences with regard to adult's fear of crime.

Table 5

Fear of Crime Demographic Frequencies and Percentages

Variable	How Fearful of Crime in Neighborhood				
	Not at All Fearful *N*(%)	Not Very Fearful *N*(%)	Somewhat Fearful *N*(%)	Very Fearful *N*(%)	Total *N*(100%)
Age					
16-17	77 (32.8)	92 (39.1)	53 (22.6)	13 (5.5)	235
18-25	402 (24.2)	687 (41.3)	479 (28.8)	94 (5.7)	1662
Sex					
Male (1)	287 (31.9)	383 (42.6)	207 (23.0)	23 (2.6)	900
Female	192 (19.3)	396 (39.7)	325 (32.6)	84 (8.4)	997
Race					
White non-Hispanic	284 (26.4)	475 (44.1)	287 (26.7)	30 (2.8)	1076
Black non-Hispanic	87 (26.2)	119 (35.8)	96 (28.9)	30 (9.0)	332
Hispanic	74 (22.0)	128 (38.0)	99 (29.4)	36 (10.7)	337
Other non-Hispanic	34 (22.4)	57 (37.5)	50 (32.9)	11 (7.2)	152
Education					
High school (1)	239 (29.8)	285 (35.5)	216 (26.9)	63 (7.8)	803
College	240 (21.9)	494 (45.2)	316 (28.9)	44 (4.0)	1094
Marital status					
Married (1)	49 (19.9)	102 (41.5)	78 (31.7)	17 (6.9)	246
Non-married	430 (26.0)	677 (41.0)	454 (27.5)	90 (5.5)	1651
Census region					
Northeast	59 (18.4)	117 (36.6)	110 (34.4)	34 (10.6)	320
Midwest	167 (30.5)	227 (41.4)	132 (24.1)	22 (4.0)	548
South	120 (24.4)	211 (43.0)	131 (26.7)	29 (5.9)	491
West	133 (24.7)	224 (41.6)	159 (29.6)	22 (4.1)	538

Table 6

Fear of Crime Mean Scores by Demographic Characteristics

Variables	*M*	*SD*	*T*	*F*	*p*
Age					
16-17	2.01	0.88	-2.52		0.01
18-25	2.16	0.86			
Gender					
Male	1.96	0.81	-8.80		0.00
Female	2.30	0.88			
Race					
White non-Hispanic	2.06	0.80			
Black non-Hispanic	2.21	0.93			
Hispanic	2.29	0.93		8.15	0.00
Other non-Hispanic	2.25	0.89			
Marital status					
Married	2.26	0.85	2.26		0.02
Non-married	2.12	0.86			
Education					
High school	2.13	0.93	-0.53		0.60
College	2.15	0.81			
Census region					
Northeast	2.37	0.90			
Midwest	2.02	0.84			
South	2.14	0.85		11.75	0.00
West	2.13	0.83			

A statistically significant difference between married and non-married youth was also found, $T(1895) = 2.26$, $p < .05$, with married youth being more fearful (married: $M = 2.26$, non-married: $M = 2.12$). As with Age, however, with a mean difference of .14 on a scale of 1 to 4 does not appear to be practically significant, and may be an effect of married youth being older.

A one-way ANOVA was used to investigate the relationships between fear of crime, and race and census region. Race results indicated statistically significant differences across the four racial categories, $F(3, 1893) = 8.15$, $p < .05$. To assess the pairwise differences among the four racial categories, the Tukey followup procedure was performed ($p = .05$). The results indicate that White non-Hispanics ($M = 2.06$) were statistically less fearful of crime than Black non-Hispanics ($M = 2.21$), Hispanics ($M = 2.29$), and Others ($M = 2.25$).

These findings are consistent with the current literature in two respects. First, when compared to Whites, other ethic groups tend to be more fearful of crime. This is not to say that Whites are more fearless than non-Whites, but instead, these results may be a reflection of the environments in which non-Whites tend to live. Given that the sample was also taken from large metropolitan areas, the economic advantages enjoyed by Whites may also play a role in screening them from the types of street level crime that are more common in less advantaged areas of the city.

Statistically significant differences were also found across the four census regions, $F(3, 1893) = 11.75$, $p < .05$. The Tukey follow-up procedure was again used to assess pairwise differences, indicating that youth living in the Northeast ($M = 2.37$) were

statistically more fearful of crime in their neighborhood than those that live in the Midwest ($M = 2.02$), South ($M = 2.14$), and West ($M = 2.13$). It is unclear why individuals living in the Northeast would be more fearful of crime than those in other regions of the country.

Research Question 1b: Are Youths' Demographic Characteristics (Age, Gender, Race, Education, Marital status, and Census region) Related to Their Satisfaction with Police?

On average, youth were satisfied with their neighborhood police (2.91 on a scale of 1 - 4). Higher satisfaction with police was reported by White non-Hispanics ($M = 2.83$) and college educated youth ($M = 2.95$), as described below.

Demographic Characteristics for Police Satisfaction

Overall, 83.1% of youth were satisfied or very satisfied with their local police agencies (see Table 7). An independent T test was used to investigate whether the levels of satisfaction with police differed by age, gender, marital status, and education (see Table 8). No statistical differences were identified for age, gender, and marital status. These results support the body of work that has found no clear distinction between the satisfaction levels of males and females. It may also be possible that while some literature states youth appear to be less satisfied with law enforcement than older adults (thirty and over), their views as a demographic group may not be homogenous.

A statistically significant difference was found between education levels, $T(1895) = -2.88$, $p < .05$, with college educated youth having a greater degree of satisfaction with neighborhood police than those with a high school education (high

Table 7

Satisfaction With Police Demographic Frequencies and Percentages

Variable	Satisfaction with Neighborhood Police				
	Very dissatisfied (%)	Dissatisfied (%)	Satisfied (%)	Very satisfied (%)	Total 100%
Age					
16-17	11 (4.7)	23 (9.8)	168 (71.5)	33 (14.0)	235
18-25	83 (5.0)	203 (12.2)	1162 (69.9)	214 (12.9)	1662
Sex					
Male (1)	41 (4.6)	98 (10.9)	635 (70.6)	126 (14.0)	900
Female	53 (5.3)	128 (12.8)	695 (69.7)	121 (12.1)	997
Race					
White non-Hispanic	31 (2.9)	94 (8.7)	787 (73.1)	164 (15.2)	1076
Black non-Hispanic	41 (12.3)	58 (17.5)	198 (59.6)	35 (10.5)	332
Hispanic	18 (5.3)	54 (16.0)	233 (69.1)	32 (9.5)	337
Other non-Hispanic	4 (2.6)	20 (13.2)	112 (73.7)	16 (10.5)	152
Education					
High school (1)	60 (7.5)	102 (12.7)	532 (66.3)	109 (13.6)	803
College	34 (3.1)	124 (11.3)	798 (72.9)	138 (12.6)	1094
Marital status					
Married (1)	12 (4.9)	26 (10.6)	166 (67.5)	42 (17.1)	246
Non-married	82 (5.0)	200 (12.1)	1164 (70.5)	205 (12.4)	1651
Census region					
Northeast	19 (5.9)	44 (13.8)	220 (68.8)	37 (11.6)	320
Midwest	24 (4.4)	56 (10.2)	389 (71.0)	79 (14.4)	548
South	33 (6.7)	63 (12.8)	328 (66.8)	67 (13.6)	491
West	18 (3.3)	63 (11.7)	393 (73.0)	64 (11.9)	538

Table 8

Satisfaction With Police Mean Scores by Demographic Characteristics

Variable	*M*	*SD*	*T*	*F*	*p*
Age					
16-17	2.95	0.65	0.91		0.36
18-25	2.91	0.67			
Gender					
Male	2.94	0.65	1.75		0.08
Female	2.89	0.67			
Race					
White non-Hispanic	3.01	0.60			
Black non-Hispanic	2.68	0.82		23.13	0.00
Hispanic	2.83	0.66			
Other non-Hispanic	2.92	0.58			
Marital status					
Married	2.97	0.69	1.41		0.16
Non-married	2.90	0.66			
Education					
High school	2.86	0.74	-2.88		0.00
College	2.95	0.60			
Census region					
Northeast	2.86	0.69			
Midwest	2.95	0.65		2.18	0.09
South	2.87	0.72			
West	2.93	0.61			

school: $M = 2.86$, $SD = .74$; college: $M = 2.95$, $SD = .60$). This statistically significant result may lie in the increased economic well-being of older, more educated individuals and their reliance on law enforcement to help them protect their growing or existing assets. As with previous statistically significant results, however, a mean difference of .09 on a scale of 1 to 4 does not appear to be practically significant.

A one-way ANOVA was used to investigate the relationship between satisfaction with police, and race and census region. Race results indicated statistically significant differences across the four racial categories, $F(3, 1893) = 23.13$, $p < .05$. To assess the pairwise differences among the four racial categories, the Tukey followup procedure was performed ($p = .05$). Results indicated that Black non-Hispanics ($M = 2.68$) were statistically less satisfied with police than White non-Hispanics ($M = 3.01$), Hispanics ($M = 2.83$), and Others ($M = 2.92$), while White non-Hispanics and Others were more satisfied with police than Hispanics or Black non-Hispanics. These results are consistent with current literature which shows Blacks are less satisfied with police when compared to Whites. On average, Blacks tend to view law enforcement officials with skepticism, often feeling police are the enemy or are biased in their treatment of Black citizens (Mieczkowski, 1996). These findings also support the position that those of Hispanic ancestry, when compared to other racial groups, tend to take the middle ground with respect to satisfaction with police. There was no statistical difference in police satisfaction between the four census regions.

Research Question 2a: How Well Do Demographics, Use of Public Transportation, Victimization, Community crime, Quality of life, Community disorder, and Police contact Explain Youths' Fear of Crime?

Data for this section of the results are presented in three main categories: (a) index construction, (b) checks for multicollinearity, and (c) linear and multiple regression results.

Index Construction

Due to theoretical links among specific independent variables, four possible indices were tested for consideration: (a) movement patterns, (b) victimization, (c) community crime, and (d) community disorder. Confirmatory factor analyses using oblique rotations were used to obtain pattern matrices of unique relationships. Extraction of factors occurred when eigenvalues were greater than 1.

Movement patterns measure

Movement patterns consisted of two variables, "How often do you go shopping?" and "How often do you ride public transportation?". The two items loaded on one factor (with a Pearson correlation coefficient of -0.62). The alpha reliability coefficient was -0.10. Because of the low reliability coefficient and theoretical considerations that make an individual's exposure during the use of public transportation a more salient contributor to an individual's fear of crime (Ishwaran, 2000), "How often do you go shopping?" was dropped from further analyses. Consequently, no "Movement Pattern" index was constructed; instead the use of "Public Transportation" was implemented as a single item

independent variable in the analyses.

Victimization index

Four questions about victimization were included in the survey: "Were you a victim of theft or attempted theft?," "Were you a victim of robbery or attempted robbery?," "Were you a victim of assault or attempted assault?," and "Were you a victim of sexual attack/rape?" The factor analysis pattern matrix identified two factors (see Table 9). Because sexual assault/rape occurred in only 0.6% of the sample, "Were you a victim of sexual attack/rape?" was dropped from further analyses. Frequency index scores ranged from no victimization to having experienced all three kinds of victimization (0-3) (see Table 10).

Community crime index

The community crime section of the survey began with a screening question, "Are you aware of any serious crime in your neighborhood?" Those who answered "yes" were

Table 9

Victimization Pattern Matrix

Variable	Factor	
	1	2
1. Were you a victim of theft or attempted theft?	0.65	0.11
Were you a victim of robbery or attempted robbery?	0.61	-0.46
Were you a victim of assault or attempted assault?	0.62	0.23
2. Were you a victim of sexual assault/rape?	0.21	0.87

Table 10

Victimization Index Frequencies and Percentages

Number of Victimizations	Frequency	Percentage
0	1365	72.0
1	441	23.2
2	84	4.4
3	7	0.4

then given nine possible crime categories to select from, identifying which types of serious crime they were aware of. Individuals who answered "no" to the screening question did not continue with this section. Because only youth who answered "yes" to the skip question continued to identify the type of crime(s) they were aware of, "not aware" responses were coded as zeros. The nine types of crime or awareness categories were: people openly selling drugs, people openly using drugs, crimes committed with guns, murder, auto theft, theft of personal property, breaking and entering, violent physical attacks, and sexual assault/rape. The factor analysis pattern matrix identified three factors (see Table 11). Because drug offenses are typically of a less serious nature in the eyes of the law when compared to violent offenses, collapsing the four variables into a single index did not seem logical. Selling and using drugs, therefore, were separated from crimes committed with guns and murder to form a second index, labeled "Violence." Factor 2, auto theft, theft, and breaking and entering formed a third index, labeled "Property," while Factor 3, sexual assault/rape and violent physical attacks formed a forth index, labeled "Physical." Note that auto theft, while falling slightly below the 0.5 guideline for

Table 11

Community Crime Pattern Matrix

Variable	Factor		
	1	2	3
Violence			
People openly using drugs	0.80	0.10	-0.02
Crimes committed with guns	0.71	-0.05	-0.15
Murder	0.63	-0.23	0.10
People openly selling drugs	0.62	0.19	0.12
Property			
Theft of personal property	-0.05	0.84	-0.02
Breaking and entering	-0.09	0.82	0.04
Auto theft	0.32	0.49	-0.04
Physical			
Sexual assault/rape	-0.16	0.09	0.89
Violent physical attacks	0.19	-0.11	0.71

determining factors previously discussed, was still within the 0.45 to 0.55 range. Table 12 presents frequencies and percentages for each index. Although a large percentage of the respondents were unaware of Drug (82.1%), Violence (80.3%), Property (74.9%), and Physical (80.8%) crimes in their neighborhood, these indices were still maintained in the regression models to investigate any possible effects of those who were aware of these offenses.

Community disorder index

The community disorder section of the survey consisted of twelve questions about:

Table 12

Frequencies and Percentages for Community Crime Indices

Indices - Number of Items		Frequency	Percentage
Drug (0-2)			
	0	1557	82.1
	1	129	6.8
	2	211	11.1
Violence (0-2)			
	0	1524	80.3
	1	202	10.6
	2	171	9.0
Property (0-3)			
	0	1420	74.9
	1	166	8.8
	2	163	8.6
	3	148	7.8
Physical (0-2)			
	0	1532	80.8
	1	240	12.7
	2	125	6.6

public drinking/drug use, public drug sales, loitering, truancy, abandoned cars/buildings, rundown buildings, poor lighting, overgrown trees/shrubs, trash, empty lots, panhandling, and transients. The factor analysis pattern matrix was used to identify three factors (see Table 13). Factor 1 consisted of drinking/drug use, drug sales, loitering, and truancy, forming the first index, "Public." Factor 2, which consisted of abandoned cars, rundown

Table 13

Community Disorder Pattern Matrix

	Factor		
Variable	1	2	3
Public			
Public drug sales	0.90	-0.05	-0.15
Public drinking/drug use	0.82	-0.01	-0.03
Truancy	0.77	-0.08	-0.05
Loitering	0.58	-0.09	0.34
Area			
Overgrown shrubs/tress	-0.17	0.77	-0.13
Empty lots	-0.05	0.72	0.02
Rundown buildings	0.19	0.64	-0.02
Poor lighting	-0.16	0.60	0.17
Abandoned cars/buildings	0.28	0.53	-0.08
Trash	0.19	0.50	0.08
People			
Transients	-0.09	-0.02	0.92
Panhandling	0.05	0.02	0.83

buildings, lighting, overgrown trees, trash, and empty lots formed the second index labeled, "Area." Factor 3, panhandling and transients, formed index three, "People." Table 14 presents frequencies and percentages for each index.

