

RELIGIOSITY AND FEAR OF CRIME

by

Jonathan Bolen

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Criminal Justice
Boise State University

December 2010

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE COLLEGE

DEFENSE COMMITTEE AND FINAL READING APPROVALS

of the thesis submitted by

Jonathan Bolen

Thesis Title: Religiosity and Fear of Crime

Date of Final Oral Examination: 06 October 2010

The following individuals read and discussed the thesis submitted by student Jonathan Bolen, and they evaluated his presentation and response to questions during the final oral examination. They found that the student passed the final oral examination.

Andrew Giacomazzi, Ph.D.

Chair, Supervisory Committee

Lisa Growette-Bostaph, Ph.D.

Member, Supervisory Committee

Robert Marsh, Ph.D.

Member, Supervisory Committee

The final reading approval of the thesis was granted by Andrew Giacomazzi, Ph.D., Chair of the Supervisory Committee. The thesis was approved for the Graduate College by John R. Pelton, Ph.D., Dean of the Graduate College.

DEDICATION

For Zoe and Angela, the calm in my storm, the anchor of my ship.

ABSTRACT

Previous research investigating fear of crime has returned little universal agreement as to what exacerbates and what reduces an individual's level of fear of crime. In this thesis the researcher seeks to add to the mountain of literature on fear of crime and to include a novel independent variable, religiosity, in effort to better inform the fear of crime debate. Analyzing survey data collected from students at an urban university, the researcher finds that (1) females are far more fearful than their male counterparts; (2) religiosity is not informative on varying levels of fear of crime in the sample. An unintended finding was strong instruments to further investigate a possible religiosity/fear of crime relationship that are available to future researchers. The results of this research indicate that fear of crime is a complex phenomenon, and is in need of further research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iv
ABSTRACT	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	3
Gendered Differences	10
Fear of Crime	10
Religiosity	12
METHODOLOGY	15
Research Question and Purpose	15
Research Design	16
Sampling Procedure	17
PRETEST OF THE INSTRUMENT	19
MEASURES	20
Independent Variable	20
Religiosity	20
Dependent Variable	22
Fear of Crime	22
Control Variables	24
Age	24

Race/Ethnicity.....	24
Socioeconomic Status	24
Gender.....	25
Education	26
Perceived Risk	26
RESULTS	28
Demographics of the Sample Population.....	28
Correlation and Analysis.....	31
Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) & Analysis	34
DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	37
REFERENCES	44
APPENDIX A.....	44
Survey Instrument	
APPENDIX B	51
Pearson Correlation Matrix	
APPENDIX C	62
Pearson Correlation Matrix 2	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics.....	29
Table 2. OLS Regression.....	35

INTRODUCTION

Accurately defining fear of crime has been, and continues to be, a difficult and highly debated task attempted by many researchers (Scarborough, Like-Haislip, Novak, Lucas, & Alarid, 2010). Though difficult to accurately define, many researchers agree that the negative emotional states stemming from belief in the potential of crime victimization, and related attitudes, behaviors, and cognitive risk assessment associated with that perceived potential is an accepted definition for fear of crime (Scarborough et al. 2010). A growing concern among policy makers and citizens alike, fear of crime can come at a significant cost to an individual, a neighborhood and a nation. Many of these costs are tangible or direct, such as increases in criminal justice budgets, insurance premiums, and security measures, with a monetary price tag clearly indicated. Other costs stem from less tangible psychological, emotional, and physical effects that can accompany an increased and prolonged level of fear (Dolan & Peasgood, 2007).

Though at the most basic level all individuals have some fear of crime, there can be substantial variation among individuals. In essence, it is not easy to say that one fears crime the same way as another and further that the price paid by each individual for his/her fear is the same. Many different variables have been established by researchers that correlate with fear of crime, including age, neighborhood conditions, an individual's perceived personal risk of victimization, and even the amount of local television news that an individual watches (Weitzer & Kubrin, 2004). Though many variables can affect fear of crime, none can be identified as the primary cause for increased or decreased

levels, leading this researcher to search for new variables that may be influencing fear levels to add to the existing body of research.

Religiosity has been largely ignored as a variable in understanding fear of crime, and this research will serve as the first step to explore it as a variable that might affect fear of crime. Being better able to examine religiosity's impact on citizens' fear levels makes policy agents more capable of understanding the construct of fear of crime in general and what can be done to reduce it. If it is found that an individual's religiosity impacts fear of crime, whether as an inhibitor or facilitator, the multitude of programs (community-based or otherwise) aimed at reducing fear may have only minimal effect, and more interpersonal fear reduction tactics may be appropriate. As such, the current research attempts to establish religiosity as a salient variable in the fear of crime debate, and to provide policy makers with an enriched view of factors impacting fear of crime.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Fear of crime has been ostensibly researched. The following is a selected review of the voluminous research that best targets and illustrates the construct developed for the current study. Many scholars have debated what factors increase and decrease an individual's fear of crime. Franklin, Franklin, and Fearn (2008) explain that most theoretical paradigms regarding fear of crime fall into two camps: facilitators and inhibitors of fear of crime. The former category encompasses elements that increase the fear of individuals, such as personal victimization and perceived risk. The latter of the two categories are variables that reduce levels of fear in an individual, including social integration and neighborhood cohesion (Franklin et al., 2008). Further, the authors detail three primary models noted in the research that explain varying levels of fear of crime: vulnerability, disorder, and social integration models.

The vulnerability model includes two factors: personal vulnerability and social vulnerability. The former can be summarized by an individual's perceived ability to fend off an attacker, the latter of the two is the increased exposure to victimization via sociodemographic factors (e.g., impoverished high crime area) and access to social networks and resources to resolve victimization if it occurs (Franklin et al., 2008). The second of the two models, disorder, measures physical and social decay in a given area. Drawing from Shaw and Mckay (1942) (as cited in Franklin et al., 2008, p. 208), this model examines the incivilities perceived by an individual in his/her neighborhood and the effect of perceived neighborhood disorder stemming from those incivilities. The final

model, social integration, is the only model among the three that examines a fear of crime inhibitor. The social integration model includes the sense of community and belonging that an individual has in his/her neighborhood and with social groups in general.

In effort to examine which of these three models best explains the variance in levels of fear of crime, Franklin and colleagues (2008) reviewed data collected from 2,861 surveys spanning 21 cities in Washington State. Utilizing the three aforementioned models, the researchers conducted hierarchical modeling to determine which model best explained fear of crime. What the authors found was that each of the aforementioned models had a statistically significant effect on fear of crime.

Though each of the models was able to explain levels of variance in fear of crime, the disorder model proved to be the most accurate across all cities. The authors further noted that there may be substantial overlap among the three models and since each of the models was able to explain varying levels of fear of crime, researchers should be warned against being rigid in their modeling of fear of crime (Franklin et al., 2008).

Similar results and assertions were found by McGarrell, Giacomazzi, and Thurman (1997). Community level perceptions of disorder were discovered to be the most significant in predicting heightened and mitigated levels of fear among Washington State residents. Also in agreement with Franklin et al. (2008), the researchers concluded that individual demographic variables, namely being female, were strongly correlated with heightened levels of fear of crime.

Previously, a definition of fear of crime was offered that was all encompassing, though it is important to note that fear of crime may not be an omniscient construct.

Moore and Shepherd (2007) conducted a secondary data analysis using the British Crime Survey from 2001, questioning whether or not the umbrella term 'fear of crime' was reducible to specific crimes. The researchers also explored if the long established relationship between age and fear of crime was a result of fear of specific crimes.

What the authors uncovered was that fear of crime can be reduced and dichotomized to fear of property loss and fear of personal harm. The authors contend that early in life (16-25 years of age) fear of personal harm is the most salient element of increased levels of fear of crime. However, this fear decreases significantly in an individual's mid-adulthood. It is at that time that fear of property loss becomes the primary dimension of an individual's fear of crime, the peak of which is reached at age forty-five. Moore and Shepherd (2007) note that the least fearful of all the age groups was sixty and above, directing the authors to assert that increased vulnerability that accompanies age is not informative to an individual's fear of crime within the research population. It is important to note, however, that this finding is at odds with other fear of crime research, the findings of which indicate increased age is strongly correlated with increases in fear of crime (for a brief discussion see Franklin et al., 2008).

Though fear of crime has been abundantly researched by criminologists, religiosity has not yet been established as a viable variable worth consideration within that research. However, religiosity within the context of criminal justice issues has been researched, especially with regards to desistance from crime and drug use among adolescents. The following is a brief overview of this research in effort to illustrate the

current standing of religiosity as a variable within criminal justice research, and to serve as a transition into the current research.

The examination of religiosity and criminality in social research is well and long established (Baier & Wright, 2001; Heaton, 2006). Arguably, the most infamous case of the study of religiosity and crime is that of Hirschi and Stark (1969). In their landmark study, Hirschi and Stark (1969) found a negligible effect of religiosity (measured through church attendance) on delinquency in a large, random, sample of students, and concluded that an individual's religiosity is in no way a deterrent to delinquency. This controversial and somewhat counterintuitive finding spawned a number of researchers to look closely at religiosity and its relationship with criminality. The results of this quest proved to widen the debate as to whether a relationship between religiosity and criminality existed, and furthermore, what the nature of such a relationship was (Baier and Wright, 2001).

In an effort to consolidate the findings of previous research examining religiosity and criminality and to inform the controversy on the religiosity/crime question, Baier and Wright (2001) conducted a meta-analysis of 60 previous research studies examining religiosity and crime. What the authors found was that in general, religiosity has a significant, however modest, inverse relationship with criminality over all studies, and that variance in this relationship between studies could partially be explained by four factors: sampling religious populations, violent versus non-violent crime as the dependent variable, sample size, and racial diversity of the sample (Baier & Wright, 2001). Similar findings were provided by Chitwood, Weiss, and Leukefeld (2008) in their examination of religiosity and drug/alcohol use and abuse.