As can be seen in Table 14, more than half of the respondents were aware of one or more Public and Area community disorder attributes. It is not clear why in large metropolitan areas, more than 65% of the respondents were unaware of people begging

Table 14

Frequencies and Percentages for Community Disorder Indices

Indices - Number of Items		Frequency	Percentage
Public (0-4)			
	0	825	43.5
	1	406	21.4
	2	270	14.2
	3	202	10.6
	4	189	10.0
Area (0-6)			
	0	776	40.9
	1	444	23.4
	2	246	13.0
	3	178	9.4
	4	117	6.2
	5	73	3.8
	6	63	3.3
People (0-2)			
	0	1241	65.4
	1	333	17.6
	2	322	17.0

and transients.

Multicollinearity

Checks for multicollinearity were accomplished by first running a bi-variate correlation matrix using each of the independent variables. All Pearson correlations

between independent variables were under the accepted level for checks of multicollinearity ($r = .6$) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001), with the exception of the Community Crime category. As shown in Table 15, variable 5 displays inflated Pearson Correlations with variables 6-9, probably because most people are unaware of crimes in their neighborhood (and were) therefore coded zero. Due to their extremely low correlations with variables of central interest (Fear of Crime and Satisfaction with Police), Public Transportation and Police Contact were removed from further analyses (see zero correlations in columns 1 and 2 of Table 15).

As expected, a low negative correlation ($r = -.19$) existed between fear of crime and satisfaction with police. It is reasonable to assume that as an individual's fear of crime increased, their satisfaction with those who were charged with its suppression would decrease. Fear of crime also had a moderate negative correlation with Quality of Life ($r = -.42$). Again, this type of relationship would be expected. All other independent variables yielded low to moderate positive correlations with fear of crime, the strongest being the Area - Community Disorder index ($r = .28$).

Satisfaction with local police also displayed logical associations and directions between variables. Qualify of Life was the only independent variable that displayed a positive association with Satisfaction with Police ($r = .38$). All other independent variables exhibited low to moderate negative correlations with Satisfaction with Police.

A second check for multicollinearity was performed by regressing each independent variable on all the other independent variables. This was done to examine the possibility that even though none of the bi-variate relationships was too high,

Table 15

Variable Correlation Matrix

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Fear of crime	—													
2. Satisfaction with police	-.19	—												
3. Public transportation	.07	-.05	—											
4. Victim	.12	-.15	.00	—										
5. Serious crimes	.19	-.16	.06	.15	—									
6. Community-Drugs	.18	-.22	.10	.18	.62	—								
7. Community-Violence	.18	-.23	.07	.13	.65	.60	—							
8. Community-Property	.18	-.16	.01	.20	.73	.55	.50	—						
9. Community-Physical	.14	-.15	.07	.12	.63	.58	.55	.56	—					
10. Quality of life	-.42	.38	-.08	-.18	-.29	-.32	-.33	-.27	-.25	—				
11. Disorder-Public	.25	-.27	.17	.19	.34	.54	.36	.35	.37	-.41	—			
12. Disorder-Area	.28	-.23	.11	.17	.29	.36	.29	.30	.28	-.39	.53	—		
13. Disorder-People	.17	-.10	.15	.13	.26	.29	.24	.28	.32	-.19	.44	.41	—	
14. Police contact	.02	.01	-.00	.01	-.00	-.02	-.03	.00	-.00	-.01	-.02	-.00	.02	—

Significant at the 0.05 level when Pearson correlation is .056 (2-tailed)
Significant at the 0.01 level when Pearson correlation is > .056 (2-tailed)

multicollinearity might still be present. Results were given in the form of tolerances, 1 minus the R^2s obtained from the previously mentioned regression runs. When tolerances are below 0.4, multicollinearity may be an issue (Allison, 1999). All tolerances for this study were above 0.4.

Regression Analyses

Demographics

The ten demographic variables shown in Table 16 explain approximately 7% of the variance in fear of crime, $R^2 = .07$, $F(10, 1896) = 13.91$, $p < .05$. Standardized multiple regression coefficients indicated that Gender was the strongest predictor for fear of crime ($\beta = -.19$) almost twice as predictive as the next highest coefficients, Hispanic ($\beta = .10$) and Northeast ($\beta = .10$). While still statistically significant, the variables Age, Black non-Hispanic, and Other were approximately one third the predictive strength of Gender. Results also indicated that younger youth were less fearful of crime than older youth.

Among racial groups, every racial category was more fearful of crime than White non-Hispanics. These findings support the belief that Blacks, Hispanics, and other racial backgrounds display elevated levels of fear, but results are not consistent with the degree of fear, identifying Hispanics as most fearful ($\beta = .10$), followed by Others ($\beta = .06$), and Blacks ($\beta = .05$).

Census Region comparisons showed youth living in the Northeast were statistically more fearful of crime than those living in the West, and were much more fearful than those living in the South. As with the results in Question 1a, the reason for these differences,

Table 16

Fear of Crime Regressed on Demographics

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β
Age (Younger = 1)	-.13*	.07	-.05
Gender (Male = 1	-.32*	.04	-.19
Black non-Hispanic [a]	.11*	.05	.05
Hispanic	.22*	.06	.10
Other non-Hispanic	.19*	.07	.06
Education (High school = 1)	-.04	.05	-.03
Marital status (Married = 1)	.08	.06	.03
Northeast [b]	.22*	.06	.10
Midwest	-.09	.05	-.05
South	.02	.06	.01

a. Race reference variable = White non-Hispanic
b. Census region reference variable = West
Constant = 2.23
$R^2 = .07$
*$p < .05$

and the relative similarities among Midwestern, Southern, and Western youth, is unknown.

Victimization

Using multiple regression, Fear of Crime was regressed on victimization (see Table 17). When controlling for demographics, the Victim index explained an additional 2.0% of the variance in fear of crime, with approximately 9.0% of the total variance explained by Model 2 ($R^2 = .09$, R^2 change = .02, $F(11, 1890) = 16.07$, $p < .05$). Standardized multiple regression coefficients indicate that, like demographics (Model 1), Gender, Hispanic, and Northeast were the strongest predictors for fear of crime, with Gender being

Table 17

Fear of Crime Regressed on Victimization

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	Constant	R^2
Model 1				2.23	.07
Age (Younger =1)	-.12	.07	-.05		
Gender (Male = 1)	-.34*	.04	-.20		
Black non-Hispanic [a]	.12	.05	.05		
Hispanic	.21*	.05	.10		
Other non-Hispanic	.20*	.07	.06		
Education (High school = 1)	-.05	.04	-.03		
Marital status (Married = 1)	.08	.06	.03		
Northeast [b]	.22*	.06	.10		
Midwest	-.09	.05	-.05		
South	.02 *	.06	.01		
Model 2				2.17	.09
Victim (0-3)	.20*	.03	.13		

a. Race reference variable = White non-Hispanic
b. Census region reference variable = West
*$p < .05$

most predictive. Those youth who had higher victim frequency index scores were significantly more likely to be fearful of crime. These results indicate that multiple, rather than single incident, occurrences of victimization might have more effect on an individual's fear of crime.

With the inclusion of the victimization index in Model 2, the statistical difference between fear of crime for Blacks and Whites, and younger and older youth, were no longer present. Hispanics remained the most fearful of crime among the racial categories.

Youth living in the Northeast continued to be more fearful of crime than youth in the West; however, with the inclusion of victimization, youth living in the South appeared to be more fearful than those youth living in the West. These results indicate that, while controlling for other independent variables, victimization frequencies might play a role in mediating the impact of Blacks fear of crime when compared to Whites and younger youths' fear of crime when compared to older youth.

Community Crime(a)

Fear of crime was regressed on Awareness of Serious Crimes in the Community (see Table 18). Results indicate that while controlling for demographics, those who were aware of serious crimes in their neighborhood were significantly more likely to be fearful of crime than those who were not aware of serious crimes in the neighborhood. Additionally, the inclusion of Awareness of Serious Crimes (Model 2) explained approximately 10.0% of the variance in fear of crime, an increase of 3.0% over demographics (Model 1) ($R^2 = .10$, R^2 change = .03, $F(11, 1829) = 19.24$, $p < .05$). Among predictor variables, Gender ($\beta = -.18$) and Serious Crimes ($\beta = .18$) were the strongest predictors for fear of crime, followed by Hispanic ($\beta = .09$), and Northeast ($\beta = .08$). Among racial variables, Hispanic was still the most predictive, almost twice that of Blacks, which remained a statistically significant predictor for fear of crime when compared to Whites.

These results are consistent with previous findings that indicate a positive relationship between fear of crime and awareness of serious crimes in the neighborhood.

Table 18

Fear of Crime Regressed on Awareness of Serious Crimes in the Community

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	Constant	R^2
Model 1				2.23	.07
Age (Younger = 1)	-.12	.06	-.05		
Gender (Male = 1)	-.32*	.04	-.18		
Black non-Hispanic [a]	.11*	.05	.05		
Hispanic	.21*	.05	.09		
Other non-Hispanic	.20*	.07	.06		
Education (High school = 1)	-.02	.04	-.01		
Marital status (Married = 1)	.09	.06	.03		
Northeast [b]	.19*	.06	.08		
Midwest	-.10	.05	-.05		
South	.02	.05	.01		
Model 2				2.11	.10
Serious crimes	.33*	.04	.18		

a. Race reference variable = White non-Hispanic
b. Census region reference variable = West
*$p < .05$

This relationship also seems to be reasonable, as one would expect individuals who are aware of crime in their area to be more fearful when compared to those who were unaware and therefore had no reason to fear.

Community Crime(b)

The second step of community crime analyses involved regressing fear of crime on the four indices: Drugs, Violence, Property, and Physical (see Table 19). While

Table 19

Fear of Crime Regressed on Community Crime Indices

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	Constant	R^2
Model 1				2.23	.07
Age (Younger = 1)	-.11	.06	-.04		
Gender (Male = 1)	-.33*	.04	-.19		
Black non-Hispanic [a]	.08	.05	.03		
Hispanic	.20*	.05	.09		
Other non-Hispanic	.21*	.07	.07		
Education (High school = 1)	-.04	.04	-.02		
Marital status (Married = 1)	.08	.06	.03		
Northeast [b]	.18*	.06	.08		
Midwest	-.09	.05	-.05		
South	.02	.05	.01		
Model 2				2.14	.11
Drugs (0-2)	.08*	.04	.06		
Violence (0-2)	.12*	.04	.09		
Property (0-3)	.09*	.03	.10		
Physical (0-2)	-.07	.05	-.00		

a. Race reference variable = White non-Hispanic
b. Census region reference variable = West
*$p < .05$

controlling for demographics, the community crime indices explained approximately 4.0% of the variance in fear of crime ($R^2 = .11$, R^2 change = .04, $F = 16.74$, $p < .05$). Model 2 accounted for roughly 11.0% of the total variance. Standardized multiple regression coefficients indicated that those who were aware of drug, violence, or property crimes in their neighborhood were statistically more likely to be fearful of crime than those who

were not aware of such activities. Of the three statistically significant indices, Property was the most predictive ($\beta = .10$), almost twice that of Drugs ($\beta = .06$).

Gender remained as the strongest predictor for fear of crime ($\beta = -.19$), followed by two of the four indices, Property and Violence ($\beta = .08$). Hispanic remained the strongest of the racial variables ($\beta = .09$).

Those with the highest awareness frequencies for Property (auto-theft, theft of personal property, and breaking and entering) were more fearful of crime than any other community crime index. In contrast, awareness of violent physical attacks and sexual assault/rape had almost no affect on youths' fear of crime. The reason for this relationship is unclear, but respondents were less aware of physical attacks than other types of crime.

Quality of Life

Using multiple regression, fear of crime was regressed on Quality of Life (see Table 20). While controlling for demographics, Quality of Life explained an additional 15.0% of the variance in fear of crime when compared to Model 1. Total variance explained by Quality of Life (Model 2) was approximately 22.0%, the largest of any independent variable ($R^2 = .22$, R^2 change = .15, $F(11, 1887) = 47.13$, $p < .05$). Standardized multiple regression coefficients indicated that as fear of crime increased, individuals' satisfaction with their quality of life significantly decreased.

More than double the predictive strength of Gender for fear of crime, Quality of Life was also greater than Education and substantially greater than Midwest, the next two

Table 20

Fear of Crime Regressed on Quality of Life (N=1888)

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	Constant	R^2
Model 1				2.23	.07
Age (Younger = 1)	-.06	.06	-.02		
Gender (Male = 1)	-.29*	.04	-.17		
Black non-Hispanic [a]	-.07	.05	-.03		
Hispanic	.10*	.05	.05		
Other non-Hispanic	.10	.07	.03		
Education (High school = 1)	-.11*	.04	-.06		
Marital status (Married = 1)	.07	.05	.03		
Northeast [b]	.07	.06	.03		
Midwest	-.10*	.05	-.05		
South	.01	.05	.01		
Model 2				3.83	.22
Quality of life (1-4)	-.49*	.03	-.40		

a. Race reference variable = White non-Hispanic
b. Census region reference variable = West
*$p < .05$

strongest predictors in predicting fear of crime. Hispanic remained the only statistically significant predictor for fear of crime among the racial variables and was the weakest of the statistically significant variables.

Due to the relatively large amount of variance explained by Model 2, further exploration into the concept of youths' quality of life is needed. Youth in this sample appear to be quite satisfied with the quality of life in their neighborhood ($M = 3.07$ on a scale of 1 - 4). Approximately 85.2% reported they were either "satisfied" or "very

satisfied" with their neighborhood's quality of life. What is not known is how youth define quality of life or what characteristics affect quality of life. Given the results of this analysis, further research into this area is warranted.

Community Disorder

Fear of crime was regressed on three community disorder indices (see Table 21). Standardized multiple regression coefficients indicate that those who were aware of public and area crimes in their neighborhood were more likely to be fearful of crime than those who were not. Those with higher Area frequencies index scores were the most fearful (β =.20). Among Model 2 variables, Area was the strongest predictor for fear of crime, followed by Gender (β = -.19), Public (β = .13), and Hispanic (β = .09). Overall, Model 2 explained approximately 16.0% of the variance in fear of crime, an increase of 9.0% over Model 1 (R^2 = .16, R^2 change = .09, $F(13, 1890) = 27.76$, $p < .05$). The results mentioned above are consistent with an ecological explanation for crime called Broken Windows Theory (Kelling & Coles, 1996), which states that criminal activity is more likely to occur in communities that allow their outward appearance to decline (such as not fixing broken windows, garbage on the street, and so on). Offenders assume this visual decay is reflective of the citizens' lack of attention or interest in their neighborhood. Because of this, criminals believe they can operate in such areas with little or no risk of being noticed or caught.

Youth who have higher frequency scores for community disorder Area and Public

Table 21

Fear of Crime Regressed on Community Disorder Indices

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	Constant	R^2
Model 1				2.23	.07
Age (Younger = 1)	-.10	.06	-.04		
Gender (Male = 1)	-.33*	.04	-.19		
Black non-Hispanic [a]	.03	.05	.01		
Hispanic	.21*	.05	.09		
Other non-Hispanic	.21*	.07	.07		
Education (High school = 1)	-.05	.04	-.03		
Marital status (Married = 1)	.15*	.06	.06		
Northeast [b]	.16*	.06	.07		
Midwest	-.09	.05	-.05		
South	.03	.05	.02		
Model 2				1.98	.16
Public (0-4)	.08*	.02	.13		
Area (0-6)	.11*	.01	.20		
People (0-2)	.03	.03	.03		

a. Race reference variable = White non-Hispanic
b. Census region reference variable = West
*$p < .05$

variables may also be more aware of crime in their neighborhood, and therefore more fearful.

Full Model

All independent variables were analyzed using hierarchical multiple regression (see Table 22). Using standardized multiple regression coefficients, Model 1 explained

Table 22

Fear of Crime Standardized Coefficients for All Independent Variables

	Model					
Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
Age	-.05*	-.05	-.04	-.04	-.02	-.02
Gender (Male=1)	-.19**	-.20**	-.20**	-.20**	-.18**	-.18**
Black non-Hispanic	.05*	.05	.05	.03	-.03	-.03
Hispanic	.10*	.10**	.09**	.09**	.05*	.06*
Other non-Hispanic	.06*	.06*	.06*	.07*	.04	.04*
Education (HS=1)	-.03	-.03	-.02	-.02	-.06*	-.05*
Married (Married=1)	.03	.03	.04	.04	.03	.04*
Northeast (Yes=1)	.09**	.09**	.08*	.07*	.03	.03
Midwest	-.05	-.05	-.06*	-.05*	-.05*	-.05
South	.01	.00**	.00	-.00	.00	.01
Victimization		.13	.11**	.09**	.05*	.04
Serious crimes			.17**	.04	.03	.04
Drug index				.05	.02	-.03
Violence index				.08*	.03	.02
Property index				.07*	.03	.01
Physical index				-.01	-.01	-.03
Quality of life					-.36**	-.31**
Public index						.06*
Area index						.12**
People index						.03
F Ratio	14.15	16.29	20.26	16.55	31.87	30.03
R^2	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.12	0.23	0.24

* $p < .05$
** $p < .001$

approximately 7% of the variance in fear of crime and identified Gender as the strongest predictor (β = -.19). Among race variables, Hispanic was almost twice as predictive as Black and Other when compared to White, and between Census Regions, Northeast was the strongest predictor when compared to West.

In general, Age and Gender displayed negative associations with fear of crime, identifying younger youth and males as less fearful, while those youth who live in the Northeast were more fearful than youth in the West, and all racial categories were more fearful of crime when compared to Whites.

Model 2 investigated the effect of Victimization on fear of crime while controlling for demographic variables and increased the amount of variance explained by 2% (R^2 = 0.09) over Model 1. As with Model 1, Gender was the strongest predictive variable for fear of crime (β = -.20), followed by Hispanic (β = .10), and Northeast (β = .09). Overall, the inclusion of Victimization into the model did very little to help explain variance in fear of crime. Age and Black dropped out of the model as statistically significant, while youth living in the South were significantly more fearful of crime than youth in the West.

Model 3 introduced Awareness of Serious Crimes into the analysis. Controlling for Demographics and Victimization, Awareness of Serious Crimes increased the amount of variance explained in fear of crime by 3% over Model 2 (R^2 = .12). Gender remained as the strongest predictor for fear of crime, but was no longer the dominant variable as in previous models. Awareness of Serious Crime (β = .17) and Victimization (β = .12) were also strong predictors, followed by Hispanic (β = .09) and Northeast (β = .08).

Model 3 indicated that those youth with higher victim frequency scores and greater awareness of serious crimes in their neighborhood were more fearful of crime. Hispanic remained the strongest predictor among racial variables and Northeast continued as the strongest predictor among Census Region variables. Youth living in the Midwest, however, were less fearful of crime when compared to youth in the West when Awareness of Serious Crime was present in the model.

Model 4 investigated the predictive strength of the four community crime indices (Drug, Violence, Property, & Physical), while controlling for variables present in Model 3. The community crime indices, when compared to the previous model, did not contribute to the amount of variance explained in fear of crime (R^2 = .12). Gender continued to be the strongest predictor (β = -.20), followed by Victimization (β = .09), Hispanic (β = .09), and Northeast (β = .02). Youth with higher victimization frequencies remained fearful of crime and those living in the Midwest continued to be less fearful of crime than those living in the West. Among the community crime indices, youth who had higher violence and property frequencies were most fearful of crime.

Model 5 produced the strongest predictor variable for fear of crime. Controlling for variables present in Model 4, Qualify of Life explained approximately 11% of the variance in fear of crime (R^2 = 0.23). Quality of Life (β = -.36) was double the predictive strength of Gender (β = -.18), six times that of Education (β = -.06), and seven times that of Victimization (β = .05) Midwest (β = -.05) and Hispanic (β = .05). Northeast dropped from the model as statistically significant and the predictive strength of Hispanic, while remaining statistically significant, decreased by about half.

Overall, males continued to be less fearful of crime than females, and Hispanics were the only racial group that was statistically more fearful of crime than Whites. Youth with a high school education were less fearful than those with a college education, those in the Midwest continued to be less fearful of crime than individuals in the West and youth with higher victimization frequencies continued to be fearful of crime. Quality of Life, as the strongest predictor, indicated that youths' fear of crime increased, their perceptions regarding their quality of life decreased. As mentioned previously, this finding highlights the need to explore how youth define quality of life and what characteristics are necessary to maintain and improve their quality of life.

Model 6, the three community disorder indices (Public, Area, & People) explained an additional 1% of the variance in fear of crime. Total R^2 for the full model was .24 or approximately one quarter of the variance in fear of crime. Quality of Life continued to be the strongest predictor (β = -.31), followed by Gender (β = -.18), Area (β = .12), and Education (β = -.05). Hispanic and Other were statistically more fearful of crime than White, married youth were more fearful than nonmarried youth, and those with a high school education were more fearful of crime than those with a college education. Among the community disorder indices, those with high area frequency scores were twice as fearful of crime than those with high public area frequency scores.

Full Model - Quality of Life

Because quality of life was the strongest predictor variable, a full model hierarchical regression was re-run to investigate the effect, if any, of using quality of life as

the first model (see Table 23). With fear of crime regressed on all independent variables, using Quality of life as the first model, Model 1 explained approximately 17% of the variance (versus 11% in Table 22 - the original full-model), with an additional 5% explained by Model 2, demographics. Subsequent models (3-6) accounted for an additional 2% of the variance explained. As with the original full-model (Table 22), Quality of Life (-.31) and Gender (-.18) consistently remained as the strongest predictor variables, along with the Area Index in Model 6 (.12).

Research Question 2a: How well do demographics, use of public transportation, victimization, community crime, quality of life, and community disorder, explain youths' satisfaction with law enforcement?

Regressions

Demographics

The ten demographic variables shown in Table 24 explained a small portion of the variance (4.0%) in satisfaction with neighborhood police, $R^2 = .04$, $F(10, 1886) = 8.28$, $p < .05$. Standardized multiple regression coefficients indicated that younger youth were more satisfied with police than older youth, Non-Hispanic Blacks and Hispanics were less satisfied with police than White non-Hispanics, and those with a high school education were less satisfied with police than those with a college education. Black was the strongest predictor of satisfaction with police ($\beta = -.17$), being almost twice that of Hispanic ($\beta = -.10$) and three times that of Education ($\beta = -.06$).

Table 23

Fear of Crime Standardized Coefficients for All Independent Variables Using Quality of Life as Model 1

	Model					
Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
Quality of life	-.41**	-.40**	-.39**	-.37**	-.36**	-.31**
Age		-.02	-.02	-.02	-.02	-.02
Gender (Male=1)		-.17**	-.18**	-.18**	-.18**	-.18**
Black non-Hispanic		-.03	-.03	-.03	-.03	-.03
Hispanic		.05*	.05*	.05*	.05*	.06*
Other non-Hispanic		.03	.03	.04	.04	.04
Education (HS=1)		-.06*	-.07*	-.06*	-.06*	-.05*
Married (Married=1)		.03	.03	.03	.03	.04*
Northeast (Yes=1)		.03	.03	.03	.03	.03
Midwest		-.05*	-.05*	-.05*	-.05*	-.05*
South		.00	.00	.00	.00	.01
Victimization			.06*	.06*	.05*	.04
Serious crimes				.07*	.03	.04
Drug index					.02	-.03
Violence index					.03	.02
Property index					.03	.01
Physical index					-.01	-.03
Public index						.06*
Area index						.12*
People Index						.03
F Ratio	384.94	46.81	43.87	41.49	31.87	30.03
R^2	0.17	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.23	0.24

* $p < .05$
** $p < .001$

Table 24

Satisfaction with Police Regressed on Demographics

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β
Age (Younger = 1)	.14*	.05	.07
Gender (Male = 1	.04	.03	.03
Black non-Hispanic [a]	-.30*	.04	-.17
Hispanic	-.17*	.04	-.10
Other non-Hispanic	-.09	.06	-.04
Education (High school = 1)	-.07*	.04	-.06
Marital status (Married = 1)	.08	.05	.04
Northeast [b]	-.03	.05	-.02
Midwest	-.03	.04	-.00
South	-.04	.04	-.03

a. Race reference variable = White Non-Hispanic
b. Census region reference variable = West
Constant = 3.01
R^2 = .04
*p < .05

These results are consistent with previous findings mentioned in the literature review that identify race as one of the strongest predictors of satisfaction with police, and that Blacks in particular tend to have negative perceptions of law enforcement (Langan et al., 2001). Given that the sample was obtained from large metropolitan areas, where dissatisfaction with police among minorities tends to be higher than in rural areas, these findings support the previously described interpersonal dynamics between law enforcement, Blacks, and Hispanics.

Of additional interest are the perceptions of younger youth and those with a high school education. Results indicate that younger youth tend to have perceptions of

satisfaction with police, while those with a high school education are dissatisfied. At first glance, these results would appear to be inconsistent. It could be, however, that those with a high school education are in fact older youth who might be dissatisfied with their life in general. This general dissatisfaction might, in turn, be directed to those who hold positions of power and authority, such as law enforcement officers. It might also be possible that older youth with a high school education are involved in illegal activities that might increase the likelihood of youth interactions with police officers.

Victimization

Using multiple regression, satisfaction with police was regressed on victimization (see Table 25). Victimization (Model 2) explained approximately 6.0% of the variance in police satisfaction, an increase of 2.0% over Model 1 ($R^2 = .06$, R^2 change = .02, $F(11, 1890) = 11.33$, $p < .05$). Standardized multiple regression coefficients indicated that victims with higher frequency index scores were significantly less likely to be satisfied with neighborhood police than those who had not. These results might indicated that multiple, rather than single incident, occurrences of victimization might have more effect on youths' satisfaction with police. This finding also highlights the importance to law enforcement of making police/victim contacts more positive in nature. As discussed previously, negative contact between law enforcement officers and community members lowers the perceptions of police satisfaction.

Table 25

Satisfaction with Police Regressed on Victimization

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	Constant	R^2
Model 1				3.01	.04
Age (Younger =1)	.13*	.05	.06		
Gender (Male = 1)	.05	.03	.04		
Black non-Hispanic [a]	-.29*	.04	-.17		
Hispanic	-.17*	.04	-.10		
Other non-Hispanic	-.11	.06	-.04		
Education (High school = 1)	-.07	.04	-.05		
Marital status (Married = 1)	.07	.05	.04		
Northeast [b]	-.03	.05	-.02		
Midwest	-.03	.04	-.00		
South	-.04	.04	-.03		
Model 2				3.05	.06
Victim (0-3)	-.16*	.03	-.14		

a. Race reference variable = White non-Hispanic
b. Census region reference variable = West
*$p < .05$

Community Crime(a)

Satisfaction with police was regressed on Awareness of Serious Crimes (see Table 26). Standardized multiple regression coefficients showed that those who were aware of serious crimes in their neighborhood were significantly less likely to be satisfied with neighborhood police when compared to those who were unaware. This result appears to be reasonable as citizens often associate police performance with the degree of crime in the neighborhood (Murty et al., 1990). Among racial variables, Black and Hispanic

continued to be predictors of satisfaction with police. Black was the strongest predictor of satisfaction with police ($\beta = -.17$), followed by Awareness of Serious Crime ($\beta = -.16$). In general, Awareness of Serious Crimes (Model 2) explained approximately 6.0% of the variance in police satisfaction, an increase of 3.0% over Model 1 ($R^2 = .06$, R^2 change = .03, $F(11, 1829) = 12.63$, $p < .05$).

Community Crime(b)

Using multiple regression, satisfaction with police was regressed on the four

Table 26

Satisfaction with Police Regressed on Serious Crimes

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	Constant	R^2
Model 1				3.01	.04
Age (Younger = 1)	.13*	.05	.06		
Gender (Male = 1)	.04	.03	.03		
Black non-Hispanic [a]	-.30*	.04	-.17		
Hispanic	-.17*	.04	-.10		
Other non-Hispanic	-.10	.06	-.04		
Education (High school = 1)	-.09*	.04	-.07		
Marital status (Married = 1)	.07	.05	.03		
Northeast [b]	-.10	.05	-.01		
Midwest	.06	.04	.00		
South	-.04	.04	-.03		
Model 2				3.08	.07
Serious crimes	-.23*	.03	-.16		

a. Race reference variable = White non-Hispanic
b. Census region reference variable = West
*$p < .05$

community crime indices (see Table 27). Controlling for demographics, the four community crime indices (Drugs, Violence, Property, & Physical) explained approximately 6.0% of the variance in satisfaction with police. Model 2 accounted for 10.0% of the total variance in satisfaction with police ($R^2 = .10$, R^2 change = .06, $F(14, 587) = 14.05$, $p < .05$). Unstandardized coefficients indicate that those who had higher awareness frequency scores for drug and violence crimes were less likely to be satisfied with police than those who were unaware. These perceptions might reflect how youths' attitudes towards serious crimes that could inflict grievous harm or death, and high profile crimes such as drug use, affect overall satisfaction with police. Current findings may indicate that youth feel police are not doing enough to control these crimes.

Quality of Life

Similar to Fear of Crime, Quality of Life was the strongest predictor of satisfaction with police among the independent variables. Using multiple regression, police satisfaction was regressed on quality of life (see Table 28). Quality of Life (Model 2) explained approximately 16.0% of the variance in satisfaction with police, an increase of 12.0% over Model 1 ($R^2 = .16$, R^2 change = .12, $F(11, 1887) = 32.94$, $p < .05$). Standardized multiple regression coefficients indicate that as an individual's satisfaction with his/her quality of life increases, so does satisfaction with police. While the predictive strength of Qualify of Life was not as strong for Satisfaction with Police as it was for Fear of Crime, it was still more than three times that of the next statistically significant predictor, Black ($\beta = -.09$) and seven times that of Hispanic ($\beta = -.05$).