In a meta-analysis of 105 studies examining relationships between alcohol/drug use and religiosity, Chitwood, et al. (2008) found that in the vast majority of studies, religiosity was negatively correlated with drug/alcohol use and abuse. The authors further assert that religiosity was found to be a protective factor against drug and alcohol abuse, regardless of how religiosity was measured in a given study.

Though both Chitwood et al. (2008) and Baier and Wright (2001) have provided informative meta-analyses suggesting an overall consensus among researchers examining the broad religiosity/crime relationship, neither provide universal theoretical foundations for why the relationship exists and how the two (religiosity and criminality) interact. The fact that the above meta-analyses did not provide a concise theoretical foundation is not uncommon. Within the literature little, if any, agreement among scholars can be found as to how the religiosity/deviant behavior relationship operates. This lack of theoretical agreement among scholars is briefly highlighted below.

Johnson, Jang, Larson, & DeLi (2001) sought to examine the importance of religiosity in reducing and protecting a youth from delinquency and to further add to the theoretical debate on the religiosity/crime relationship by incorporating social bonding and social learning variables. Utilizing longitudinal data from the National Youth Survey (NYS), the authors found that religiosity had a significant, direct, and consistent dampening effect on delinquency.

In an attempt to examine the process in which religiosity reduces an individual's delinquency, the authors incorporated variables from two theoretic explanations: social bonding (measured by beliefs) and social learning (measured by delinquent peer

association). The authors found that social bonding/social learning were somewhat informative of the religiosity/crime relationship, in that religiosity and belief were significantly and negatively related to delinquent peer association and thus related to reduced delinquency. However, the authors further note that the social control and social learning variables do not explain the relationship in its entirety and that the relationship between religiosity and delinquency remains largely independent of the social bonding and social learning explanations.

The relationship between religiosity and crime also has been scrutinized through the paradigm of general strain theory (GST). This theoretical explanation posits that an individual's religiosity can be relied upon to cope with various stressors and strain in one's life, and as such religiosity will serve as an inhibitor to criminal behaviors. To examine this theoretical relationship, Johnson and Morris (2008) utilized the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) to examine whether a juvenile's religiosity mediated increased levels of strain (as measured by exposure to violence and school troubles) and reduced violent and property criminality.

The authors found that, as expected, increased levels of strain were highly informative to increased levels of criminal behavior among the sample. However, the results of Johnson and Morris' (2008) research clearly show that religiosity was unable to reduce or eliminate criminal behavior in response to a juvenile's strain, leading the authors to question whether religiosity and other strain conditioning variables are at all informative to understanding strain coping strategies.

Though Johnson and Morris (2008) were unable to find any direct dampening effect of religiosity on criminality, their findings are not universal. Jang and Johnson (2005) examined religiosity and its effect on strain and criminality in a sample of African Americans and found the opposite of Johnson and Morris' (2008) findings.

Utilizing data obtained by the National Survey of Black Americans, Jang and Johnson (2005) probed the relationships between gender, religiosity, strain, and criminality. What the authors discovered was that females were far more likely to be religious than were men and that their religiosity was a vital tool in their reactions to strain and reduced their likelihood of responding to strain in criminal ways. The authors explain that the increased level of religiosity found among females in the sample altered their strain response by increasing their exposure to other religious individuals, who were in turn able to assist them through their stressful times. Furthermore, the authors argue that being female and religiosity both increase the likelihood of internalizing strain and reducing the likelihood of responding to strain in aggressive/antisocial ways.

The theoretical debate surrounding religiosity and criminality rages on. At this juncture in religiosity/criminality research, the only clear and universal agreement appears to be that no one theory has yet explained how an individual's religiosity interacts with criminality.

Gendered Differences

Fear of Crime

Though many researchers have found different variables that mitigate and aggravate levels of fear of crime, one variable remains consistent across previous studies. Gender has been established as an important variable in predicting higher levels of fear of crime; females have consistently shown higher rates of fear of crime than their male counterparts (Jennings, Gover, & Pudrzynska, 2007; Schafer, Huebner, & Bynum, 2006; McGarrell et al., 1997; Ferraro, 1996). The present research explores the relationship between gender and fear of crime as it relates to an individual's religiosity. Therefore, it is important to establish what may be influencing these differing rates of fear among females before new research is conducted.

Schafer et al. (2006) examined previously collected data that utilized 2,058 telephone interviews in a midsized urban area in an effort to explore differences between rates of fear of crime and gender. Schafer and colleagues (2006) tested three models, perceived safety, personal victimization, and property victimization, adhering to the rationale that by doing so, the researchers would be better able to isolate any identified gendered differences. The authors further controlled for other known variables that have impacted an individual's fear of crime, including age, race, SES, education, and employment status.

What the authors found was that women in general were more fearful of crime than men. However, the researchers also found that these engendered differences were only statistically significant with regard to a limited number of variables (perceived

neighborhood disorder and perceptions of major crime, respectively) and were only applicable to the fear of personal victimization and perceived safety models. The third model (fear of property victimization) did reveal a correlation: men were found to be more fearful than women of property victimization; however, this correlation fell short of statistical significance.

The demographic variables that were controlled for by Schafer et al. (2006) provided predictive validity for men's fear of crime but not for women. These results left the authors to question if the prevalence of fear of sexual victimization felt by women was to blame, in so far as the fear of sexual victimization that is felt by females and not by males results in a widening of the net for potential crimes for women to fear. This hypothesis, posited by Schafer et al. (2006), had been previously investigated by Ferraro (1996). Reviewing data that were collected through the Fear of Crime in America Survey, Ferraro (1996) found that women's fear of sexual assault substantially heightened their fear of other victimization, especially fear of crimes that involved physical confrontation. The author's findings give substantial reliability to the shadow of sexual assault hypothesis, explaining that sexual assault (a mostly female victim crime) casts a dark and fearful shadow over women, thereby increasing their fear of crime.

The gendered differences found in rates of fear of crime also may be affected by issues outside of readily identified demographic variables. For example, Sutton and Farrall (2005) surveyed 1,629 Scottish residents to explore a possible explanation to gender differences in fear of crime: do men lie about their fear? To test this hypothesis, the authors created a survey instrument that monitored fear of crime, but that also

included a “lie scale” (Sutton & Farrall, 2005, p. 214), which was designed to examine a respondent’s desire to give socially desirable answers in which men were hypothesized to align themselves to socially acceptable gender roles and to minimize their fear of crime.

The authors’ hypothesis was supported in that men who scored high on the lie scale were also far less likely to score high on their measured fear of crime. This led the authors to assert that “(. . .) beneath their bravado, men may actually be more fearful than women” (Sutton & Farrall, 2005, p. 222).

Religiosity

Gender has served as a powerful predictor of an individual’s fear of crime. But gender also has been evidenced to play a substantial role in predicting an individual’s religiosity level. Research has shown that females are more religious than males (Thompson, 1991; Miller & Hoffmann, 1995). Some authors contend that it is not gender per se that predicts higher levels of religiosity, but rather gender roles (Thompson, 1991).

In his research, Thompson (1991) investigated whether the difference in religiosity levels between females and males was actually related to an individual’s accepted gender role, asserting that religion has long been established as a feminine institution that is founded on typical feminine ideals of community, togetherness, and properness. The authors speculate that men can be as religious as females only if their personal paradigm is more feminine than masculine and further contend that females with a more or less feminine view of the world may impact their personal religiosity, and that this could explain variation of religiosity levels among females.

To test these hypotheses, the researchers administered a survey to 358 undergraduate university students. The instrument was specifically designed to measure individual religiosity and gender orientation. The researchers found that gender orientation was much more predictive of an individual's religiosity than was gender alone. However, the authors also found that gender orientation was only able to explain differing levels of religiosity among men and could only account for some difference in religiosity of females.

The latter of these findings suggests that other explanations as to the varying levels of religiosity between males and females may not be entirely explained by gender roles. Miller and Hoffman (1995) hypothesized that gender differences in religiosity may be influenced not only by accepted female gender roles of submissiveness, obedience, and nurturing, but rather risk preference. The authors contend, under the philosophy that believing in a God costs an individual nothing and could provide substantial benefit and not believing in a God could potentially cost an individual the ultimate price (Pascal's wager), non-religious individuals are exhibiting higher levels of risk taking behavior. Since women in general show far less propensity to take risks, the authors assert that it follows that women would be substantially more religious than men.

Utilizing data obtained by the Monitoring the Future Study, Miller and Hoffman (1995) were able to examine if an individual's risk preference was correlated with his/her religiosity. The authors found that risk preference was predictive of religiosity in a small, yet statistically significant way. In light of their findings the authors contend that if males are being socialized to masculine gender roles that include increased risk behavior,

they are being socialized to be less religious (Miller & Hoffman, 1995). This assumption lends some support to the findings of Thompson (1991). Therefore, it is not the sex of an individual that determines religiosity, but rather a constellation of traits that is typically viewed as being feminine.

In the following sections, a review of the methods, instruments, and hypothesis for the current research will be reviewed. After a foundation of the methods and research design are provided, an examination of the statistical results of the current study will be included, followed by discussions and conclusions based on those results.

METHODOLOGY

Research Question and Purpose

The aforementioned research was the driving force behind the current research question: does an individual's level of religiosity affect his/her fear of crime? The efforts of previous researchers seeking to establish explanations for the variance in levels of fear of crime have produced little universal agreement. However, one area that researchers do appear to agree on is that fear of crime is an extremely complex construct and that many variables are at play. Previous research has established both macro level reasons for the variance in fear as well as establishing individual variables for the variance, but to date any relationship between religiosity and fear of crime has not yet been clearly established.

With few exceptions, previous research suggests that being female is an important variable that affects levels of fear (Jennings et al., 2007). Further, previous research suggests that females are more religious than males (Miller & Hoffman, 1995). If women in general are more fearful of crime and tend to be more religious than men, speculation is warranted as to whether the latter is correlated with the former across gender, or if the relationship is prevalent only in women. The purpose of the current research is twofold. First, religiosity and its association with fear of crime will be examined. Second, this research will examine the gender role in this relationship. More specifically, the research seeks to answer the question of whether an individual's religiosity and fear of crime is

gender specific or if, as previous research suggests, the correlation may be found in both genders.