Table 27

Satisfaction with Police Regressed on Community Crime Indices

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	Constant	R^2
Model 1				3.01	.04
Age (Younger = 1)	.11*	.05	.06		
Gender (Male = 1)	.05	.03	.04		
Black non-Hispanic [a]	-.25*	.04	-.15		
Hispanic	-.15*	.04	-.09		
Other non-Hispanic	-.11	.06	-.04		
Education (High school = 1)	-.07*	.03	-.05		
Marital status (Married = 1)	.07	.04	.04		
Northeast [b]	.01	.05	.01		
Midwest	.04	.04	.00		
South	-.04	.04	-.02		
Model 2				3.06	.10
Drugs (0-2)	-.10*	.03	-.10		
Violence (0-2)	-.14*	.03	-.13		
Property (0-3)	-.03	.02	-.04		
Physical (0-2)	.07	.04	.01		

a. Race reference variable = White non-Hispanic
b. Census region reference variable = West
*$p < .05$

Community Disorder

Satisfaction with police was regressed on the three community disorder indices (Public, Area, & People). Standardized multiple regression coefficients revealed that those who had a greater awareness of Public and Area crimes in their neighborhood were less satisfied with law enforcement (see Table 29). With the inclusion of the community

Table 28

Satisfaction with Police Regressed on Quality of Life

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	Constant	R^2
Model 1				3.01	.04
Age (Younger = 1)	.09	.05	.04		
Gender (Male = 1)	.02	.03	.02		
Black non-Hispanic [a]	-.17*	.04	-.09		
Hispanic	-.09*	.04	-.05		
Other non-Hispanic	-.03	.05	-.01		
Education (High school = 1)	-.03	.03	-.02		
Marital status (Married = 1)	.08	.04	.04		
Northeast [b]	.06	.04	.04		
Midwest	.05	.04	.00		
South	-.04	.04	-.03		
Model 2				1.89	.16
Quality of life (1-4)	.34*	.02	.36		

a. Race reference variable = White Non-Hispanic
b. Census Region reference variable = West
*p < .05

disorder indices, younger youth were statistically more satisfied with police and all racial groups, when compared to Whites, were less satisfied. The variables with the strongest predictive value were Public (β = -.19) and Public β = -.15). These results might provide support for the current move towards putting police officers back into the community (Community Oriented Policing) and cities' efforts to renovate and rejuvenate rundown and neglected areas. In general, Model 2 explained approximately 11.0% of the variance in satisfaction with police, an increase of 7.0% over Model 1 (R^2 = .11, R^2 change = .07,

Table 29

Satisfaction with Police Regressed on Community Disorder Indices

Variable	*B*	*SE*	β	Constant	R^2
Model 1				3.01	.04
Age (Younger = 1)	.12*	.05	.06		
Gender (Male = 1)	.04	.03	.03		
Black non-Hispanic [a]	-.23*	.04	-.13		
Hispanic	-.16*	.04	-.09		
Other non-Hispanic	-.12*	.06	-.05		
Education (High school = 1)	-.05	.03	-.04		
Marital status (Married = 1)	.04	.04	.02		
Northeast [b]	.03	.05	.02		
Midwest	.02	.04	.02		
South	-.05	.04	-.03		
Model 2				3.15	.11
Public (0-4)	-.09*	.01	-.19		
Area (0-6)	-.06*	.01	-.15		
People (0-2)	.04	.02	.05		

a. Race reference variable = White non-Hispanic
b. Census region reference variable = West
*$p < .05$

$F(13, 1890) = 18.31, p < .05)$.

Full Model

All independent variables were analyzed using hierarchical multiple regression (see Table 30). Using standardized multiple regression, Model 1, demographics, explained approximately 4.0% of the variance in satisfaction with police

Table 30

Satisfaction With Police Standardized Coefficients for All Independent Variables

	Model					
Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
Age	.07*	.07*	.06*	.05*	.04	.04
Gender (Male=1)	.03	.03	.04	.05*	.03	.03
Black non-Hispanic	-.17**	-.17**	-.16**	-.14**	-.08**	-.08*
Hispanic	-.10**	-.10**	-.09**	-.09**	-.05*	-.05*
Other non-Hispanic	-.04	-.04	-.04	-.05*	-.02	-.03
Education (High school=1)	-.06*	-.06*	-.06*	-.05	-.02	-.01
Married (Married=1)	.04	.04	.03	.03	.04	.03
Northeast (Yes=1)	-.02	-.02	-.01	.01	.04	.05*
Midwest	.00	.00	.01	.01	.01	.02
South	-.03	-.03	-.02	-.02	-.02	-.02
Victimization		-.14**	-.12**	-.10**	-.07*	-.06*
Awareness of serious crimes			-.15**	.03	.04	.03
Drug index				-.10*	-.07*	-.03
Violence index				-.14**	-.10*	-.10*
Property index				-.04	-.00	.01
Physical index				-.00	.00	.00
Quality of life					.31**	.28**
Public index						-.09*
Area index						-.06*
People index						.05*
F Ratio	8.03	11.07	14.08	13.96	24.20	21.77
R^2	0.04	0.06	0.08	0.11	0.18	0.19

* $p < .05$
** $p < .001$

(R^2 = .04). Black Non-Hispanic was identified as the strongest predictor (β = -.17), followed by Hispanic (β = -.10), Age (β = .06), and Education (β = -.06). All statistically significant predictor variables were negatively associated with satisfaction with police except Age, which indicated that younger youth are more satisfied with police than older youth.

Model 2 introduced Victimization into the analysis. Controlling for demographics, Model 2 explained an additional 2.0% of the variance in satisfaction with police (R^2 = 0.06). Results indicated Black remained unchanged as the strongest predictor for satisfaction with police (β = -.17), while Victimization was the second strongest predictor (β = -.14). Statistically significant demographic variables remained constant in the relationship and magnitude to the prediction of satisfaction with police. Victimization results indicated those with higher victim frequency index scores were significantly less likely to be satisfied with police.

Model 3 investigated the effect of Awareness of Serious Crimes while controlling for variables in Model 2. Standardized multiple regression coefficients indicated while statistically significant demographic predictors were similar to those in Model 2, Awareness of Serious Crimes (β = -.15) and Victimization (β = -.12) were the second and third strongest predictors of satisfaction with police. Awareness of Serious Crimes coefficients indicated that youth who are more aware of serious crimes in their neighborhood were less satisfied with police. Victimization results were similar in nature to that of Model 2. Model 3 increased the amount of variance explained by another 2.0% over Model 2 (R^2 = .08).

Model 4 introduced the four community crime indices (Drug, Violence, Property, & Physical) and results indicated that while controlling for variables in Model 3, an additional 3% of the variance in satisfaction with police was explained. The total variance accounted for by Model 4 was approximately 11% ($R^2 = .11$). With the inclusion of the indices, males were more satisfied with police than females, while Others were less satisfied. Black remained the strongest predictor among the racial variables, however, the strongest model predictor for satisfaction with police was Violence ($\beta = -.14$). Victimization remained the third strongest predictor ($\beta = -.10$). Among the four community crime indices, Violence and Drug ($\beta = -.10$) had the greatest predictive power and were negatively associated with satisfaction with police, suggesting that those with higher awareness of Drug and Violence crimes were less satisfied with those charged to monitor and eliminate them.

Model 5, as with Fear of Crime, produced the strongest predictor for satisfaction with police among the independent variables ($\beta = .31$). With the introduction of Quality of Life into the model, an additional 7.0% of the variance was explained over that in Model 4. Total variance explained was approximately 18.0%. Standardized multiple regression coefficients identified a drop in the predictive power of all other statistically significant variables with the inclusion of Quality of Life into the model. Results showed that as Quality of Life increases, so does satisfaction with police. As with Fear of Crime, the strength of this predictor is such that further research into this area is warranted.

Model 6, the community disorder indices, added little (1%) to the variance explained in satisfaction with police ($R^2 = .18$). Quality of Life remained the strongest

predictor of satisfaction with police , being greater than Violence (β = -.10) and substantially greater than Black (β = -.08). Standardized multiple regression coefficients indicated that among the three community disorder indices, Public (β = -.09) and Area (β = -.06) were strongest and had a negative relationship with satisfaction with police. People was also statistically significant (β = .05), but indicated that as awareness of begging and transients went up, so did satisfaction with police. The reason for this relationship is unclear.

Full Model - Quality of Life

As with fear of crime, quality of life was the strongest predictor variable for satisfaction with police. Because of this, a full model hierarchical regression was re-run to investigate the effect, if any, of using quality of life as the first model (see Table 31). With fear of crime regressed on all independent variables, Quality of life as Model 1, explained approximately 15% of the variance (versus 7% in Table 29 - the original full-model), with an additional 4% explained by subsequent models (2-6). As with the original full-model (Table 29), Quality of Life (.28), the Violence Index (-.10), and Black Non-Hispanic (-.08) consistently remained as the strongest predictor variables.

Table 31

Satisfaction with Police Standardized Coefficients for All Independent Variables Using Quality of Life as Model 1

	Model					
Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
Quality of life	.38**	.36**	.35**	.33**	.31**	.28**
Age		.04	.04	.04	.04	.04
Gender (Male=1)		.02	.02	.02	.03	.03
Black non-Hispanic		-.09**	-.09**	-.10**	-.08**	-.08**
Hispanic		-.05*	-.05*	-.05*	-.05*	-.05*
Other non-Hispanic		-.01	-.02	-.02	-.02	-.03
Education (HS=1)		-.02	-.02	-.03	-.02	-.01
Married (Married=1)		.04	.04	.04	.04	.03
Northeast (Yes=1)		.04	.03	.04	.04	.05*
Midwest		.00	.00	.01	.01	.02
South		-.03	-.03	-.02	-.02	-.02
Victimization			-.08**	-.08**	-.07*	-.06*
Serious crimes				-.06*	.04	.03
Drug index					-.07*	-.03
Violence index					-.10**	-.10**
Property index					-.00	.01
Physical index					.00	.00
Public index						-.09**
Area index						-.06*
People index						.05*
F Ratio	323.41	32.57	31.25	29.51	24.20	21.77
R^2	0.15	0.16	0.17	0.17	0.18	0.19

* $p < .05$
** $p < .001$

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Overview

This study was conducted because of a lack of information about youth's perceptions of fear of crime and satisfaction with law enforcement. Designed to provide a framework for further research, a general overview was needed: (a) to provide baseline information on youths' fear of crime and their perceptions of law enforcement from which additional studies could build and to which results could be compared, and (b) to investigate how fear of crime and perceptions of law enforcement can be studied and identify areas in need of improvement. Because youth perceptions of crime and law enforcement have not been the focus of any known research to date, this study used a large national data set designed to investigate criminal victimization and perceptions of community safety. As part of this study, single question inquiries were asked of all respondents concerning their fear of crime and their satisfaction with law enforcement. It is from these questions and subsequent predictor variables that the data for this study were obtained.

Sources of Crime Information and Police Contact

In general, youth appear to obtain their information about crime from one of two sources, personal communication with other individuals or through the media. In either case, the sources appear to be secondary in nature and not through direct observation of

the event or events. These findings highlight the need for those who do witness criminal acts to report the event in such a way as to accurately reflect the true nature of what occurred.

Additionally, because crime and law enforcement are explicitly linked, officials should pay particular attention to these findings. As Surrette (1992) stated in his book, *Media, crime, and criminal justice,* the media can affect an individual's factual perceptions of the world. This is not to say that the information they are receiving is factual, although sometimes this might be the case, but that fact may and can be a function of personal perceptions. This dynamic has recently come to light during investigations into the accuracy of eye witness testimony. People will perceive a situation differently based upon their state of mind at the time of the incident, their proximity to the event, and their focus of attention during the event (Searcy, Bartlett, & Memon, 1999). Law enforcement officers, while unable to control every environment in which they operate, should be cognizant of how they present themselves during interactions with the public.

These reports about sources of police contact were inconclusive. Results indicate that a majority of reported interactions occurred as a result of "official" contacts between youth and police. While youths' overall satisfaction with law enforcement is relatively high, it appears that police could do a better job of public relations by making their officers more accessible to youth through non-official interactions. Police involvement in youth sports, day camps, and scouting might provide positive interactions, allowing youth the opportunity to see officers as people and not always as enforcers of the law.

Research Question 1a: Are youths' demographic characteristics (age, gender, race, education, marital status, and census region) related to their fear of crime?

In general, youth in the United States are not very fearful of crime in their neighborhood (66.3%). This finding is consistent with the previously discussed perceptions of fear of crime among the general population within the United States. Female youth are more fearful of crime than men (Borooah & Carcach, 1997; Ferraro, 1995) and Blacks, Hispanics, and Other racial groups expressed elevated levels of fear when compared to Whites (Silverman, 2001). Additionally, this study indicates that married youth and youth living in the Northeast expressed statistically higher levels of fear when compared to non-married youth and those living in the Midwest, South, and West.

Caution must be used, however, when interpreting these results. Current literature on the topic of fear of crime is inconsistent with respect to a general definition for the construct (Haghighi & Sorensen, 1996; Silverman). As previously discussed, fear of crime can be interpreted as perceived risk (Silverman); a direct threat, either real or perceived, to personal safety (Haghighi & Sorensen, 1996; Robinson, 1998; Silverman); an emotional response to crime or symbols of crime (Ferraro, 1995; Silverman), or a fear of violent or non-violent victimization (Warr, 2000). It is quite possible that given the nature of the original study from which these data were collected, criminal victimization and perception of community safety, respondents may have associated fear of crime with one of three definitions: (1) threats to personal safety, (2) fear of victimization, or (3) threats to personal safety combined with a fear of victimization. With this in mind, it might be

difficult to formulate an accurate picture of what perceptions youth are genuinely expressing with regarding to fear of crime in their neighborhoods. That is, how did the subjects in particular, and how do youth in general, operationalize the concept of fear of crime?

A second concern lies in the lack of data on youths' socioeconomic status (SES). During 1998, the median income for a white family living inside central city limits was more than double that of Black and Hispanic families ($56,075 versus $26,265 & $26,750) (U.S. Census, 2001b). Because of the inability of this study to examine the effects of SES and race, it is possible that identified racial effects may instead be a reflection of youths' SES or a combination of SES and race. In either case, the possibility of artificially inflated racial effects must be acknowledged.

Regardless of the operationalization used by the subjects of this study, what was learned is that, in general, youth in the United States are not fearful of crime. Whether their perceptions centered around victimization, personal safety, emotional response, direct threats, a combination of these, or some unknown interpretation, overall they were less fearful than fearful. Even those who expressed the highest reports of fear using the four point Likert type scale; youth living in the Northeast ($M = 2.37$), females ($M = 2.30$), and Hispanics ($M = 2.29$) still reported scores that were in the lower half of the fear of crime scale.

Research Question 1b: Are youths' demographic characteristics (age, gender, race, education, marital status, and census region) related to their satisfaction with police?

Youth in this study reported high levels of satisfaction with police in their neighborhood. Overall, approximately 81% of the youth surveyed felt "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with those charged with enforcing the law. No statistical differences were found between the perceptions of younger and older youth, males and females, and married and non-married youth. These findings tend to support the position that no relationship exists between satisfaction with police and the above mentioned demographic groups.

When comparing satisfaction with police to racial categories, the results of this study were consistent with the literature previously discussed. In general, individuals were satisfied with the police in their neighborhood (Huang & Vaughn, 1996; Langan, 1994; Smith et al., 1999), but Whites reported the highest degree of satisfaction while all other racial groups reported lower levels of satisfaction (Huang & Vaughn, 1996; Langan et al., 2001). Overall, Blacks were least satisfied with the police in the neighborhood ($M = 2.68$ on a scale of 1 - 4) (Langan et al., 2001), while Hispanics tended to report low to moderate levels of satisfaction (Lasley, 1994). These findings support previous work and indicate that in terms of satisfaction with police, non-white racial groups appear to be consistent in their less positive perceptions of law enforcement. Results of this study also indicate that in general, satisfaction with police is consistent across the nation; there was no difference by Census Regions.

Finally, those with a college education appear to have a higher degree of satisfaction with police than those with a high school education. It should be remembered, however, that this was not a comparison between high school and college students, but of youth within the sample (younger and older) with a high school or college education. The relationship between education and satisfaction with police identified in this study supports the position that such a relationship does exist. While it is not reasonable for an officer to ask someone his/her educational level during the course of official contacts, this finding should be of interest to an agency's public relations officer (PRO). Because education is positively correlated with an individual's income, PROs should insure their department is adequately represented, officially and non-officially, in a variety of socio-economic settings. As discussed in the review of literature, positive police/citizen interactions equate to positive citizen perceptions (Huang & Vaughn, 1996).

Research Question 2: How well do demographics, use of public transportation, victimization, community crime, quality of life, community disorder, and police contact explain youths' fear of crime?

Consistent with both current literature and the findings previously discussed, gender and race were among the strongest predictors for fear of crime (Silverman, 2001). Being female was the strongest predictor for fear of crime and, when compared to Whites, Blacks were the least predictive among the three remaining racial groups. It is not clear why Hispanics and other racial categories reported higher levels for fear of crime, however this relationship might be accounted for by a steady increase of immigrants into U.S. cities.

Their perceptions regarding fear of crime might be influenced by a general fear of living in a foreign land where the people, customs, and laws are unfamiliar to them.

Equally unclear is why youth living in the Northeast are more fearful of crime than the other Census Regions. It is possible this relationship might be the result of sampling bias. One of the two cities located in the Northeast is New York City, traditionally one of the nation's worst crime areas (Conklin, 2001). While the other three Census Regions also contained cities with traditionally high crime rates, these effects might have been offset by cities with less crime. Further exploration into the makeup of each city might also help answer this question.

The introduction of prior victimization was a weak indicator for fear of crime. While statistically significant, victimization accounts for a small percentage of the variance explained and did not change the predictive strength of gender, those living in the Northeast, or being Hispanic. It is possible that had the data for theft, robbery, and assault been weighted, a more thorough investigation into their effects could have been performed. This, however, was a limitation of the data in that the severity of each victimization is unknown, such as if a youth's car had been stolen (theft) versus the individual being pushed to the ground (assault).

When victimization was replaced with an individual's awareness of serious crimes in his/her neighborhood, gender remained the strongest predictor for fear of crime. An individual's awareness, however, replaced living in the Northeast as the second strongest predictor. The results of including awareness of serious crimes into the model indicate that Hispanic females who are aware of serious crimes in their neighborhoods are most

likely to be fearful of crime.

Community crime indices also appeared to add little explanatory value to the fear of crime model. Gender remained as the strongest predictor. However, high levels of awareness regarding property and violent crimes were also predictive of youths' fear of crime. An awareness of drug crimes, while statistically significant, was not among the strongest predictors. These relationships could be reflective of youth living in a large metropolitan area where property and violent crimes could be viewed as a direct threat to the individual, while drug offenses may constitute a social, rather than a personal problem. Further research to verify this relationship is needed. As with the previous model, Hispanic females were more likely to be fearful of crime, especially if they were aware of property and or violent crimes in their neighborhood.

The strongest of all the predictor variables was identified when the community crime indices were replaced with youths' satisfaction with the quality of life in their neighborhood. Inversely related to variable of interest, quality of life explained almost 15% of the variance in fear of crime. As with fear of crime, however, quality of life appears to be equally difficult to operationalize (Ferriss, 2000). Social scientists investigating this construct, however, appear to focus on specific domains that are associated with subjective meanings or definitions (Ferriss, 2000).

Diener (1995), in contrast to Mukherjee (1989), focused on individual markers for conceptualizing and measuring quality of life, while other measures center around the concepts of experience and conditions (subjective and objective measures) (Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, 1976). Experience refers to an individual's personal perceptions

regarding the positive or negative experiences of his/her life. Studies using this definition often focus on emotional variables, such as happiness. Conversely, conditional measures of quality of life tend to focus on an individual's perceptions regarding the conditions in which he/she lives. Satisfaction measures are often used in this type of study. This distinction is critical, according to Campbell et al. (1976), as young people, when compared to older people, are more likely to describe their lives as happy, but are less likely to say they are satisfied with life.

As can be seen from this small sampling of quality of life characteristics, there is little consensus as to what constitutes a good measure for quality of life. In reviewing quality of life literature, little was also found on the differences, if any, in how adults and youth characterize quality of life issues. With the predictive strength of quality of life in this study, further investigation is needed, not only into how youth define quality of life, but the characteristics that are most salient to that definition.

Lastly, substituting community disorder indices for youths' quality of life perceptions lowered the predictive value of the model, while controlling for demographics, by almost 6%. Among the indices, Area variables that described the care and up keep of the surrounding neighborhood were most predictive of youths' fear of crime.

As mentioned previously, these results are consistent with Broken Windows Theory and support the need for community improvement and revitalization programs. By funding initiatives that clean up deteriorating portions of a neighborhood, local governments might accomplish two goals. First, according to Broken Windows Theory, if

an area is maintained criminal activities are less likely to occur (Kelling & Coles, 1996). Beautifying an area would not only add to its aesthetic appeal, but serve a dual purpose as a crime preventative measure. Secondly, these results indicate that by improving the appearance of a given area, youths' overall fear of crime may be decreased. In an age where funding allocations must be as diversified as possible, projects that improve a neighborhood's appearance could be beneficial.

Results from both the original full-model and the full-model using Quality of Life as the first predictor variable, indicate the predictive consistency of certain variables. Quality of Life, as previously discussed, is most predictive of a youth's fear of crime when compared to all other variables. Gender's explanatory characteristics remain strong even in the presence of Quality of Life. Hispanic, when compared to White, retains its statistical significance throughout all six models, but has its predictive strength diminished with the inclusion of Quality of Life. It must be remembered, however, that while a number of variables were statistically significant, their coefficients were so small as to make them practically insignificant (typically less that .10). The exceptions were Quality of Life, Gender, and Area Index variables.

Research Question 2: How well do demographics, use of public transportation, victimization, community crime, quality of life, community disorder, and police contact explain youths' satisfaction with police?

Among demographic variables, the results of Research Question 2 were consistent with current literature in a number of ways. First, Blacks and Hispanics were less satisfied

with police than Whites (Huang & Vaughn, 1996; Lasley, 1994). This finding has been consistent throughout the literature on police satisfaction and is well known to the law enforcement community. While efforts have been made by police to reduce the negative feelings towards them by minority populations, such as increasing the number of minority officers and being diligent in the pursuit of complaints against officers by minority members of the community (Radelet & Carter, 1994), additional work needs to be done.

Also consistent with the literature on satisfaction with police were the increased levels of satisfaction expressed by respondents with a college education. When compared to those with high school educations, it appears reasonable that college educated individuals are more likely to occupy positions of authority and power. Because of this, those with a college education may tend to identify themselves with law enforcement officers who also hold positions of power and authority within the community.

There is also a negative correlation between crime and education. In general, people who commit crimes tend to have lower levels of education (Jarjoura & Triplett, 1997). Because of this, those with a high school education are at greater risk for the kinds of negative interactions with police that would evoke a negative perception.

In addition to the previously discussed literature, this study identified younger youth as being more satisfied with police than older youth. It is not clear why this relationship exists and further study would be warranted.

As with fear of crime, the addition of victimization, when controlling for demographic variables, did little to improve the predictive characteristics of the model. Results showed an inverse relationship between those who had experienced victimization

and satisfaction with police. Those who had been victimized reported lower levels of satisfaction with police. The same problem, however, exists with satisfaction with police as it does for fear of crime. Data for victimization was not weighted and therefore any direct comparisons should be viewed with caution. The predictive strengths of Age, Black, and Hispanic remained consistent, indicating that the effects of prior victimization did little to the explanatory properties of these variables.

The negative relationship between Victimization and satisfaction with police indicate that police might want be more cognizant of their interactions with youthful victims. It is unclear whether the act of being victimized, and the possible perceptions of failure on the part of law enforcement to prevent such an act, or the interactions with police that took place after the victimization, are responsible for the correlational strength of this index. As such, law enforcement agencies should continue in their efforts to acquaint the members of their victim advocacy programs with the developmental and psychological issues unique to adolescence.

The introduction of the community crime indices into the demographic model indicated that older Black or Hispanic youth with a high school education remained the least satisfied with the police in their neighborhoods, while younger youth continued to display the greatest satisfaction. Of the four indices, violent and drug offenses were the strongest predictors of decreased levels of satisfaction with police. From a community crime prevention perspective, these findings are especially salient. While crimes committed with guns and murder (Violent Index) were the strongest predictors of the four community crime indices, it is interesting to note that youth appear to place a higher

degree of importance on the absence of drug offenses in their neighborhood, both using and selling, than property or physical crimes.

While the reason(s) for this relationship are unknown, two possibilities are suggested. First, violent and drug crimes may be viewed by youth as the most immediate threats to their personal safety. Because the data were collected from large metropolitan areas where violent and drug related crimes are most prominent (Will & McGrath, 1995), these findings might reflect the environment in which the respondents live.

A second possibility lies in the amount of media attention given to each of these crime categories. Youth might be comparing the amount of violent and drug offenses they see in their area to those shown in the media. It is possible then, they might equate a reduced awareness of these offenses to a more efficient police department, thereby raising their satisfaction levels with local law enforcement. Likewise, as is the case in this study, an increased awareness of these offenses in their neighborhood might also leave the impression that local law enforcement is less efficient, thereby reducing their overall satisfaction. Both of these possibilities are speculative and require further study.

As with fear of crime, a youth's quality of life was the strongest predictor of their satisfaction with police in their neighborhood. Only Black and Hispanic remained statistically significant when, controlling for demographics, fear of crime was regressed on this variable. Quality of life is also the consistent predictor for both satisfaction with police and fear of crime. Because of this, as previously discussed, a further exploration into how youth define quality of life and the characteristics that make up this definition is needed.

The introduction of the community disorder indices into the demographic model produced the second strongest explanatory relationship. Racial variables, including Other, were still negatively associated with satisfaction with police, while Black remained as the strongest predictor. Of the community disorder variables, Public and Area characteristics were identified as being the strongest predictors. These results not only support the need for community improvement projects, similar to that found with fear of crime, but also identify the possibility that youth may agree that the mission of police goes beyond the mere enforcement of criminal law. Youth who were aware of public area disorder variables, such as loitering and trash, had lower levels of satisfaction with police.

From a law enforcement perspective, these results may highlight the need for further community education on the purpose for and mission of neighborhood police. Conditions such as rundown buildings and visible trash, do not fall under the jurisdiction of most police agencies. Results from this study, however, indicate that youth who are aware of these conditions in their neighborhood subsequently have lower levels of satisfaction with police.

Similar to that found in fear of crime, both the original full-model and full-model using Quality of Life as the first predictor variable for satisfaction with police contained consistently strong variables. Quality of life, as previously discussed, was the strongest predictor of youths' satisfaction with police. Black, Hispanic, victimization, and violent also maintained statistical significance throughout the analyses, but their strength diminished considerably with the introduction of quality of life. In general, it appears that Blacks or Hispanics who have been prior victims are aware of violent crimes in their

neighborhood, and who are dissatisfied with the quality of their life, are least likely to be satisfied with police in their neighborhoods. As with fear of crime, a number of statistically significant variables had such small coefficients as to make them practically insignificant. Satisfaction with police predictor variables that did maintain practical significance were Quality of Life and the Violence index.

Ecological Theory

This study did not support the ecological belief that individual variables would have a greater effect on a person's perceptions than those from other systems. Both an individual's fear of crime and satisfaction with police were most affected by the person's perceptions regarding the quality of life in his/her neighborhood (an exosystem variable). Other exosystem variables that were practically significant predictors, included the Area Index for fear of crime, and the Violence Index for satisfaction with police. The only practically significant individual variable for fear of crime was Gender. There were no practically significant individual variables for satisfaction with police. The reason for this relationship is unclear and bears further investigation.

Limitations

Threats to external validity, low response rate for the CVPCS survey, the difficulty in defining key constructs, the inability of the data source to include additional indicators, missing data, and the constraints of using a cross-sectional research design were all limitations of this study.

Participants in this study all lived in 12 large metropolitan cities, primarily located on the east and west coasts of the United States. It is uncertain, however, how well these results may be generalized to youth living in smaller cities, rural areas, and the central United States. Additional research is needed to form a more complete picture of youths' fear of crime and perceptions of law enforcement.

As mentioned previously, another limitation to this study is the low response rate for the CVPCS survey (approximately 48%). It is unknown what effect this source of error might pose in this study; however, if respondents in fact differ from non-respondents, this present a source of significant bias in the estimates. Additional limitations of the data set have been previously discussed.

Perhaps one of the notable limitations to this study is the lack of clearly defined constructs. There appears to be a generalized assumption by the authors of the original survey that everyone will interpret key constructs and legal terminology in the same manner. Such an assumption is problematic. As previously discussed, the term "fear of crime" can be defined in a number of ways (Haghighi & Sorensen, 1996; Silverman, 2001) . The same is true for Quality of Life, the strongest of the predictor variables for both fear of crime and satisfaction with police (Ferriss, 2000). Further research needs to clarify for the respondents, or at the very least provide clearly defined examples of, what is meant by fear of crime and quality of life. While providing such clarification cannot insure understanding of the construct, it should increase the accuracy of the perception(s) under investigation.

Likewise, researchers should not assume a common understanding of legal terms, such as robbery and theft. Many people, including youth, may lack the proper legal training or exposure to comprehend the subtle distinctions between concepts that are basic to those who study crime. Researchers should be cognizant of this possibility and provide brief examples of each term to facilitate the respondents' understanding.

An additional limitation that is endemic to secondary data analysis is the exclusion of additional indicators that might be salient to the proposed study. The data from which this study was derived were not intended to focus on youths' fear of crime and satisfaction with law enforcement. With this fact in mind, additional research should strive to collect data salient to one or both of the constructs. Additional indicators might include a youth's delinquent/criminal history, and the length and type of exposure to various forms of media the individual has sustained.

The issue of missing data for this study was central to the reduction of usable cases. Initially, 3,070 youth, ages 16-25, were included in the total sample. Missing data, however, reduced the sample by approximately one third. While the final study sample of 1,897 was sufficient to investigate youths' fear of crime and satisfaction with police, the effect of losing over 1,000 cases because of missing data is unknown.

A final limitation of this study is the use of cross-sectional data. As has been seen since the events of the Rodney King beating in Los Angeles, California and the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the public's perceptions of crime and law enforcement are subject to the events that surround our lives. Periodic monitoring of youth's perceptions may help develop a more accurate picture of how fearful they truly are, their levels of

satisfaction with police, and how these perceptions are influenced by changes in both policy and procedures.

Future Research

Future research investigating youths' fear of crime and satisfaction with police should focus on two primary areas: (1) examining how youth define and characterize the concept of quality of life and (2) the process(es) surrounding the development of youths' perceptions regarding fear of crime and satisfaction with law enforcement. As indicated by the results of this study, quality of life was the single strongest predictor for youths' fear of crime and satisfaction with police. Due to the nature of the data source, however, what is not known is how members of the youth culture define quality of life, if this definition is universal among youth, and what elements are important when discussing quality of life among the younger members of our society. Further investigation, therefore, would appear to be needed to gain a deeper understanding of fear of crime and satisfaction with police among youth.