Research Design

To investigate the impact of an individual's religiosity on his/her fear of crime, the current study utilized survey research. The target population for the questionnaire was undergraduate and graduate students within the social sciences at a metropolitan university in the northwest. The use of a questionnaire for this type of research is particularly appropriate as survey research has been the established, preferred, and most frequently used research design by researchers exploring fear of crime (Ferraro, 1996; Franklin et al., 2008; McGarrell et al., 1997; Scarborough et al., 2010).

The student questionnaire was the only method used to explore the research question. Since the unit of analysis in the research is the individual, a questionnaire allows for the largest pool of individual subjects to be available to the researcher. Though utilizing a questionnaire is an appropriate method for examining the research question, it may be argued that triangulation, or use of multiple methods to examine the research question is warranted (Farrall, Bannister, Ditton, & Gilchrist, 1997). Such a claim is generally valid; however it was not feasible for the current research due to limitations in resources and time that were available. Furthermore, this research is unique in that no previous studies have been conducted to address this particular research question. As an undeveloped research area, the current study should be construed as a foundation on which future research may be conducted. If a relationship between religiosity and fear of

crime is established, and if that relationship is found to be informative in increased or decreased levels of fear of crime, future research should implement multiple methods to create a more multi-dimensional image of religiosity and fear of crime.

Sampling Procedure

As of the Fall Semester 2009, the metropolitan university had 18,936 students enrolled (Office of Communications and Marketing, 2010). Due to this high number of students, distributing a questionnaire to all students to provide a census across the university was deemed impractical due to cost, time, and practicality. To circumvent the improbability of obtaining a census, while also maintaining a large enough sample to administer an array of statistical techniques to data collected, a convenience sample was used. The convenience sample (the limitations of which will be discussed in a later section) included students enrolled in summer school courses in the ten academic departments housed within the social sciences college. In determining which classes received the survey, initial contact was made via e-mail with the faculty member of a given class to gain approval to administer the survey to his/her students. Once approval from the professor was granted, all students for each class were surveyed by the researcher during the regularly scheduled class period. However, given the large availability of online courses during the summer, an online version of the questionnaire was created and made available via the Web-based surveying company, Survey Monkey. In these cases, potential respondents were informed not to include any personally

identifying information on the questionnaire, as anonymity was of central concern and that their participation in the research was wholly voluntary.

In effort to minimize potential harm to subjects and to insure that the survey instrument and method of delivery met the rigorous standards of compliance for testing of human subjects, prior to the delivery of the survey a research proposal was submitted for review, and was subsequently approved by, the Institutional Review Board.

For the complete questionnaire and the order in which questions were asked, see Appendix A. Each of the questionnaire items is addressed individually in the following sections.

Though relationships among femaleness, religiosity, and fear of crime were the original catalysts for this research, males are included in the sample to better examine whether any relationships found between religiosity and fear of crime are gender specific or if they can be generalized to both genders. The student population at the university is nearly a 50/50 split between males and females, with males representing the minority at 45% (Office of Communications and Marketing, 2010).

Though females are a slight majority in the overall university student population, they represent a larger majority of survey participants (60.9% of participants are female). Though the sample is not a mirror image of the demographic makeup of the university population, females remain the majority and only slightly more so than their overall percentage in the university's population. As such, there existed no need to alter sampling techniques to incorporate more male participants.

PRE-TEST OF THE INSTRUMENT

Before distribution of the survey to the targeted sampling frame, the questionnaire was pre-tested with a small number of friends and family. The reason for doing this was to further test the validity and reliability of the measures before launching the survey to the larger target population. Though a largely informal process, by doing so the researcher was able to preemptively address any issues found in the questionnaire, thereby avoiding dealing with any problems post hoc. This, in turn, bolstered the validity of the questionnaire and assured the reliability of the measurement tool.

MEASURES

Independent Variable

Religiosity

Religiosity was conceptualized as the presence of devotional religious behavior of an individual and the importance of religion in an individual's life. This conceptualization is consistent with the research literature regarding individual religiosity (Welch, Tittle, & Grasmick, 2006). Though religiosity can take on many forms and there is no universal agreement in the field as to how to measure religiosity (Chitwood, et al., 2008), the above conceptualization allowed for valid measurement beyond the simple self-description of being religious or not, and allowed the researcher to establish differences between religious and non-religious individuals, as well as variations among individuals within those two groups.

In order to measure the devotional element of religiosity, two questionnaire items were used that have proven to be valid by previous researchers. Using five responses ranging from (1) never, (2) a few times a year, (3) once or twice a month, (4) once a week, and (5) several times a week, survey participants were asked, "If ever, how often did you attend religious services during the past year?" (Jang & Johnson, 2001). The responses were coded to reflect higher attendance scores as indicative of being more religious. The second question to explore the devotional element of religiosity was operationalized as the practice of prayer (Welch et al., 2006). Respondents were asked,

“If ever, how often do you pray?” Possible responses were (1) never, (2) rarely, (3) sometimes, (4) very often, and (5) daily.

Attendance at religious services and the ritual of prayer, however, are not sufficient on their own to gauge levels of religiosity of an individual. As conceptualized above, religiosity also means the importance of religion in one’s life. To gauge this attribute of religiosity, respondents were asked, “How important is religion in your life?” Participants were provided the following possible responses: (1) not important at all, (2) not very important, (3) somewhat important, (4) important, and (5) very important (Jang & Johnson, 2001). Higher “importance” response scores were coded as higher religiosity.

The importance of religion to the survey participants was also measured by two Likert scale statements that were found to be valid measures by previous researchers: “Religion influences how I live my life” and “I would describe myself as very religious” (Welch et al., 2006, p. 1610). The possible responses to both statements were: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) agree, and (4) strongly agree. Higher numbered scores were deemed as higher levels of religiosity.

Five categories were created that were derived from the above survey items measuring religiosity. An individual received a religiosity score determined by his/her answers to the above religiosity items; the higher the score, the more “religious” the individual. The answers to the five religiosity items received a numbered score and the total of that score placed the respondent into one of five groups: Absence of religiousness (score of 0-2), not religious (score of 3-6), somewhat religious (score of 7-10), religious (score of 11-14), and very religious (score of 15-18). The formula for determining the

total numbered score was the corresponding number of the answer minus one ($X-1=Y$). The corresponding number was the number attached to the questionnaire item (i.e., (1) strongly disagree, received a score of 0, (4) strongly agree received a score of 3).

Originally, it was the intention of the researcher to categorize respondents as “Not Religious” only if that individual’s religiosity score was zero. However, the religiosity tool included items that may be evidence of ritual behavior that is systemic of family pressures. The best example of this is the religious service attendance, whereas an answer of “(2) A few times a year” would give the respondent a religiosity score of 1, pulling them out of the originally developed “not religious” category and potentially evidencing only the individual’s want to please family, not his/her religiosity (Jang & Johnson, 2001). In effort to eliminate this threat to the validity of the instrument, the above categories were created. Categorization affords the researcher the ability to generalize comparison to broader groups of people and the categories were created to ease comparisons between groups of respondents and not just between individual respondents. Since the majority of questions among the items addressing religiosity had five possible response choices, five categories were created.

Dependent Variable

Fear of Crime

For the purpose of this study, fear of crime is the emotive feelings of general danger stemming from crime and behaviors in response to those emotions. Though some researchers have cautioned that fear of crime conceptualizations and operationalizations

may not be accurately describing fear, but rather perceived risk (the latter being a cognitive reaction to crime, the former being emotional [Jennings, et al., 2007]), the current research relied on two measurements that have been well established throughout the literature as validly measuring the emotive feelings of fear that is a result from crime (McGarrell et al., 1997).

The questionnaire items were originally established by the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) and consisted of two items: “How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood at night?” and “How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the day?” (McGarrell et al., 1997). Response choices to these two questions were: (1) very unsafe, (2) unsafe, (3) neither safe nor unsafe, (4) safe, and (5) very safe (McGarrell et al., 1997). Further, the responses of the two questions were collapsed into one statistical measure as was done by McGarrell et al. (1997), which in their research was capable of producing an alpha score of .71, making the fear measurement acceptably valid. The five categories for the collapsed fear of crime measure were: Very fearful, fearful, neither fearful nor un-fearful, un-fearful, and very un-fearful. It is important to note that the fear of crime measure is coded inverse to intuition in that the higher an individual’s measured fear of crime score the less fearful they are.

Control Variables

Age

In the current study, some key variables needed to be controlled as they have frequently been established as affecting an individual's fear of crime. The first and most common is age, which was controlled by the inclusion of a questionnaire item asking for the respondent's date of birth.

Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity has been shown to be inconsistent throughout the research as a variable for predicting fear of crime on its own, (See Scarborough et al. (2010) for a discussion). However, race/ethnicity has been shown to have a potential affect on fear of crime levels when examined with other variables and thus was a control variable. It is important to note, however, that in the current study race/ethnicity was considered a dichotomous variable when coded. Due to the largely racial homogeneity of the target population, respondents were coded as either white or non-white. This categorization for homogeneous populations is in line with previous researchers with similar sample limitations (see Franklin et al., 2008).

Socioeconomic Status

A third control variable was socioeconomic status (SES), which was measured with two questionnaire items: pre-tax household income, and pre-tax family household income (Hudson, 2010). For respondents under the age of 25, they were asked first for

their family's household annual income, and secondly for their household income. For respondents over the age of 25, they were asked to divulge only their own household income. The rationale behind using two questionnaire items to measure socioeconomic status stems from the unique nature of college students. Younger students at universities may not be fully independent and may still be supported by their families. Therefore, their personal income may not accurately describe their total access to resources that can come from financial contributions from outside their own home. To illustrate the point further, if a respondent acknowledged that his/her annual income was less than \$9,000 dollars annually, an appropriate assessment of the individual's SES would be that they were from the lower class category. However, if that same respondent's family paid for rent, bills, food, and gave the respondent a \$1,000 monthly allowance, his/her appropriate category would change significantly. By utilizing two different measures of SES, the researcher avoids potential pitfalls of mis-categorizing all respondents based solely on their individual income, which circumvents a substantial risk to internal validity of the variable.