A qualitative exploration could help identify the prominent characteristics for each construct and the processes that take place during their development. This information would be helpful if improvements are to be made in reducing youths' fear of crime and improving their satisfaction with police. Merely identifying and defining the elements of fear and satisfaction are not enough. Future research should strive to understand how these elements come to be, are sustained, and how they change. Once these processes are identified, programs to strengthen negative elements and support positive ones could be

designed, implemented, and evaluated. The underlying goal of these efforts would be to reduce youths' fears of crime and improve their satisfaction with police using a proactive versus reactive approach.

Applied Policy

This study has highlighted a variety of areas in potential policy implications. The need to support and fund initiatives that foster the visual appeal of areas in community decline could provide a benefit for the majority of people. Should such a policy be implemented, a dual benefit would be obtained in the form of both crime and fear of crime reduction, as well as improved perceptions of law enforcement. Support for such an initiative could come in the form of formalized law or policy, or from informal sources, such as volunteer or community action groups.

The concept of community improvement to combat crime is not new. Crime prevention through environmental manipulation is often a distinct component of community psychology and many community crime prevention programs. The results of this study further support the argument to investigate environmental considerations when addressing crime prevention strategies by the identification of significant environmental variables found in Community Disorder indices.

Conclusions

This study began with the intent of exploring the little known areas of youths' fear of crime and their perceptions of law enforcement. Traditionally, surveys addressing these

issues focus on the general population, including the younger demographic group almost as an afterthought. Why this occurs is unknown, but this lack of focus highlights a gap in current literature that provided the impetus for this work. The goal, therefore, was to obtain baseline information about youths' fear of crime and perceptions of law enforcement from which further explorations and comparisons could be performed. To this end, the study has succeeded by identifying consistencies between the youth and general populations, the acquisition of new information, and the discovery of weaknesses in current methodologies used to investigate these relationships.

In general, respondents from this study were not fearful of crime in their neighborhoods and tended to have positive perceptions of local police. They obtained most of their information regarding crime from conversations with other individuals or through the media. A majority of their personal contacts with neighborhood police came in the form of either reporting a crime or through traffic violations.

With respect to fear of crime, consistencies between the youth and general populations were identified as women being more fearful of crime than men, and non-White racial groups being more fearful than Whites (Ferraro, 1995; Parker, 1993). As previously discussed, however, these results must be tempered with the realization that these consistencies are not universal. Current literature cannot agree on the degree and scope of these relationships and as such, these results are in agreement with only a portion of the known studies.

New information was added to the study of fear of crime by the discovery that Hispanics were, in general, the most fearful of the racial categories. This finding

contradicts previous literature on the general population that identified Blacks as the most fearful of crime, when compared to Whites (Haghighi & Sorensen, 1996). Additionally, community disorder variables identified the importance of community decay characteristics in relationship to youths' fear of crime.

Finally, the most significant finding with regard to youths' fear of crime was the importance of youths' perceptions regarding their quality of life. This single factor accounted for almost half of the variance explained by the full-model.

Findings from youths' satisfaction with law enforcement also corroborated existing literature on the general population. Blacks were found to exhibit the lowest levels of satisfaction, while Hispanics perceptions of law enforcement were mid-way between Whites and Blacks (Lasley, 1994).

Additional information regarding youths' perceptions of law enforcement included the predictive strengths of prior victimizations, awareness of violent crime in the neighborhood, and the awareness of community disorder characteristics. As with fear of crime, however, the strongest predictor of youths' satisfaction with police were the perceptions regarding their quality of life.

Finally, this study has identified the need for stronger measures of fear of crime and satisfaction with police. Respondents must be aware of the researcher's intent, that is how the construct is being defined. Youth, with their limited experiences with legal terminology, might benefit from examples to which they can make comparisons. These examples, however, should inform the respondents as to the differences in terms and not lead the response in a predetermined direction.

Further investigation is also needed into the development of youths' perceptions. How do they acquire, maintain, or alter their personal images of crime and law enforcement? Without such qualitative information, substantial improvements in decreasing youths' fear of crime and their perceptions of law enforcement will be hindered.

In conclusion, there has been little study of youths' fear of crime and their satisfaction with neighborhood police. Additional work is needed to understand this often overlooked segment of our society. Some of the findings of this work might be useful in that endeavor.

REFERENCES

Allison, P. D. (1999). *Multiple regression: A primer*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Bass, S. (2001). Policing space, policing race: Social control imperatives and police discretionary decisions. *Social Justice, 28(1)*, 156-176.

Belyea, M. J., & Zingraff, M. T. (1988). Fear of crime and residential location. *Rural Sociology, 53*, 473-486.

Benedict, W. R., Brown, B., & Bower, D. J. (2000). Perceptions of the police and fear of crime in a rural setting: Utility of a geographically focused survey for police services, planning, and assessment. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 11(4)*, 275-298.

Bennett, R. R., & Flavin, J. M. (1994). Determinants of fear of crime: The effect of cultural setting. *Justice Quarterly, 11*, 357-381.

Borenstein, D. B. (2000). Report on violence in the media and children. *Report From the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation*. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Borooah, V., & Carcach, C. A. (1997). Crime and fear: Evidence from Australia. *British Journal of Criminology, 37*, 635-657.

Brantingham, P.L., & Brantingham, P.J. (1993). Location quotients as a measurement tool for crime analysis. In D. Zahm & P. Cromwell (Eds.), *Proceedings of the international seminar on environmental criminology and crime analysis* (pp. 123-151). Coral Gables, FL: Florida Criminal Justice Executive Institute.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1989). Ecological systems theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development*, vol. 6 (pp. 187-251). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Bureau of Justice Statistics, U. S. Department of Justice. (May, 1999). *Criminal victimization and perceptions of community safety in 12 cities, 1998*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.

Campbell, A., Converse, P.E., & Rodgers, W.L. (1976). *The quality of American life*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Carter, D. L. (1985). Hispanic perception of police performance: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 13*, 487-500.

Center for Public Policy. (1988). *The Houston are survey*. Houston, TX: University of Houston, Center for Public Policy.

Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review, 44*, 588-608.

Comrey, A.L., & Lee, H.B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Conklin, J. E. (2001). *Criminology* (7th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Cordner, G. W. (1986). Fear of crime and police: An evaluation of a fear-reduction strategy. *Journal of Police Science and Administration, 14*, 223-233.

Cox, S. M., & Conrad, J. J. (1996). *Juvenile justice: A guide to practice and theory* (4th ed.). Chicago: Brown & Benchmark.

Decker, S. H. (1985). The police and the public: Perceptions and policy recommendations. In R. J. Homant & D. B. Kennedy (Eds.), *Police and law enforcement, 1975-1981* (Vol. 3, pp. 89-105), New York: AMS.

Diener, E. (1995). A value based index for measuring national quality of life. *Social Indicators Research, 36*, 107-127.

Dryfoos, J. G. (1990). *Adolescents at risk: Prevalence and prevention*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dunham, R. G., & Alpert, G. P. (1988). Neighborhood differences in attitudes toward policing: Evidence for a mixed-strategy model of policing in a multi-ethnic setting. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 79*, 504-523.

Durkheim, E. (1950). *The rules of sociological method*. Glencoe: The Free Press.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2001). *Crime in the United States, 2000: Uniform crime reports*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice.

Ferraro, K. F. (1995). *Fear of crime: Interpreting victimization risk*. New York: SUNY Press.

Ferraro, K. F., & LaGrange, R. L. (1987). The measurement of fear of crime. *Sociological Inquiry, 57*, 70-101

Ferriss, A.L. (2000). The quality of life among U.S. States. *Social Indicators Research, 49*, 1-23.

Finely, G. E. (1983). Fear of crime in the elderly. In J. I. Kosbert (Ed.). *Abuse and mistreatment of the elderly: Causes and intervention* (pp. 77-89). Littejohn, MA: John Wright Publishers.

Finkelhor, D., & Ormrod, R. (June, 2000). Characteristics of crimes against juveniles. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.

Flanagan, T. J. (1996). Public opinion on crime and justice: History, development, and trends. In T. J. Flanagan & D. R. Longmire (Eds.), *Americans view crime and justice: A national public opinion survey* (pp. 1-14). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Garofalo, J. (1977). *Public opinion about crime: The attitudes of victims and non-victims in selected cities*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Garofalo, J. (1981). The fear of crime: Causes and consequences. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 82*, 839-857.

Gordon, M., & Heath, L. (1981). The news business, crime and fear. In D. A. Lewis (Ed.). *Reactions to crime* (pp. 227-250). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gottfredson, M.R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Grier, S. A. (2001). The Federal Trade Commission's report on the marketing of violent entertainment to youths: Developing policy-tuned research. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 20(1)*, 123-132.

Groebel, J. (June, 1998). Warning: Children are watching. *UNESCO Sources*, 102, 4-5.

Haghighi, B., & Sorensen, J. (1996). America's fear of crime. In T. J. Flanagan & D. R. Longmire (Eds.) , *Americans view crime and justice: A national public opinion survey* (pp. 16-30). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hagan, F. E. (1987). *Introduction to criminology: Theories, methods, and criminal behavior*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Herbst, S. (1993). *Numbered voices: How opinion polling has shaped American politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hindelang, M. J. (1974). Public opinion regarding crime, criminal justice, and related topics. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 11*, 101-116.

Huang, W. W., & Vaughn, M. S. (1996). Support and confidence: Public attitudes toward police. In T. J. Flanagan & D. R. Longmire (Eds.) , *Americans view crime and justice: A national public opinion survey* (pp. 31-45). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hunter, R.D., & Jeffery, C.R. (1991). Environmental crime prevention: An analysis of convenience store robberies. *Security Journal, 2(2)*, 78-83.

Hurst, Y. G., Frank, J., & Browning, S. L. (2000). Attitudes of juveniles toward the police: A comparison of black and white youth. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 23(1)*, 37-53.

Ishwaran, S. (2000). Criminal victimization in a postmaterialist world: A cross-cultural model. In D. Rounds (Ed.), *International criminal justice: Issues in a global perspective* (pp. 272-287). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Jarjoura, G.R., & Triplett, R.A. (1997). The effects of social area characteristics on the relationship between social class and delinquency. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 25*, 125-139.

Junger, M. (1987). Women's experiences of sexual harassment. *British Journal of Criminology, 22*, 358-383.

Kelling, G.L., & Coles, C.M. (1996). *Fixing broken windows: Restoring order and fixing crime in our communities*. New York: Free Press.

Kratcoski, P., Verma, A., & Das, D. (2001). Policing public order: A world perspective. *Police Practice and Research, 2(2)*, 109-143.

LaGrange, R. L., & Ferraro, K. F. (1989). Assessing age and gender differences in perceived risk and fear of crime. *Criminology, 24*, 575-591.

Langan, P. A. (1994). No racism in the justice system. *The Public Interest*, 17, 48-51.

Langan, P. A., Greenfeld, L. A., Smith, S. K., Durose, M. R., & Levin, D. J. (2001). *Contacts between police and the public: Findings from the 1999 national survey*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.

Lasley, J. R. (1994). The impact of the Rodney King incident on citizen attitudes toward policing. *Police and Society, 3*, 245-255.

Lee, G. R. (1982). Sex differences in fear of crime among older people. *Research on Aging, 4*, 284-298.

Lee, G. R. (1983). Social integration and fear of crime among older persons. *Journal of Gerontology, 38*, 745-750.

Liska, A. E., Sanchirico, A., & Reed, M. D. (1988). Fear of crime and constrained behavior: Specifying and estimating a reciprocal effect model. *Social Forces, 66*, 827-837.

Maguire, K., & Pastore, A. L. (Eds.). (2001). Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics [Online]. Available: http://www.albany.edu/sourcebook/. Date accessed: December 13, 2001.

Martin, C. A., & Colbert, K. K. (1997). *Parenting: A life span perspective*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Maxfield, M. (1984). Fear of crime in England and Wales. *A Home Office Research and Planning Unit Report*. London, England: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Maxfield, M. (1987). Explaining fear of crime: Evidence from the 1984 British crime survey. *A Home Office Research and Planning Unit Report*. London, England: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Moore, D. W. (1992). *The superpollsters: How they measure and manipulate public opinion in America*. New York: Four Walls Eight Windows.

Mukherjee, R. (1989). *The quality of life: Valuation in social research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Murty, K. S., Roebuck, J. B., & Smith, J. D. (1990). The image of the police in black Atlanta communities. *Journal of Police Science and Administration, 17*, 250-257.

Parker, K. (1993). Fear of crime and the likelihood of victimization: A bi-ethnic comparison. *Journal of Social Psychology, 133*, 723-732.

Peek, C. W., Lowe, G. D., & Alston, J. P. (1981). Race and attitudes toward local police: Another look. *Journal of Black Studies, 11*, 361-374.

Radelet, L. A., & Carter, D. L. (1994). *The police and the community* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Rennie, Y. L. (1978). *The search for criminal man*. Boston: D. C. Heath.

Rennison, C. (2001). Violent victimization and race, 1993-1998. *Bureau of justice statistics special report*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.

Reiss, A. J., & Tonry, M. (1986). Communities and crime (vol. 8). *Crime and justice: A review of literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Robinson, M. B. (1998). High aesthetics/low incivilities: Criminal victimization and perceptions of risk in a downtown environment. *Journal of Security Administration, 12(2)*, 19-32.

Rountree, P. W. (1998). A re-examination of the crime-fear linkage. *The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 35*, 341-372.

Rusinko, W. T., Johnson, K. W., & Hornung, C. A. (1978). The importance of police contacts in the formulation of youth's attitudes toward police. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 6(1)*, 53-67.

Scaglion, R., & Condon, R. G. (1980). Determinants of attitudes toward city police. *Criminology, 17*, 485-494.

Schmalleger, F. (Ed.) (1997). *Crime and the justice system in America: An encyclopedia*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Schwendinger, H., & Schwendinger, J. (1975). Defenders of order or guardians of human rights? In I. Taylor, P. Watson, & J. Young (Eds.), *Critical criminology* (pp. 113-146). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Searcy, J.H., Bartlett, J.C., & Memon, A. (1999). Age differences in accuracy and choosing in eyewitness identification and face recognition. *Memory and Cognition, 27(3)*, 538-52.

Siegel, D. J. (1999). *The developing mind: Toward a neurobiology of interpersonal experience*. New York: Guilford Press.

Siegel, J. S., & Senna, J. J. (1994). *Juvenile delinquency: Theory, practice, and law* (5th ed.). New York: West Publishing.

Siegel, L. J. (1983). *Criminology*. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing.

Silverman, E. B. (2001). Urban policing and the fear of crime. *Urban Studies, 38*, 941-958.

Simon, T., & Mercy, J. (2001). *National crime victimization survey: Injuries from violent crime, 1992-1998*. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Special Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Skogan, W. G. (1987). The impact of victimization on fear. *Crime and Delinquency, 33(1)*, 135-154.

Skogan, W. G., & Maxfield, M. G. (1981). *Coping with crime: Individual and neighborhood reactions*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Smith, M. R. (1994). Integrating community policing and the use of force: Public education, involvement, and accountability. *American Journal of Police, 13(4)*, 1-21.

Smith, L. N., & Hill, G. D. (1991). Victimization and fear of crime. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 18*, 217-239.

Smith, S. K., Steadman, G. W., Minton, T. D., & Townsend, M. (1999). *Criminal victimization and perceptions of community safety in 12 cities, 1998.* Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.

Snyder, H. N. (2000). Juvenile arrests, 1999. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin, 12*, 1-12.

Song, J. H. L. (1992). Attitudes of Chinese immigrants and Vietnamese refugees toward law enforcement in the United States. *Justice Quarterly, 9*, 703-719.