In all, an individual's SES was needed within the control variables of the current study because previous fear of crime literature has established it as informative in assessing variance in fear of crime levels (Schafer et al., 2006; McGarrell et al., 1997).

Gender

Gender has long been established as a predictor of heightened levels of fear of crime without a definitive reason as to why; therefore, gender is another control variable

used in this study. Since being female has been readily established as impacting fear of crime (Jennings et al., 2007; Schafer et al., 2006; McGarrell et al., 1997; Ferraro, 1996), and since the question posed by this research is whether religiosity is correlated with fear of crime, by controlling for gender, the researcher was able to compare the mean score of personal religiosity to fear of crime over the entire sample population (both males and females).

Education

An individual's level of education has been shown to produce a modest, yet statistically significant impact on levels of fear of crime (Scarborough et al., 2010) and thus was controlled for. To monitor a respondent's education level, the following question was asked: "What is your highest achieved degree?" Covering the spectrum of available education levels among this target population was somewhat problematic and will be discussed further in a later section.

Perceived Risk

As previously noted, some researchers have questioned whether measurements of fear of crime are unintentionally measuring an individual's perceived risk of criminal victimization. Also, Jennings et al. (2007) found that perceived risk was especially salient among college students in affecting fear of crime levels. In an effort to circumvent contamination to the validity of the fear of crime measurement in the present study, individual perceived risk was controlled for by including eight questionnaire items

established by Jennings and colleagues (2007) in their survey of university students.

Since the items were originally designed to solely measure perceived risk of victimization among college students and the Cronbach's alpha value for perceived risk instrument was .83, one can conclude that the various measures of perceived risk are reliable.

The eight items included scale responses asking respondents to estimate the likelihood of victimization for the following crimes ranging from (1) being the least likely and (10) being the most likely for: "Being approached by a beggar or panhandler"; "Being sexually assaulted"; "Being assaulted by someone with a weapon"; "Being mugged"; "Having someone break into your place of residence while you are there"; "Having someone break into your place of residence while you are *not* there"; "Having your car stolen"; and, "Having your property stolen" (Jennings et al., 2007, p. 199).

RESULTS

Demographics of the Sample Population

The number of survey participants totaled two hundred and thirty-eight (N=238), representing 11 classes. Of the total participants, 211 respondents participated with the paper and pencil version, while 27 took the online version. Of all professors solicited for participation, only two refused, due mainly to issues of limited in-class time for the summer session. The demographics of the sample population can be found below in Table 1.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Valid</u> <u>%</u>	<u>Cumulative</u> <u>%</u>
<u>Religiosity</u>	1 = Absence of religiousness	57	24.3	24.3
	2 = Not religious	36	15.3	39.6
	3 = Somewhat religious	55	23.4	63.0
	4 = Religious	40	17.0	80.0
	5 = Very religious	46	19.6	100.0
	99 = Missing	4		
<u>Fear of Crime Collapsed</u>	1 = Very Fearful	1	0.4	0.4
	2 = Fearful	3	1.3	1.7
	3 = Neither fearful or unfearful	25	10.5	12.2
	4 = Unfearful	83	34.9	47.1
	5 = Very unfearful	126	52.9	100.0
<u>Gender</u>	0 = Female	145	60.9	60.9
	1 = Male	93	39.1	100.0
<u>Age</u>	1 = 18 and 19	20	8.6	8.6
	2 = 20 to 24	72	31.0	39.7
	3 = 25 to 29	50	21.6	61.2
	4 = 30 to 39	59	25.4	86.6
	5 = 40 and older	31	13.4	100.0
	99 = Missing	6		
<u>Race</u>	0 = White	188	79.0	79.0
	1 = Non-White	50	21.0	100.0

Table 1.0 continues

Table 1 (continued)

<u>Education</u>	1 = GED	16	6.7	6.7
	2 = High School Diploma	113	47.5	54.2
	3 = Associates Degree	55	23.1	77.3
	4 = Bachelors Degree	51	21.4	98.7
	5 = Masters Degree	2	0.8	99.6
	6 = Other	1	0.4	100.0
<u>Household income</u>	1 = Less than \$15,000	53	25.1	25.1
	2 = \$15,001-30,000	50	23.7	48.8
	3 = \$30,001-60,000	67	31.8	80.6
	4 = \$90,001-120,000	16	7.6	88.2
	5 = \$60,001-90,000	14	6.6	94.8
	6 = \$120,001-above	11	5.2	100.0
	99 = Missing	27		

As shown in Table 1, the sample was over representative of women (n = 145) accounting for 60.9% of respondents. Men (n = 93) made up the remaining 39.1%. The age of participants varied from 18 to 60 years old with the majority of participants between 20 and 39 years old. Respondents' age was originally identified in the survey by the question "What is the year you were born?" As previously noted, however, the majority of participants ranged from 20 to 39 years of age; for statistical analysis, the variable identifying age was collapsed into five categories (i.e., 18 and 19, 20 to 24, 25 to 29, 30 to 39, and 40 and older). The variable identifying race also was recoded for ease in analysis as the survey sample was largely racially homogenous, with Whites representing 79.0% of participants. The vast majority of participants (80.6%) reported a household income of \$60,000 or less, and, as was expected, the majority of survey participants had an education level of at least a high school diploma or GED (54.2%); only three participants had an educational degree greater than that of a bachelor's degree. The

religiosity categories gleaned from the five religiosity items showed nearly even distribution. The absence of religiousness category was the largest of the five categories, representing nearly 25% of all respondents. The dependent variable, fear of crime, resulted in little variation, with 87.8% of respondents falling into either the un-fearful or very un-fearful categories.

To investigate if a relationship between fear of crime and religiosity existed, a variety of statistical methods were used, which are described below.

Correlation and Analysis

All independent variables and the dependent variable were entered into a Pearson correlation matrix to identify if any relationships existed between variables and in which direction those relationships were. The results of the Pearson correlation can be found in Appendix B.

All significant relationships found in the Pearson correlation matrix at the $p < .05$ level are discussed below (also, see Appendix B). Age was found to be positively correlated with household income ($r = .194$); not surprisingly, the older the participant was, the larger his/her gross annual income. Age also was found to be positively correlated with education ($r = .289$), indicating that the older a participant was the more educated she/he was. Finally, a positive correlation was found between a respondent's age and one of the components of the fear of crime measure: "How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood at night" ($r = .191$), meaning that the older the respondent was, the less fearful at night he/she was in his/her own neighborhood.

Recall from Table 1 that fear of crime is coded inversely, whereas a lower fear of crime score is indicative of increased levels of fear of crime

It is important to note, however, that age was not found to be correlated with the collapsed fear of crime measure, nor was age correlated with the second component of that measure: “How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the day?” It is possible that the correlation between age and night fear levels is a product of older respondents also having higher incomes; as higher income level was found to be positively correlated with both “How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood at night” ($r = .170$) and the collapsed fear of crime measure ($r = .156$), possibly indicating that older, more affluent respondents live in more established communities, which could alleviate fear of crime.

Though the collapsed fear of crime measure was found to be correlated with higher household income, it was correlated with little else. The collapsed fear of crime measure was found to correlate with all eight of the items included in the risk of personal victimization: panhandler ($r = -.191$), sexual assault ($r = -.330$), weapon assault ($r = -.347$), mugged ($r = -.386$), break-in while there ($r = -.292$), break-in not there ($r = -.287$), car stolen ($r = -.180$), and property stolen ($r = -.270$). Fear of crime was also correlated with gender ($r = .251$); females in the sample were more likely than males to report higher levels of fear. Additionally, fear of crime was found to be positively correlated with only one of the religiosity factors, “I would describe myself as very religious” ($r = .138$).

It is interesting to note that of the five items measuring religiosity, “I would describe myself as very religious” was the only component found to be correlated with any variable(s) other than with its other religiosity components: fear of crime ($r = .138$) and “being sexually assaulted” ($r = -.139$).

Given the lack of variance in the dependant variable and the resulting weakening of the fear of crime measure, and due to the limited variables found to correlate with fear of crime, the author posited that it may be possible that the absence of variance was possibly linked to the emotive nature of the fear of crime measure, and that the current sample may not possess emotive fear of crime, but rather a cognitive fear. In an effort to investigate whether a more cognitive and tangible measure of fear, such as perceived likelihood of victimization, would better access respondents’ fear of crime and whether this measure of fear could be linked to individual religiosity, an additional dependent variable (post hoc) was created by collapsing the perceived victimization questions to create a “likelihood of victimization” measure.

Before collapsing the perceived victimization questions to create this measure, a Cronbach’s alpha was run to determine the reliability of the measure. Like Jennings et al. (2007), the alpha coefficient for this measure was extremely high ($\alpha = .847$), and as such allowed for the eight questions to be collapsed into a single measure. The perceived likelihood of victimization scale was coded into five potential categories: a score of 1-16 = very unlikely at risk, 17-32 = unlikely at risk, 33-48 = somewhat likely at risk, 49-64 = likely at risk, and 65-80 = very likely at risk. The creation of five categories was chosen to mirror the earlier five religiosity categories in an attempt to ease comparisons.

After the creation of the new perceived likelihood of victimization measure, a correlation matrix was created to identify any possible relationships between the study variables. Like the fear of crime variable, however, few significant relationships among variables were found, with the exception of the fear of crime variable and gender (see Appendix C).

The relationship between perceived risk and fear of crime was significant at the $p < .05$ level and was in a negative direction. The relationship between perceived risk and fear of crime was relatively strong ($r = -.386$), and indicated (not surprisingly) that as individual perceived risk for victimization increased, the more fearful of crime they were. The correlation found between gender and perceived risk was also significant at the $p < .05$ level, and, like fear of crime, was in a negative direction. The relationship is rather strong ($r = -.155$) and provided evidence that females were more likely to consider themselves at higher risk for victimization than were males. This is not surprising however, as gender, more specifically being female, represented the only individual variable that was correlated with any of the items included within the perceived victimization scale, namely, “being sexually assaulted” ($r = -.463$), “being mugged” ($r = -.181$), and “having someone break into your place of residence while you are there” ($r = -.139$).

Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) & Analysis

An ordinary least squares regression was utilized to examine how robust any of the found correlations with fear of crime were at predicting higher or lower levels of fear

for a given individual. The variables included in the regression were: gender, perceived risk, “I would describe myself as very religious,” and household income (see Table 2).

Table 2

OLS Regression

<u>Predictors</u>	b	Std. Error	β	Sig.
Perceived risk	-.334	.174	-.374	.000*
I would describe myself as very religious	.070	.042	.102	.099
Household income	.104	.034	.188	.002*
Gender	.342	.097	.218	.001*
Constant	4.582			
Model F	16.894			
R ²	.253			

^a. Dependent Variable: Fear of crime

*. $p < .05$

The model for this regression was significant at the $p < .05$ level, and the corresponding F score was 16.894. Three of the four measures – perceived risk, household income, and gender – were significant within the model. The only independent variable that did not retain its significance was “I would describe myself as very religious.” The model’s R^2 was .253, meaning that the model explained 25.3% of the variance in the dependent variable. The strongest predictor within the model was gender. Within the data, females were coded as the control group (female = 0) and the positive direction of prediction within the model provided evidence that being female strongly

predicted increased levels of fear of crime. Also predictive of heightened levels of fear of crime is perceived risk. The direction of this prediction was negative, which illustrates that as a respondent's level of perceived risk of victimization increased, that heightened level of personal victimization risk can predict the individual's higher level of fear of crime. Finally, household income was found to be an insulating or protective predictor of fear of crime; stated differently, as a respondent's gross household income increased, his/her predicted level of fear of crime decreased.

In brief summary, the results of this research show that of all variables examined, being female was the most robust predictor for heightened levels of fear of crime among the sample, independent of religiosity levels. Furthermore, religiosity was found to have no effect on fear of crime, and was not informative to increases or decreases in perceived victimization.

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The intent of this study was to investigate whether an individual's religiosity could inform his/her level of fear of crime. The immediate answer to this question is no, it cannot. However, a discussion must take place as to why the answer is no, and whether future research may be better able to explore this theoretical relationship.

As shown above, an individual's religiosity was found, with rare and insignificant exception, not to be associated with any of the variables examined. This may have occurred as a product of compiling two different measures of religiosity, those borrowed from Jang and Johnson (2001), and from Welch et al. (2006), to create a single and novel religiosity measure. To further examine this possibility, a Cronbach's alpha was conducted, which allowed for weighing the five religiosity items together for the purpose of accessing the reliability of the measure. Though the initial motivation for conducting the Cronbach's alpha was to discover a faulty measure and to explain the lack of association religiosity had with other variables, the opposite was found to be true. The Cronbach's alpha was robust ($\alpha = .929$) and provided evidence that the novel religiosity measure is a reliable one.

The strength of the religiosity measure and the wide variation found within, however, was not enough to overcome the most significant restriction to any statistical analysis within the current study: the lack of variation in both dependent variables and the weakness of the fear of crime measure. Simply stated, very few respondents felt fearful, and very few felt they were at any significant risk of victimization. Without variation in

the dependent variable, little could be derived, despite the robustness of the religiosity measure.

Though religiosity was found not to be correlated with any of the variables within the current study, one predictive variable was found to be strongly associated with fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization: being female. Being female was the most robust variable contributing to heightened levels of fear in the current research, and echoed the findings of previous researchers (Jennings et al., 2007; Schafer et al., 2006; McGarrell et al., 1997; Ferraro, 1996). Furthermore, females were most fearful of being sexually assaulted, which lends support to the shadow of sexual assault hypothesis referred to by Ferraro, (1996). Recall this hypothesis stated that a female's increased level of fear of crime in general was a product of her increased fear of sexual assault. The results of the current study support this hypothesis, as females were far more likely to be fearful of crime and fearful of sexual assault.

Though femaleness was found to be informative to an individual's level of fear of crime, it was not found to be associated with religiosity as was suggested by previous researchers (Thompson, 1991; Miller & Hoffmann, 1995). Investigating gender's role in the religiosity/fear of crime relationship was an establishing force in the creation of this research. However, since no association between gender and religiosity could be established, examining gender as a variable to understand the interplay between the theoretical relationship between religiosity and fear of crime was rendered ineffective.

Though the current research is limited in its statistical findings, the methodological results are important to discuss for potential future research. Fear of

crime (or rather the lack of fear of crime) was the driving force behind the limitations of the current research. Future researchers should identify more racially, financially, and otherwise diversified populations than university students when studying fear of crime. It is not to say that university populations cannot be used for analysis; however, the current research demonstrates that the limitations of this demographic may possibly be crippling to analysis.

The design of this research has followed a long line of similar research conducted to explore fear of crime and religiosity independently. Reliability and validity were largely ensured by relying on well-established measures, circumventing any issues that may arise from theorizing a new design for a well-established.

Though the design and methods of this research were appropriate for the pursuit of answering the research question, the study is not without its shortcomings. The findings of this research are extremely constrained in their generalizability in so far as a convenience sample of social science university students may not be representative of the aggregate population (university students or otherwise). This may be especially true of aggregate education levels because the education levels of the current sample population can only be superficially controlled for. As a requirement of admittance to the university, all university students had at minimum a General Equivalency Degree (GED). This characteristic of the target population does not provide insight into the variance of fear of crime levels that has been found among individuals along the broad spectrum of education levels. Though the current research attempts to control for different levels of education among the sample population, it fails to include those from lower (or higher)

levels of educational achievement, which the largest variations in fear of crime levels are suspected to be found. Future researchers would be well instructed to control for this variable in a larger, more representative population, as it has been shown to impact levels of fear of crime (Scarborough et al., 2010).

Potential issues also arise from the sampling technique being used. Convenience sampling is a non-probability sampling technique and as such aggregate population comparisons cannot be made. Though this is a substantial limitation, there is room to contend that, due to the nature of this research, convenience sampling is appropriate. Furthermore, convenience sampling allows the researcher to circumvent the limitations in time, resources, and feasibility of other sampling methods. Still, it is important to note that to aggregate findings to the larger university population, a probability sampling technique would have been necessary.

The brevity of the survey may draw concerns as to its validity, and those concerns are addressed here. The questionnaire was bound in its length with respect to the environment in which individuals were questioned: the classroom. Since surveying commenced during regularly scheduled class periods, including those to be administered online, approval from professors was intrinsically tied to the length of the interruption: the shorter, the quicker, the better. Though little resistance was observed by university professors, the fact remains that a brief survey was far more likely an acceptable interruption than a time consuming one. Further, the short length of the survey encouraged thoughtful answers by respondents and limited the threat of hasty responses

and/or non-participation. As such, the brevity of the survey likely increased the validity of respondent's answers.

Though there are great benefits to a shortened survey, minimizing its length also posed the risk of not being as exhaustive as it could have been, which raises the concern of the overall validity of the findings. Perceived risk was controlled for in the current research because it was found to especially impact college students' fear of crime. However, many other theories and variables that have been shown to impact fear levels were not included in the current research as a result of considerations of survey length. Future researchers would be well advised to add additions to the current instrument to more thoroughly explore relationships, and control for these other known variables.

Though the sample population showed little variation in fear of crime, the measure borrowed from McGarrell et al. (1997) accurately captures the emotive feeling of fear as was originally reported in their study. However, the collapsed measurement of fear of crime for this sample did not have nearly the same alpha level as that reported by McGarrell, et al., (1997). The Cronbach's alpha level for fear of crime in the present study was $\alpha = .549$. Though this is a reasonable level of reliability for the measure, it is nowhere near as strong as the $\alpha = .71$ reported by McGarrell, et al., (1997). In further investigation as to why the alpha level for this variable was at such a departure from the levels reported by McGarrell, et al., (1997) the author came to two conclusions. First, the level of variance in the dependant variable within the current sample was almost non-existent, with only 29 cases reporting being less than un-fearful. Secondly, the size of the current sample population is miniscule compared to the 998 in the study in which the

scale was borrowed. When compounded, these issues make any analysis of fear of crime in the present study difficult at best.

The current research also validated another measure as being reliable and created another. The perceived risk of victimization measure created by Jennings et al. (2007) was strong in their study and retained its strength in the current study. Both Jennings et al. (2007) and the current research used the risk of victimization scale with university survey populations and it is possible that the eight item measure is only reliable in this given demographic. However, if future researchers attempting to access the perceived risk of victimization are using university students as test populations, they need not go any further than the measure created by Jennings et al. (2007).

The unique and novel measure used in the current study to measure an individual's religiosity was extremely strong. Though the items used in constructing this measure were few in number, the five items seemed to have reached face validity for the construct of religiosity: devotional behavior and individual importance of religion in one's life (Welch et al., 2006). Future researchers investigating religiosity should consider using this valid and reliable measure.

Even in light of the methodological issues presented above and the resulting limitations of this research, the initial motivation underlying this research remains important and must be reiterated. Fear of crime has carved a niche deep within criminological research, and as a social phenomenon has been studied extensively. However, even in its celebrity as a topic, fear of crime researchers are unable to come to a concise and universal agreement as to what causes increases and reductions in fear

levels. This research sought to add a dimension to this debate that had to date been overlooked. By increasing the amount of valid elements and variables used to assess fear of crime, a far more enriched understanding can be developed.