Stafford, M.C., & Galle, O.R. (1984). Victimization rates, exposure to risk, and fear of crime. *Criminology, 22*, 164-180.

Surrette, R. (1992). *Media, crime, and criminal justice.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Sutherland, E., & Cressey, D. (1970). *Criminology* (8th ed.). Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Taylor, R. B., & Hale, M. (1986). Testing alternative models of fear of crime. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 77*, 151-189.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2001a). Resident population estimates of the United States by age and sex: April 1, 1990 to July 1, 1999, with short-term projection to November 1, 2000. Retrieved November 1, 2001, from http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/nation/intfile2-1.txt.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2001b). Median income of families by selected characteristics, race, and Hispanic origin of householder: 2000, 1999, and 1998. Retrieved August 9, 2002, from http://www.census.gov/hhes/income/income00/inctab4.html.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2001a). *Local police departments, 1999*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, NCJ 186478, p. 10, Table 23.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2001b). *Sheriffs' offices 1999*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, NCJ 186479, p. 10, Table 23.

Walklate, S. (1992). Jack and Jill join up at Sun Hill: Public images of police officers. *Policing and Society, 2*, 219-232.

Walsh, W.F., Vito, G.F., & Tewksbury, R. (2000). Fighting back in Bright Leaf: Community policing and drug trafficking in public housing. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 25(1)*, 76-92.

Warr, M. (1984). Fear of victimization: Why women and elderly are more afraid? *Social Science Quarterly, 65*, 681-702.

Warr, M. (2000). Fear of crime in the United States: Avenue for research and policy. In D. Duffee (Ed.), *Measurement and analysis of crime* and justice (pp.451-489), Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Will, J.A., & McGrath, J.H. (1995). Crime, neighborhood perceptions, and the underclass: The relationship between fear of crime and class position. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 23*, 163-176.

Williams, P. (1993). Fear of crime: Read all about it? The relationship between newspaper crime reporting and fear of crime. *British Journal of Criminology, 33*, 33-56.

Winkel, F. W., & Universiteit, V. (1986). Reducing fear of crime through police visibility: A field experiment. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 1*, 381-398.

Wirth, C. B. (1958). The development of attitudes toward law enforcement. *Police, 3*(2), 52-64.

Woodard, E. H., & Gridina, N. (2000). *Media in the home, 2000: The fifth annual survey of parents and children*. Philadelphia: Annenberg Public Policy Center.

Yin, P. (1980). Fear of crime among the elderly: Some issues and suggestions. *Social Problems, 27*, 492-504.

Zamble, E., & Annesley, P. (1987). Some determinants of public attitudes toward the police. *Journal of Police Science and Administration, 15*, 285-290.

Zevitz, R. G., & Rettammel, R. J. (1990). Elderly attitudes about police service. *American Journal of Police, 9*, 25-39.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

IRB Approval Letter

Utah State
UNIVERSITY

VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH OFFICE
1450 Old Main Hill
Logan UT 84322-1450
Telephone: (435) 797-1180
FAX: (435) 797-1367
Email: vpr@cc.usu.edu

May 3, 2002

MEMORANDUM

TO: Brent Miller
Bruce Bayley

FROM: True Rubal, IRB Administrator

SUBJECT: Fear of Crime and Perceptions of the Criminal

Your proposal has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board and is approved under exemption #4.

X There is no more than minimal risk to the subjects.
There is greater than minimal risk to the subjects.

This approval applies only to the proposal currently on file for the period of one year. If your study extends beyond this approval period, you must contact this office to request an annual review of this research. Any change affecting human subjects must be approved by the Board prior to implementation. Injuries or any unanticipated problems involving risk to subjects or to others must be reported immediately to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board.

Prior to involving human subjects, properly executed informed consent must be obtained from each subject or from an authorized representative, and documentation of informed consent must be kept on file for at least three years after the project ends. Each subject must be furnished with a copy of the informed consent document for their personal records.

The research activities listed below are exempt from IRB review based on the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) regulations for the protection of human research subjects, 45 CFR Part 46, as amended to include provisions of the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, June 18, 1991.

4. Research, involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

Appendix B

Survey for Criminal Victimization and Perceptions of Community Safety in 12 Cities, 1998

LARGE CITY RDD VICTIMIZATION SURVEY
COMMUNITY POLICING QUESTIONS

Note 1: If the respondent is 16 years old or older AND interviewed by self-response, continue the interview with the COPS questions, otherwise skip to the FILLROSTER screen, if there are other household members 12 years of age or older to be interviewed, or to THANK-YOU to end the interview with the household.

Section A. Perception/Identification of the Crime Problem

1a. Now, I am going to ask you a few questions about crime in your current neighborhood. To the best of your knowledge, have any serious crimes occurred in your neighborhood in the past 12 months, that is between <fill>?
(PROBE, IF NECESSARY)
(1) Yes - Ask 1b
(2) No - Skip to 2
(3) Not aware of any crime occurring in current neighborhood - Skip to 2
(D) Don't know - Skip to 2.

1b. Which of the following types of serious crimes do you know to have occurred in your neighborhood in the past 12 months . . .
(READ EACH CATEGORY THEN ENTER THE APPROPRIATE CODE FOR EACH CATEGORY)
(1) Yes (2) No (3) Don't know

. . . People openly selling drugs
. . . People openly using drugs
. . Auto-theft
. . . Theft of personal property
. . . Breaking and entering to steal personal property
. . . Violent physical attacks
. . . Crimes committed with guns
. . . Sexual assault/Rape
. . . Murder

1c. How did you find out about these crimes?
(DO NOT PROBE. ENTER THE CODE FOR ALL CATEGORIES THAT APPLY).
Was there any other way you found out?
(WHEN FINISHED, ENTER "N" FOR 'NO MORE)
---- (1) Respondent or someone they know was victimized.
---- (2) Witnessed criminal acts in neighborhood.
---- (3) Learned about crime through conversations with neighbors, neighborhood associations/civic organizations' newsletters, and/or community meetings.
---- (4) Received information directly from the local police through community meetings, newsletters, pamphlets, crime bulletins, and/or police Internet websites.
---- (5) Received information through the media, such as newspapers, television, and radio.
---- (6) Received information through a public kiosk/terminal or by visiting a police substation.
---- (7) Other (Specify)

Section B. Fear of crime/Quality of Life

2. Overall, do you think you are well informed of crime which occurs in your neighborhood?
(1) Yes
(2) No
(D) Don't know.

3a. Now I'd like to ask you questions about your fear of crime and quality of life in both your current neighborhood and in your city.

How satisfied are you with the quality of life in your NEIGHBORHOOD? Are you very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?
(1) Very satisfied
(2) Satisfied
(3) Dissatisfied
(4) Very dissatisfied
(D) Don't know.

3b. How satisfied are you with the quality of life in your city? Are you very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?
(1) Very satisfied
(2) Satisfied
(3) Dissatisfied
(4) Very dissatisfied
(D) Don't know.

4a. How fearful are you about crime in your NEIGHBORHOOD? Are you very fearful, somewhat fearful, not very fearful, or not at all fearful?
(1) Very fearful
(2) Somewhat fearful
(3) Not very fearful - Skip to 5a
(4) Not at all fearful - Skip to 5a
(D) Don't know - Skip to 5a.

4b. Over the last 12 months, have your fears increased, decreased, or stayed the same?
(1) Increased
(2) Decreased
(3) Stayed the same
(D) Don't know.

5a. How fearful are you about crime in your city? Are you very fearful, somewhat fearful, not very fearful, or not at all fearful?
(1) Very fearful
(2) Somewhat fearful
(3) Not very fearful - Skip to 6a
(4) Not at all fearful - Skip to 6a
(D) Don't know - Skip to 6a.

5b. Over the last 12 months, have your fears increased, decreased, or stayed the same?
(1) Increased
(2) Decreased
(3) Stayed the same
(D) Don't know.

6a. Now I am going to ask you a few questions that are more NEIGHBORHOOD specific.
Do any of the following conditions or activities exist in your neighborhood ?
(READ EACH CATEGORY THEN ENTER THE APPROPRIATE CODE FOR EACH CATEGORY)
(1) Yes (2) No (3) Don't know
. . . Abandoned cars and/or buildings
. . . Rundown/neglected buildings
. . . Poor lighting
. . . Overgrown shrubs/trees
. . . Trash
. . . Empty lots
. . . Illegal public drinking/public drug use
. . . Public drug sales
. . . Vandalism or Graffiti
. . . Prostitution
. . . Panhandling/Begging
. . . Loitering/"hanging out"
. . . Truancy/youth skipping school
. . . Transients/Homeless sleeping on benches, streets

NOTE 2: Do any of the categories in 6a contain an entry of 1?
[ ] Yes - Ask 6b
[ ] No - Skip to 7.

6b. Do any of the conditions you just mentioned make you feel less safe in your NEIGHBORHOOD?
(1) Yes
(2) No - Skip to 7
(D) Don't know - Skip to 7.

6c. Which one of the conditions just mentioned affects your feeling of safety the most?
(DO NOT READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES UNLESS REQUESTED BY THE RESPONDENT)
(1) Abandoned cars
(2) Rundown/neglected buildings

(3) Poor lighting
(4) Overgrown shrubs/trees
(5) Trash
(6) Empty lots
(7) Illegal public drinking/public drug use
(8) Public drug sales
(9) Vandalism or Graffiti
(10) Prostitution
(11) Panhandling/Begging
(12) Loitering/"hanging out"
(13) Truancy/youth skipping school
(14) Transients/Homeless sleeping on benches, streets
(D) Don't know.

7. Here are some things people DO to protect themselves or their property from crime that takes place AT HOME. In the past 12 months, have you done any of these things to protect yourself from crime in the home, in a direct response to you or your family's fear of crime?.
(READ EACH CATEGORY THEN ENTER THE APPROPRIATE CODE FOR EACH CATEGORY)
(1) Yes (2) No (3) Don't know
... You go to neighborhood watch meetings.
... You and your neighbors have agreed to watch out for each other's safety.
... You've installed a security system for your home.
... You've asked the police department to do a home security check.
... You have guard dogs at home.
... You've engraved security identification numbers on all your belongings.
... You've installed extra locks on windows and/or doors.
... You keep weapons inside the home.
... You've added outside and/or automatic lighting (e.g timers).
... Are there any other precautions you take that I haven't described? (Specify).

8a. The next few questions pertain to ALL areas of your city. Are you afraid of becoming a victim of STREET crime?
(1) Yes
(2) No- Skip to 9a
(D) Don't know - Skip to 9a.

8b. What type of street crime are you MOST afraid of?
(READ EACH CATEGORY THEN ENTER THE APPROPRIATE CODE)
(1) Robbery, someone stealing from you
(2) Physical assault that does not involve a gun (non-domestic violence)
(3) Assault with a gun, someone hurting you with a deadly weapon
(4) Sexual assault/Rape
(5) Murder, OR
(D) Don't know.

8c. Here are some things people DO to avoid becoming a victim of crime that takes place outside the home. In the past 12 months, have you done any of these things?.
(READ EACH CATEGORY THEN ENTER THE APPROPRIATE CODE FOR EACH CATEGORY)
(1) Yes (2) No (3) Don't know
... You carry a self-defense warning device such as a whistle or alarm.
... You carry a self-defense weapon (includes knife, gun, club, mace, stun-gun).
... You no longer take certain routes or go into certain areas in your neighborhood.
... You avoid going out at night.
... You avoid going out alone.
... You took a self-defense class.
... You attend community meetings in your neighborhood.
... You've made an effort to get to know the police in your neighborhood.
... You plan to relocate to outside of your neighborhood.
OR
... Have you taken other preventative measures that I haven't described? (Specify).

Section C. Police Contact/Visibility

9a. Now, I am going to ask about the LOCAL police.
In the past 12 months, have you been in contact with the LOCAL police for any reason?
(1) Yes
(2) No - Skip to 10
(D) Don't know/Can't remember - Skip to 10.

9b. How would you best describe your contact with the police?
(DO NOT PROBE. ENTER THE APPROPRIATE CODE FOR ALL CATEGORIES THAT APPLY.
WHEN FINISHED, ENTER "N" FOR 'NO MORE'.
---- (1) Casual conversation with a police officer.
---- (2) Officer responding to respondent's call for service.
---- (3) Gave information to police about a crime or incident (e.g. crime tip).
---- (4) Reported a crime to the police.
---- (5) Participated in a survey given by the police department.
---- (6) Asked the police for information or advice.
---- (7) Participated in a community activity that involved the police (e.g. clean-up, social event, community meeting).
---- (8) Traffic violations/traffic accidents.
---- (9) Working with police to address specific problems.
---- (10) Other (Specify).

10. In the past 12 months, have you observed any increases or decreases in police officer presence in your neighborhood or did the number stay the same?
(1) Increase
(2) Decrease
(3) No change
(4) Never see police in my neighborhood
(D) Don't know.

11. In the past 12 months, what activities have you seen police doing?
(READ EACH CATEGORY THEN ENTER THE APPROPRIATE CODE FOR EACH CATEGORY)
(1) Yes (2) No (3) Don't know
. . . Police talking with residents in the neighborhood.
. . . Police talking with business owners in the neighborhood.
. . . Police attending community meetings.
. . . Police facilitating crime watch and prevention activities such as nights out.
. . . Police involved with kids through recreational or school activities.
. . . Police opening police substations or information centers.
. . . Are there any other activities that you've noticed police are involved in (Specify).
OR
. . . Have you noticed any other activities?

12a. In the past 12 months, have you heard about any community meetings concerning crime taking place in your neighborhood?
(1) Yes
(2) No - Skip to 13
(D) Don't know - Skip to 13.

12b. In the past 12 months, have you attended any of these community meetings?
(1) Yes - Skip to 13
(2) No
(D) Don't know - Skip to 13.

12c. What are your reasons for not attending any meetings?
(DO NOT PROBE. ENTER THE CODE FOR ALL CATEGORIES THAT APPLY.)
---- (1) Aware of meetings, but do not know location and/or dates/times.
---- (2) Unable to obtain transportation.
---- (3) Unable to obtain child care.
---- (4) Meetings held in unsafe/scary part of town.
---- (5) Attendance would not help crime problem.
---- (6) Meeting place is too far.
---- (7) Meeting times take place during work hours.
---- (8) Don't have the time to attend.
---- (9) Not especially concerned about crime in my neighborhood.
---- (10) Other (Specify)
---- (D) Don't know.

Section D. Satisfaction with Police/Availability of Police

13. In general, how satisfied are you with the police who serve your neighborhood? Are you very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?
(1) Very satisfied
(2) Satisfied
(3) Dissatisfied
(4) Very Dissatisfied
(D) Don't know (no opinion; not aware of police services).

14. Does the police department servicing your neighborhood have a phone number for you to call for non-emergencies, other than 911?
(1) Yes (includes respondents who may not remember the number itself)
(2) No
(D) Don't know/can't remember.

Section E. Responsibility for Crime Prevention

15. How much work are police doing with the residents of your neighborhood to prevent crime and safety problems, a lot, some, very little, or nothing at all?
(1) A lot
(2) Some
(3) Very little
(4) Nothing at all
(D) Don't know.

Section F. Knowledge of Community Policing

16a. Are you familiar with the term "Community Policing?"
(1) Yes
(2) No
(D) Don't Know.

16b. Community policing involves police officers working with the community to address the causes of crime in an effort to reduce the problems themselves and the associated fear, through a wide range of activities. Based on the definition, do you think the police in your neighborhood practice community policing?
(1) Yes - Skip to 17a
(3) Somewhat - Skip to 17a
(2) No
(D) Don't know .