The theoretical connection between fear of crime and religiosity was not found to be supported in the current research. However, the theoretical foundations for that relationship still exist, and may simply not have been appropriately accessed in the current study. For example, if a person's religiosity can alter the way an individual responds to stress and strain as Jang and Johnson (2005) suggest, it can be argued that it should also have some influence on the strain a person feels in response to his/her fear of crime.

Future researchers who are better positioned to overcome the limitations of the current study should incorporate religiosity measures to accomplish two goals: first, establish whether a connection between religiosity and fear of crime does exist, and, secondly, if a relationship does exist, determine how it informs the fear of crime debate. Further research is certainly warranted.

REFERENCES

- Baier, C.J., & Wright, B.R.E. (2001). "If you love me, keep my commandments: A meta-analysis of the effect of religion on crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 38(1), 3-21.
- Chitwood, D. D., Weiss, M. L., & Leukefeld, C. G. (2008). A systematic review of recent literature on religiosity and substance abuse. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 38(3), 653-688.
- Dolan, P., & Peasgood, T. (2007). Estimating the economic and social costs of the fear of crime. *British Journal of Criminology*, 47, 121-132.
- Farrall, S., Bannister, J., Ditton, J., & Gilchrist, E. (1997). Questioning the measurement of the fear of crime: Findings from a major methodological study. *British Journal of Criminology*, 37(4), 658-679.
- Ferraro, K. (1996). Women's fear of victimization: Shadow of sexual assault? *Social Forces*, 75(2), 667-690.
- Franklin, T., Franklin, C.A., & Fearn, N.E. (2008). A multilevel analysis of the vulnerability, disorder, and social integration models of fear of crime. *Social Justice Research*, 21, 204-227.
- Heaton, P. (2006). Does religion really reduce crime? *Journal of Law and Economics*, 49, 147-172.
- Hirschi, T., & Stark, R. (1969). Hellfire and delinquency. *Social Problems*, 17(2), 202-213.

- Hudson, M. (2010). Crime is not just a man's world: Perceptions of female offenders through a feminist lens" (2010). *Boise State University Theses and Dissertations: Paper 84*. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.boisestate.edu/td/84>
- Jang, S.J., & Johnson, B.R. (2001). Neighborhood disorder, individual religiosity, and adolescent use of illicit drugs: A test of multilevel hypotheses. *Criminology*, 39(1), 109-143.
- Jang, S. J., & Johnson, B. R. (2005). Gender, religiosity, and reactions to strain by African Americans. *Sociological Quarterly*, 46, 323-357.
- Jennings, W.G., Gover, A.R., & Pudrzynska, D. (2007). Are institutions of higher learning safe? A descriptive study of campus safety issues and self-reported campus victimization among male and female college students. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 18(2), 191-208.
- Johnson, B. R., Jang, S. J., Larson, D. B., & De Li, S. (2001). Does adolescent religious commitment matter? A reexamination of the effects of religiosity on delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 38, 22-44.
- Johnson, M. C., & Morris, R. G. (2008). The moderating effects of religiosity on the Relationship between stressful life events and delinquent behavior. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36, 486-493.
- McGarrell, E.F., Giacomazzi, A.L., & Thurman, Q.C. (1997). Neighborhood disorder, integration, and fear of crime. *Justice Quarterly*, 14(3), 479-499.

- Miller, A.S., & Hoffmann, J.P. (1995). Risk and religion: An explanation of gender differences in religiosity. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 34(1), 63-75.
- Moore, S., & Shepherd, J. (2007). The elements and prevalence of fear. *British Journal of Criminology*, 47, 154-162.
- Office of Communications and Marketing, Boise State University (2010). Web facts. Retrieved from <http://news.boisestate.edu/files/2009/10/facts-and-figures09-10.pdf>
- Scarborough, B.K., Like-Haislip, T. Z., Novak , K. J., Lucas , W. L., & Alarid, L. F. (2010). Assessing the relationship between individual characteristics, neighborhood context, and fear of crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 819-826.
- Schafer, J.A., Huebner, B.M., & Bynum, T.S. (2006). Fear of crime and criminal victimization: Gender-based contrasts. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34, 285-301.
- Sutton, R.M., & Farrall, S. (2005). Gender, socially desirable responding, and fear of crime. *British Journal of Criminology*, 45, 212-224
- Thompson, Edward H. (1991). Beneath the status characteristic: Gender variations in religiousness. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 30(4):381–94.
- Weitzer, R., & Kubrin, C. E. (2004). Breaking news: How local TV news and real-world conditions affect fear of crime. *Justice Quarterly*, 21(3), 497-520.
- Welch, M.R., Tittle, C.R., & Grasmick, H.G. (2006). Christian religiosity, self-control and social conformity, *Social Forces*, 84(3), 1605-1623.

APPENDIX A
Survey Instrument

1) What is the year you were born? _____

2) Please Indicate your Race/Ethnicity.

- a. White
- b. Hispanic
- c. African American
- d. Asian American
- e. Native American
- f. Other

3) Please indicate your self-identified gender.

- a. Male
- b. Female

(IF YOU ARE UNDER 25, SKIP TO QUESTION 4; IF YOU ARE OVER 25, SKIP TO QUESTION 5)

4) Estimate which of the following categories your annual pre-tax family household income falls into?

- a. Less than \$15,000
- b. \$15,001-30,000
- c. \$30,001-60,000
- d. \$60,001-90,000
- e. \$90,001-120,000
- f. \$120,001-above

5) Estimate which of the following categories your annual pre-tax household income falls into?

- a. Less than \$15,000
- b. \$15,001-30,000
- c. \$30,001-60,000
- d. \$60,001-90,000
- e. \$90,001-120,000
- f. \$120,001-above

6) Please indicate the highest degree you have obtained.

- a. GED
- b. High school diploma
- c. Associates Degree
- d. Bachelors Degree
- e. Masters Degree
- f. Other, please specify

- 7) If ever, how often did you attend religious services during the past year?
- 1) Never
 - 2) A few times a year
 - 3) Once or twice a month
 - 4) Once a week
 - 5) Several times a week
- 8) How important is religion in your life?
- 1) Not important at all
 - 2) Not very important
 - 3) Somewhat important
 - 4) Important
 - 5) Very important
- 9) How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the day?
- 1) Very unsafe
 - 2) Unsafe
 - 3) Neither safe or unsafe
 - 4) Safe
 - 5) Very safe
- 10) On a scale from 1 to 10 (1 being least likely and 10 being most likely), please indicate your potential for being a victim of the following crimes:
- a) Being approached by a beggar or panhandler ____
 - b) Being sexually assaulted ____
 - c) Being assaulted by someone with a weapon ____
 - d) Being mugged ____
 - e) Having someone break into your place of residence while you are there
 - f) Having someone break into your place of residence while you are not there ____
 - g) Having your car stolen ____
 - h) Having your property stolen ____
- 11) If ever, how often do you pray?
- 1) Never
 - 2) Rarely
 - 3) Sometimes
 - 4) Very often
 - 5) Daily

12) Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statement: Religion influences how I live my life.

- 1) Strongly disagree
- 2) Disagree
- 3) Agree
- 4) Strongly agree

13) Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statement: I would describe myself as very religious.

- 1) Strongly disagree
- 2) Disagree
- 3) Agree
- 4) Strongly agree

14) How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the night?

- 1) Very unsafe
- 2) Unsafe
- 3) Neither safe nor unsafe
- 4) Safe
- 5) Very safe

APPENDIX B
Pearson Correlation Matrix

Pearson Correlation Matrix

		Household Income	Education	How often did you attend religious services during the past year?	How important is religion in your life?	How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the day?	Being approached by a panhandler	Being sexually assaulted
Household Income	Pearson	1	.256**	-.068	-.012	.108	.074	-.039
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.323	.867	.119	.282	.576
	N	211	211	211	211	211	211	211
Education	Pearson	.256**	1	.049	.084	.008	.063	.016
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.453	.194	.901	.336	.808
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238
How often did you attend religious services during the past year?	Pearson	-.068	.049	1	.705**	-.025	.014	-.108
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.323	.453		.000	.706	.824	.097
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238
How important is religion in your life?	Pearson	-.012	.084	.705**	1	.034	.000	-.086
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.867	.194	.000		.606	.999	.185
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238
How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the day?	Pearson	.108	.008	-.025	.034	1	-.150*	-.190**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.119	.901	.706	.606		.020	.003
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238
Being approached by a panhandler	Pearson	.074	.063	.014	.000	-.150*	1	.254**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.282	.336	.824	.999	.020		.000
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238
Being sexually assaulted	Pearson	-.039	.016	-.108	-.086	-.190**	.254**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.576	.808	.097	.185	.003	.000	
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238

		Household Income	Education	How often did you attend religious services during the past year?	How important is religion in your life?	How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the day?	Being approached by a panhandler	Being sexually assaulted
Being assaulted by someone with a weapon	Pearson	-.035	.017	-.090	-.035	-.288**	.217**	.553**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.616	.797	.169	.593	.000	.001	.000
	N	210	237	237	237	237	237	237
Being mugged	Pearson	-.027	-.010	-.046	-.009	-.306**	.347**	.570**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.698	.876	.476	.885	.000	.000	.000
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238
Having someone break into your place of residence while you are there	Pearson	.069	.109	-.047	.017	-.251**	.205**	.393**
	Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)	.322	.095	.475	.798	.000	.002	.000
	N	210	237	237	237	237	237	237
Having someone break into your place of residence while you are not there	Pearson	.038	.012	-.031	-.002	-.232**	.249**	.317**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.587	.849	.634	.979	.000	.000	.000
	N	209	236	236	236	236	236	236
Having your car stolen	Pearson	.095	.028	.010	.027	-.154*	.285**	.319**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.169	.665	.882	.684	.017	.000	.000
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238
Having your property stolen	Pearson	.092	.066	-.025	-.014	-.206**	.349**	.302**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.183	.311	.701	.835	.001	.000	.000
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238
How often do you pray?	Pearson	.052	.088	.656**	.811**	.011	.008	-.061
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.455	.174	.000	.000	.867	.900	.351
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238
Religion influences how I live my life	Pearson	-.012	.118	.630**	.816**	.064	-.011	-.080
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.866	.069	.000	.000	.322	.867	.218
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238

		Household Income	Education	How often did you attend religious services during the past year?	How important is religion in your life?	How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the day?	Being approached by a pandhandler	Being sexually assaulted
I would describe myself as very religious	Pearson	-.062	.096	.672**	.826**	.106	-.003	-.139*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.375	.142	.000	.000	.106	.966	.033
	N	209	235	235	235	235	235	235
How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the night?	Pearson	.170*	.047	-.004	.028	.380**	-.130*	-.359**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.013	.471	.949	.665	.000	.045	.000
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238
Religiosity	Pearson	-.052	.094	.705**	.800**	.036	-.021	-.086
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.453	.149	.000	.000	.579	.753	.186
	N	209	235	235	235	235	235	235
Fear of crime collapsed	Pearson	.156*	.039	.000	.059	.826**	-.191**	-.330**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.023	.551	.995	.367	.000	.003	.000
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238
Race Recode	Pearson	-.123	-.139*	.140*	.126	-.132*	-.066	-.104
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.076	.033	.030	.053	.042	.308	.109
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238
Age	Pearson	.194**	.289**	-.029	.033	.028	.006	-.054
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.000	.662	.621	.673	.931	.411
	N	205	232	232	232	232	232	232
Gender recode	Pearson	-.020	-.018	.032	-.025	.121	-.020	-.463**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.778	.780	.628	.696	.063	.758	.000
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238

		Being assaulted by someone with a weapon	Being mugged	Having someone break into your place of residence while you are there	Having someone break into your place of residence while you are not there	Having your car stolen	Having your property stolen	How often do you pray?
Household Income	Pearson	-.035	-.027	.069	.038	.095	.092	.052
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.616	.698	.322	.587	.169	.183	.455
	N	210	211	210	209	211	211	211
Education	Pearson	.017	-.010	.109	.012	.028	.066	.088
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.797	.876	.095	.849	.665	.311	.174
	N	237	238	237	236	238	238	238
How often did you attend religious services during the past year?	Pearson	-.090	-.046	-.047	-.031	.010	-.025	.656**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.169	.476	.475	.634	.882	.701	.000
	N	237	238	237	236	238	238	238
How important is religion in your life?	Pearson	-.035	-.009	.017	-.002	.027	-.014	.811**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.593	.885	.798	.979	.684	.835	.000
	N	237	238	237	236	238	238	238
How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the day?	Pearson	-.288**	-.306**	-.251**	-.232**	-.154*	-.206**	.011
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.017	.001	.867
	N	237	238	237	236	238	238	238
Being approached by a pandhandler	Pearson	.217**	.347**	.205**	.249**	.285**	.349**	.008
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.002	.000	.000	.000	.900
	N	237	238	237	236	238	238	238
Being sexually assaulted	Pearson	.553**	.570**	.393**	.317**	.319**	.302**	-.061
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.351
	N	237	238	237	236	238	238	238
Being assaulted by someone with a weapon	Pearson	1	.790**	.589**	.498**	.426**	.409**	-.011
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.862
	N	237	237	236	235	237	237	237

		Being assaulted by someone with a weapon	Being mugged	Having someone break into your place of residence while you are there	Having someone break into your place of residence while you are not there	Having your car stolen	Having your property stolen	How often do you pray?
Being mugged	Pearson	.790**	1	.520**	.426**	.449**	.368**	.009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.886
	N	237	238	237	236	238	238	238
Having someone break into your place of residence while you are there	Pearson	.589**	.520**	1	.712**	.517**	.464**	.031
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.635
	N	236	237	237	235	237	237	237
Having someone break into your place of residence while you are not there	Pearson	.498**	.426**	.712**	1	.561**	.589**	-.009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.890
	N	235	236	235	236	236	236	236
Having your car stolen	Pearson	.426**	.449**	.517**	.561**	1	.627**	-.054
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.404
	N	237	238	237	236	238	238	238
Having your property stolen	Pearson	.409**	.368**	.464**	.589**	.627**	1	.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.997
	N	237	238	237	236	238	238	238
How often do you pray?	Pearson	-.011	.009	.031	-.009	-.054	.000	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.862	.886	.635	.890	.404	.997	
	N	237	238	237	236	238	238	238
Religion influences how I live my life	Pearson	-.012	-.026	-.009	-.051	-.031	-.019	.787**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.849	.692	.887	.433	.633	.775	.000
	N	237	238	237	236	238	238	238
I would describe myself as very religious	Pearson	-.071	-.052	-.035	-.070	-.084	-.080	.706**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.280	.427	.595	.285	.199	.219	.000
	N	234	235	234	233	235	235	235

		Being assaulted by someone with a weapon	Being mugged	Having someone break into your place of residence while you are there	Having someone break into your place of residence while you are not there	Having your car stolen	Having your property stolen	How often do you pray?
How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the night?	Pearson	-.295**	-.340**	-.231**	-.235**	-.193**	-.245**	-.014
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.003	.000	.826
	N	237	238	237	236	238	238	238
Religiosity	Pearson	-.040	-.003	-.021	-.073	-.055	-.066	.759**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.543	.962	.753	.265	.400	.310	.000
	N	234	235	234	233	235	235	235
Fear of crime collapsed	Pearson	-.347**	-.386**	-.292**	-.287**	-.180**	-.270**	.011
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.005	.000	.869
	N	237	238	237	236	238	238	238
RaceRecode	Pearson	-.032	-.010	-.005	-.048	.024	-.050	.098
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.626	.876	.934	.464	.718	.439	.131
	N	237	238	237	236	238	238	238
Age	Pearson	-.071	-.101	.007	.061	-.026	-.002	.064
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.281	.125	.915	.360	.698	.973	.334
	N	231	232	231	230	232	232	232
Genderrecode	Pearson	-.097	-.181**	-.139*	-.043	-.045	.010	-.052
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.138	.005	.032	.507	.492	.880	.422
	N	237	238	237	236	238	238	238

		Religion influences how I live my life	I would describe myself as very religious	How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the night?	Religiosity	Fear of crime collapsed	RaceRecode	Age	Genderrecode
Household Income	Pearson	-.012	-.062	.170*	-.052	.156*	-.123	.194**	-.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.866	.375	.013	.453	.023	.076	.005	.778
	N	211	209	211	209	211	211	205	211
Education	Pearson	.118	.096	.047	.094	.039	-.139*	.289**	-.018
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.069	.142	.471	.149	.551	.033	.000	.780
	N	238	235	238	235	238	238	232	238
How often did you attend religious services during the past year?	Pearson	.630**	.672**	-.004	.705**	.000	.140*	-.029	.032
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.949	.000	.995	.030	.662	.628
	N	238	235	238	235	238	238	232	238
How important is religion in your life?	Pearson	.816**	.826**	.028	.800**	.059	.126	.033	-.025
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.665	.000	.367	.053	.621	.696
	N	238	235	238	235	238	238	232	238
How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the day?	Pearson	.064	.106	.380**	.036	.826**	-.132*	.028	.121
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.322	.106	.000	.579	.000	.042	.673	.063
	N	238	235	238	235	238	238	232	238
Being approached by a pandhandler	Pearson	-.011	-.003	-.130*	-.021	-.191**	-.066	.006	-.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.867	.966	.045	.753	.003	.308	.931	.758
	N	238	235	238	235	238	238	232	238
Being sexually assaulted	Pearson	-.080	-.139*	-.359**	-.086	-.330**	-.104	-.054	-.463**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.218	.033	.000	.186	.000	.109	.411	.000
	N	238	235	238	235	238	238	232	238
Being assaulted by someone with a weapon	Pearson	-.012	-.071	-.295**	-.040	-.347**	-.032	-.071	-.097
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.849	.280	.000	.543	.000	.626	.281	.138
	N	237	234	237	234	237	237	231	237

		Religion influences how I live my life	I would describe myself as very religious	How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the night?	Religiosity	Fear of crime collapsed	RaceRecode	Age	Genderrecode
Being mugged	Pearson	-.026	-.052	-.340**	-.003	-.386**	-.010	-.101	-.181**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.692	.427	.000	.962	.000	.876	.125	.005
	N	238	235	238	235	238	238	232	238
Having someone break into your place of residence while you are there	Pearson	-.009	-.035	-.231**	-.021	-.292**	-.005	.007	-.139*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.887	.595	.000	.753	.000	.934	.915	.032
	N	237	234	237	234	237	237	231	237
Having someone break into your place of residence while you are not there	Pearson	-.051	-.070	-.235**	-.073	-.287**	-.048	.061	-.043
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.433	.285	.000	.265	.000	.464	.360	.507
	N	236	233	236	233	236	236	230	236
Having your car stolen	Pearson	-.031	-.084	-.193**	-.055	-.180**	.024	-.026	-.045
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.633	.199	.003	.400	.005	.718	.698	.492
	N	238	235	238	235	238	238	232	238
Having your property stolen	Pearson	-.019	-.080	-.245**	-.066	-.270**	-.050	-.002	.010
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.775	.219	.000	.310	.000	.439	.973	.880
	N	238	235	238	235	238	238	232	238
How often do you pray?	Pearson	.787**	.706**	-.014	.759**	.011	.098	.064	-.052
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.826	.000	.869	.131	.334	.422
	N	238	235	238	235	238	238	232	238