16c. Do you wish the police in your neighborhood practiced community policing?
(1) Yes
(2) No
(D) Don't know.

NOTE 5: Is there a response of 2 or D in 16c?
[ ] Yes - Skip to FILLROSTER, if there are other household members 12 years of age or older to be interviewed, otherwise skip to THANK-YOU to end the interview with the household.
[ ] No - Ask 16d

16d. What type of things do you wish the police were doing in your neighborhood? (DO NOT PROBE.)
---- (1) Working with the community to prevent crime
---- (2) Increasing the number of officers patrolling the streets
---- (3) Assigning the same officers to my neighborhood day in and day out
---- (4) Removing the trash, abandoned cars, destroying abandoned buildings or helping to evict bad tenants
---- (5) Cleaning up the streets
---- (6) Working more with the children in the area/ giving them a safe place to play
---- (7) Doing home security checks/surveys
---- (8) Do not want them to do anything/they are doing what I want them to do
---- (9) Other (Specify).

NOTE 6: If any response in 16d, skip to FILLROSTER, if there are any other household members 12 years of age or older to be interviewed, otherwise skip to THANK YOU to end the interview with the household

17a. How do you know?
(DO NOT PROBE. ENTER CODE FOR ALL CATEGORIES THAT APPLY.)
---- (1) Saw police doing community policing activities
---- (2) Saw in newspaper, on TV, or heard on the radio that police were doing community policing
---- (3) Other (Specify).
---- (D) Don't know.

NOTE 7: Is there an entry of 1 in 17a?
[ ] Yes - ask 17b.
[ ] No - Skip to FILLROSTER if there are any other household members 12 years of age or older who need to be interviewed, otherwise skip to THANK YOU to end the interview with the household.

17b. You said you saw the police doing community policing activities. Please specify what types of activities you saw the police participating in.
(DO NOT READ CATEGORIES. ENTER THE APPROPRIATE CODE FOR ALL CATEGORIES THAT APPLY.)
---- (1) Traffic enforcement
---- (2) Increasing their presence in high crime/"bad" areas
---- (3) Increasing patrol by vehicle/foot/bike patrol
---- (4) Working with the community and/or business owners to address specific problems
---- (5) Attending community meetings
---- (6) Conducting crime prevention or community policing workshops
---- (7) Conducting community and/or business surveys about neighborhood problems
---- (8) Running youth programs like DARE, GREAT, PAL
---- (9) Other (Specify).
End interview.

CURRICULUM VITA

Bruce K. Bayley
1-26-02

Office Address
Department of Family and Human Development
Family Life Building
Utah State University
Logan, UT 84322-2905
Phone: 435-799-8723
Fax: 435-799-4829
Email: b.bayley@usu.edu

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:

Ph.D. 2002 — **Utah State University**
Family and Human Development (GPA: 4.0)
Emphases: Juvenile justice and delinquency, adolescent/law enforcement interactions, adult and juvenile corrections, the bi-directional relationships between crime and the family, and utilization of GIS/GPS technologies in the analysis and mapping of adult and juvenile correctional facilities
Dissertation: *Perceptions of Crime and the Criminal Justice Systems Among American Youth*
* Anticipated completion date: June 2002

M.S. 1999 — **University of Utah**
Family Ecology (GPA 3.95)
Emphases: Juvenile delinquency and juvenile justice systems
Thesis: *Utah's juvenile drug court: An assessment of attrition*

B.S. 1997 — **University of Utah**
Major: Sociology; Minor: Criminology; Certificate in Adult and Juvenile Corrections (GPA: 4.0)

EMPLOYMENT AND RELATED EXPERIENCES:

9/99 - present	**Research assistant.** *Add Health Adoption Study, Utah State University, Logan, UT.* Analyze data, assist in grant writing, prepare papers, maintain records, and prepare annual reports of an NIH funded study using the Add Health data set to address a variety of adoption issues. *Supervisor: Brent C. Miller, Ph.D.*
5/00 - present	**Founder - Chief crime and intelligence analyst.** *Public Safety Research and Analysis Center, Logan, UT (A non-profit organization providing mapping and crime analysis services to small and medium sized law enforcement agencies and schools operating in Utah)*
5/00 - present	**Crime and intelligence analyst.** *Cache County Crime and Intelligence Unit, Cache County, UT.* Collect and analyze data, as needed, from the five law enforcement agencies operating in Cache Valley, UT. Prepare administrative, strategic, and tactical crime analyses in support of the various missions within each department. Implement and maintain the use of GIS/GPS technologies in support of the above analyses.
7/99 - present	**Research Analyst - Contractual.** *Intermountain Health Care, Salt Lake City, UT.* Collect and analyze data for local HMO on a project-by-project basis.
4/92 - 7/00	**Founder/Researcher.** *Protect The Children, Salt Lake City, UT (A non-profit child safety organization specializing in research and education).* Collect, analyze, and disseminate information regarding missing children and child safety.
8/96 - 8/99	**Deputy Juvenile Probation Officer.** *Third District Juvenile Court, Assessment and Diversion Unit, Salt Lake City, UT.* Supervisor: *Jim Grundhauser*
6/88 - 2/92	**Correctional Officer II.** *Sonoma County Sheriff's Department, Santa Rosa, CA Medical retirement after sustaining injuries while on duty* Supervisor: *Sgt. Jerry Schackali*

CERTIFICATIONS:

11/01	Certified Family Life Educator (CFLE)
9/01	Institutional Review Board Certification - Utah State University
1/01	Protection of Human Research Subject - National Institutes of Health
6/92	911 Emergency Dispatcher
8/88	POST Basic Officer Training (CA)
2/89	POST Advanced Officer Training (CA)
1/02	Crime and Intelligence Analyst - California's Department of Justice *Anticipated Completion - 1/02

CERTIFICATES:

3/02	Crime Mapping - United States Department of Justice *Anticipated Completion - 4/02
10/01	ESRI Spatial Analyst

CERTIFICATES (cont.):

9/01	ESRI ArcIMS
9/01	ESRI ArcView 3D Analyst
8/01	ESRI ArcView 3.X
12/00	Criminal Investigations (Psychological Profiling)
10/00	Criminal Intelligence
8/00	Crime Analysis

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

Utah State University

Spring, 2002 — **Graduate Instructor. FHD 4240: Social and Family Gerontology (Satellite)**
Full responsibility for an undergraduate course in social and family gerontology. Duties include syllabus design, lectures, textbook selection, group activities, test construction/grading, homework grading, and acquiring guest speakers.

Spring, 2002 — **Instructor. Terrorism in the 21st Century (Internet)**
Full responsibility for the development and implementation of an undergraduate introductory course in crime analysis. Duties include website design, syllabus design, lectures, textbook selection, test construction/grading, and homework grading.

Spring, 2002 **Instructor. Crime Analysis: Theory and Application (Internet)**
Full responsibility for the development and implementation of an undergraduate course in applied crime analysis. Duties include website design, syllabus design, lectures, textbook selection, test construction/grading, and homework grading. This course is designed for both students and active law enforcement officers.

1/01 - present **Graduate Instructor. FHD 4230: Families and Social Policy.**
Full responsibility for an undergraduate course in family and social policy. Duties include syllabus design, lectures, textbook selection, group activities, test construction/grading, homework grading, and acquiring guest speakers.
Enrollment: Spring, 2001: 60 students
Fall, 2001: 46 students

6/01 - 8/01 **Instructor. FHD 1500: Human Development Across the Lifespan (Satellite)**
Full responsibility for an undergraduate course in human development. Duties included syllabus design, lectures, textbook selection, group activities, test construction/grading, homework grading, and acquiring guest speakers.
Enrollment: 43 students

9/00 - 12/00 **Teaching Assistant. FHD 4230: Families and Social Policy.**
Responsible for grading papers, maintaining class records, proctoring exams, and lecturing on criminal and juvenile justice sections.

<u>American Military University</u>

Summer, 2002 **Adjunct Professor. SOC2420: Social Statistics (Internet)**
Full responsibility for the development and implementation of an undergraduate course in social statistics. Duties include syllabus design, lectures, textbook selection, test construction/grading, and homework grading.

Spring, 2002 **Adjunct Professor. FD2400: Adolescence (Internet)**
Full responsibility for an undergraduate course covering the bi-directional relationships between crime and the family, including syllabus design, lectures, textbook selection, test construction/grading, and homework grading.

9/01 - present **Adjunct Professor. CJ322: Crime and the Family (Internet)**
Full responsibility for an undergraduate course covering the bi-directional relationships between crime and the family, including syllabus design, lectures, textbook selection, test construction/grading, and homework.

7/01 - 9/01 **Adjunct Professor. CJ501: Criminology (Internet)**
Full responsibility for the development and implementation of a graduate course in criminology from a global perspective. Duties included syllabus design, lectures, textbook selection, test construction/grading, and homework grading.
Enrollment: 6 students

University of Utah

5/00 - 8/00 **Instructor. FCS 5966: Ecology of Juvenile Justice Problems.**
Full responsibility for a graduate level course covering juvenile justice and juvenile justice systems including syllabus design, lectures, group activities, test construction and grading, homework grading, and acquiring guest speakers.
Enrollment: 26 students

6/99 - 8/99 **Instructor. FCS 5962: Ecology of Juvenile Delinquency and Justice.**
A graduate level course in juvenile delinquency developed at the request of the Continuing Education Department, University of Utah. Full responsibility for the syllabus design, lectures, textbook selection, group activities, test construction/grading, homework grading, and acquiring guest speakers.
Enrollment: 47 students

5/99 - 6/99 **Instructor. FCS 1600: Home and Community Environments.**
Full responsibility for an undergraduate course that addressed the interactive relationships between a family's home and their community environment. Duties included syllabus design, lectures, group activities, test construction and grading, homework grading, and acquiring guest speakers.
Enrollment: 148 students

1/99 - 5/99 **Teaching Assistant. FCS 3650: Community Psychology and Environments.**
Responsible for grading, coordinating groups projects, maintaining class records, and periodic lectures.

9/98 - 12/98 **Teaching Assistant. FCS 1600: Home and Community Environments.**
Responsible for grading, coordinating groups projects, maintaining class records, and lectures on crime and delinquency.

PUBLICATIONS:

Refereed Journal Articles

Miller, B.C., Fan, X., Bayley, B.K., Christensen, M., Coyl, D., Grotevant, H.D., & Dulmen, M. (in press). Who is adopted? Measuring adoption status using national survey data. Adoption Quarterly.

Invited Chapters

Miller, B.C., Bayley, B.K., Christensen, M., Leavitt, S.C., & Coyl, D. (in press). The Blackwell Handbook of Adolescence. In G. Adams and M. Berzonsky (Eds.), Adolescent Pregnancy and Childbearing (Chapter 19). Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell Publishers.

Professional Publications

Bayley, B.K. (in press). The Year of the Family: Improving the lives of United States Air Force personnel and their families. Family Focus On Military Families.

Bayley, B.K., & Miller, B.C. (2001). Violence and the use of geographic information systems: Hotspot identification and the reallocation of services. Family Focus On Violence Prevention, 46(3), FF21-FF22.

Minor Publications (Magazine articles, booklets)

Bayley, B.K. (1994). Are your grandchildren really safe? Utah Prime Times, 5(8), p. 25.

Bayley, B.K. (1993). Missing children's protection booklet. Santa Rosa, CA: Sonoma Publications.

Submitted Manuscripts

Fan, X., Miller, B.C., Bayley, B.K., Christensen, M., Park, K.E., Grotevant, H.D., van Dulmen, M., & Dunbar, N. Questionnaire and interview inconsistencies between adopted and non-adopted adolescents in a national sample.
Submitted to Adoption Quarterly

Manuscripts in preparation

Bayley, B.K., & Jones, R. Profile analysis: Sex registrants in violation of proximity requirements. Analysis in progress.

Bayley, B.K., & Piercy, K. Adolescent presentation of self within a virtual environment. Manuscript in progress.

PRESENTATIONS:

Bayley, B.K. (2001, December). Perceptions of crime and criminal justice systems among American youth. Colloquium guest speaker, Utah State University, Logan, UT.

Grotevant, H.D., van Dulmen, M.H.M., Dunbar, N., Miller, B.C., Christensen, M., Bayley, B.K., & Fan, X.(2001, August). Antisocial behavior of adopted and nonadopted adolescents: Differences in process and outcomes. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco.

Dunbar, N., Grotevant, H.D., van Dulmen, M.H.M., Miller, B.C., Fan, X., Christensen, M., & Bayley, B.K. (2001, August). Depression in adopted and nonadopted adolescents. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco.

Bayley, B.K., & Box, P. (Accepted). Predicting criminal patterns and COPS deployment using least cost analysis. Submitted to the 21st Annual ESRI User Conference, San Diego, CA.

Bayley, B.K. (2000, November). Technical considerations for using Internet chat rooms as a qualitative data source. Round table presented at the annual meeting of the National Conference on Family Relations, Minneapolis, MN.

van Dulmen, M.H., Grotevant, H.D., Dunbar, N., Miller, B.C., Fan, X., Bayley, B.K., Christensen, M., & Coyl, D. (2000, August). Assessing DSM-IV criteria with the Wave I adolescent in-home interview. Add Health user's workshop, Bethesda, MD.

van Dulmen, M.H., Grotevant, H.D., Dunbar, N., Miller, B.C., Fan, X., Bayley, B.K., Christensen, M, & Coyl, D. (2000, August). Connecting survey data with DSM-IV criteria. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Bayley, B.K. (2000, March). Youth violence. Colloquium panelist, Utah State University, Logan, UT.

Bayley, B.K. (2000, February). Secondary data analysis. Presented to an undergraduate research methods class, Utah State University, Logan, UT.

Bayley, B.K. (1992, June). Characteristics of sex offenders in California's correctional system. Presented to the California Department of Corrections, Sacramento, CA.

Radio Presentations

Bayley, B.K. (1990, November). Child safety in the 20th century. KSRO, Santa Rosa, CA.

Bayley, B.K. (1990, June). Missing children in California. KSRO, Santa Rosa, CA.

GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS:

Received

- Presidential Fellowship: Utah State University (9/99 - 5/00; $12,000).
- National Council of Family Relations Travel Grant (2000; $790).
- University of Utah Teaching Assistantship, one of five awards given to graduate students with promising abilities as educators (1999, $4500).
- Principal Investigator, *The prevention of missing children.* The Henry W. & Leslie M Eskuche Foundation, 1996; $600.
-

Submitted

- Principal Investigator (2001 Byrne Grant - Cache County Crime/Intelligence Analysis and Mapping Program). Submitted to the State of Utah.

AWARDS AND HONORS:

1999	National Sociological Honor Society
1998	Phi Theta Kappa
1997	Golden Key Society
1996	Nominated for the Harry S. Truman National Scholarship (1 of 2 students nominated by Salt Lake Community College)

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:

Professional Associations

- American Society of Criminology
- International Association of Crime Analysts
- Justice Research and Statistics Association
- International Association of Law Enforcement Intelligence Analysts
- Retired Peace Officers Association of California
- Society for Research on Adolescence
- American Sociological Association
- National Council on Family Relations

Other Activities

Student Reviewer - Family Relations

Selection Committee Member (2001). Anselm Strauss Award for excellence in qualitative research, National Council on Family Relations.

Graduate Student Senator (2000-2001). Department of Family and Human Development, Utah State University.