		Religion influences how I live my life	I would describe myself as very religious	How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the night?	Religiosity	Fear of crime collapsed	RaceRecode	Age	Genderrecode
Religion influences how I live my life	Pearson	1	.760**	.017	.755**	.073	.111	-.015	-.027
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.798	.000	.262	.087	.816	.678
	N	238	235	238	235	238	238	232	238
I would describe myself as very religious	Pearson	.760**	1	.100	.815**	.138*	.119	.065	.059
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.125	.000	.035	.068	.326	.371
	N	235	235	235	235	235	235	229	235
How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the night?	Pearson	.017	.100	1	.054	.762**	-.076	.191**	.357**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.798	.125		.414	.000	.244	.003	.000
	N	238	235	238	235	238	238	232	238
Religiosity	Pearson	.755**	.815**	.054	1	.065	.108	.066	-.030
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.414		.318	.100	.324	.643
	N	235	235	235	235	235	235	229	235
Fear of crime collapsed	Pearson	.073	.138*	.762**	.065	1	-.086	.107	.251**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.262	.035	.000	.318		.185	.104	.000
	N	238	235	238	235	238	238	232	238
RaceRecode	Pearson	.111	.119	-.076	.108	-.086	1	-.175**	-.033
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.087	.068	.244	.100	.185		.008	.618
	N	238	235	238	235	238	238	232	238

		Religion influences how I live my life	I would describe myself as very religious	How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the night?	Religiosity	Fear of crime collapsed	RaceRecode	Age	Genderrecode
Age	Pearson	-.015	.065	.191**	.066	.107	-.175**	1	-.003
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.816	.326	.003	.324	.104	.008		.960
	N	232	229	232	229	232	232	232	232
Genderrecode	Pearson Correlation	-.027	.059	.357**	-.030	.251**	-.033	-.003	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.678	.371	.000	.643	.000	.618	.960	
	N	238	235	238	235	238	238	232	238

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

APPENDIX C

Pearson Correlation Matrix: 2

Pearson Correlation Matrix 2

		Household Income	Education	How often did you attend religious services during the past year?	How important is religion in your life?	How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the day?	Being approached by a pandhandler	Being sexually assaulted	Being assaulted by someone with a weapon
Household Income	Pearson	1	.256**	-.068	-.012	.108	.074	-.039	-.035
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.323	.867	.119	.282	.576	.616
	N	211	211	211	211	211	211	211	210
Education	Pearson	.256**	1	.049	.084	.008	.063	.016	.017
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.453	.194	.901	.336	.808	.797
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238	237
How often did you attend religious services during the past year?	Pearson	-.068	.049	1	.705**	-.025	.014	-.108	-.090
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.323	.453		.000	.706	.824	.097	.169
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238	237
How important is religion in your life?	Pearson	-.012	.084	.705**	1	.034	.000	-.086	-.035
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.867	.194	.000		.606	.999	.185	.593
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238	237
How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the day?	Pearson	.108	.008	-.025	.034	1	-.150*	-.190**	-.288**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.119	.901	.706	.606		.020	.003	.000
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238	237
Being approached by a pandhandler	Pearson	.074	.063	.014	.000	-.150*	1	.254**	.217**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.282	.336	.824	.999	.020		.000	.001
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238	237
Being sexually assaulted	Pearson	-.039	.016	-.108	-.086	-.190**	.254**	1	.553**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.576	.808	.097	.185	.003	.000		.000
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238	237

		Household Income	Education	How often did you attend religious services during the past year?	How important is religion in your life?	How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the day?	Being approached by a pandhandler	Being sexually assaulted	Being assaulted by someone with a weapon
Being assaulted by someone with a weapon	Pearson	-.035	.017	-.090	-.035	-.288**	.217**	.553**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.616	.797	.169	.593	.000	.001	.000	
	N	210	237	237	237	237	237	237	237
Being mugged	Pearson	-.027	-.010	-.046	-.009	-.306**	.347**	.570**	.790**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.698	.876	.476	.885	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238	237
Having someone break into your place of residence while you are there	Pearson	.069	.109	-.047	.017	-.251**	.205**	.393**	.589**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.322	.095	.475	.798	.000	.002	.000	.000
	N	210	237	237	237	237	237	237	236
Having someone break into your place of residence while you are not there	Pearson	.038	.012	-.031	-.002	-.232**	.249**	.317**	.498**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.587	.849	.634	.979	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	209	236	236	236	236	236	236	235
Having your car stolen	Pearson	.095	.028	.010	.027	-.154*	.285**	.319**	.426**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.169	.665	.882	.684	.017	.000	.000	.000
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238	237
Having your property stolen	Pearson	.092	.066	-.025	-.014	-.206**	.349**	.302**	.409**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.183	.311	.701	.835	.001	.000	.000	.000
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238	237
How often do you pray?	Pearson	.052	.088	.656**	.811**	.011	.008	-.061	-.011
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.455	.174	.000	.000	.867	.900	.351	.862
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238	237
Religion influences how I live my life	Pearson	-.012	.118	.630**	.816**	.064	-.011	-.080	-.012
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.866	.069	.000	.000	.322	.867	.218	.849
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238	237

		Household Income	Education	How often did you attend religious services during the past year?	How important is religion in your life?	How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the day?	Being approached by a pandhandler	Being sexually assaulted	Being assaulted by someone with a weapon
I would describe myself as very religious	Pearson	-.062	.096	.672**	.826**	.106	-.003	-.139*	-.071
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.375	.142	.000	.000	.106	.966	.033	.280
	N	209	235	235	235	235	235	235	234
How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the night?	Pearson	.170*	.047	-.004	.028	.380**	-.130*	-.359**	-.295**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.013	.471	.949	.665	.000	.045	.000	.000
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238	237
Religiosity	Pearson	-.052	.094	.705**	.800**	.036	-.021	-.086	-.040
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.453	.149	.000	.000	.579	.753	.186	.543
	N	209	235	235	235	235	235	235	234
Fear of crime collapsed	Pearson	.156*	.039	.000	.059	.826**	-.191**	-.330**	-.347**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.023	.551	.995	.367	.000	.003	.000	.000
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238	237
RaceRecode	Pearson	-.123	-.139*	.140*	.126	-.132*	-.066	-.104	-.032
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.076	.033	.030	.053	.042	.308	.109	.626
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238	237
Age	Pearson	.194**	.289**	-.029	.033	.028	.006	-.054	-.071
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.000	.662	.621	.673	.931	.411	.281
	N	205	232	232	232	232	232	232	231
Genderrecode	Pearson	-.020	-.018	.032	-.025	.121	-.020	-.463**	-.097
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.778	.780	.628	.696	.063	.758	.000	.138
	N	211	238	238	238	238	238	238	237
Perceived Risk	Pearson	.057	.034	-.055	-.015	-.293**	.558**	.617**	.689**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.416	.601	.402	.823	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	207	234	234	234	234	234	234	234

		Being mugged	Having someone break into your place of residence while you are there	Having someone break into your place of residence while you are not there	Having your car stolen	Having your property stolen	How often do you pray?	Religion influences how I live my life	I would describe myself as very religious
Household Income	Pearson	-.027	.069	.038	.095	.092	.052	-.012	-.062
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.698	.322	.587	.169	.183	.455	.866	.375
	N	211	210	209	211	211	211	211	209
Education	Pearson	-.010	.109	.012	.028	.066	.088	.118	.096
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.876	.095	.849	.665	.311	.174	.069	.142
	N	238	237	236	238	238	238	238	235
How often did you attend religious services during the past year?	Pearson	-.046	-.047	-.031	.010	-.025	.656**	.630**	.672**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.476	.475	.634	.882	.701	.000	.000	.000
	N	238	237	236	238	238	238	238	235
How important is religion in your life?	Pearson	-.009	.017	-.002	.027	-.014	.811**	.816**	.826**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.885	.798	.979	.684	.835	.000	.000	.000
	N	238	237	236	238	238	238	238	235
How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the day?	Pearson	-.306**	-.251**	-.232**	-.154*	-.206**	.011	.064	.106
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.017	.001	.867	.322	.106
	N	238	237	236	238	238	238	238	235
Being approached by a pandhandler	Pearson	.347**	.205**	.249**	.285**	.349**	.008	-.011	-.003
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.002	.000	.000	.000	.900	.867	.966
	N	238	237	236	238	238	238	238	235
Being sexually assaulted	Pearson	.570**	.393**	.317**	.319**	.302**	-.061	-.080	-.139*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.351	.218	.033
	N	238	237	236	238	238	238	238	235

		Being mugged	Having someone break into your place of residence while you are there	Having someone break into your place of residence while you are not there	Having your car stolen	Having your property stolen	How often do you pray?	Religion influences how I live my life	I would describe myself as very religious
Being assaulted by someone with a weapon	Pearson	.790**	.589**	.498**	.426**	.409**	-.011	-.012	-.071
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.862	.849	.280
	N	237	236	235	237	237	237	237	234
Being mugged	Pearson	1	.520**	.426**	.449**	.368**	.009	-.026	-.052
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.886	.692	.427
	N	238	237	236	238	238	238	238	235
Having someone break into your place of residence while you are there	Pearson	.520**	1	.712**	.517**	.464**	.031	-.009	-.035
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.635	.887	.595
	N	237	237	235	237	237	237	237	234
Having someone break into your place of residence while you are not there	Pearson	.426**	.712**	1	.561**	.589**	-.009	-.051	-.070
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.890	.433	.285
	N	236	235	236	236	236	236	236	233
Having your car stolen	Pearson	.449**	.517**	.561**	1	.627**	-.054	-.031	-.084
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.404	.633	.199
	N	238	237	236	238	238	238	238	235
Having your property stolen	Pearson	.368**	.464**	.589**	.627**	1	.000	-.019	-.080
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.997	.775	.219
	N	238	237	236	238	238	238	238	235
How often do you pray?	Pearson	.009	.031	-.009	-.054	.000	1	.787**	.706**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.886	.635	.890	.404	.997		.000	.000
	N	238	237	236	238	238	238	238	235
Religion influences how I live my life	Pearson	-.026	-.009	-.051	-.031	-.019	.787**	1	.760**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.692	.887	.433	.633	.775	.000		.000
	N	238	237	236	238	238	238	238	235

		Being mugged	Having someone break into your place of residence while you are there	Having someone break into your place of residence while you are not there	Having your car stolen	Having your property stolen	How often do you pray?	Religion influences how I live my life	I would describe myself as very religious
I would describe myself as very religious	Pearson	-.052	-.035	-.070	-.084	-.080	.706**	.760**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.427	.595	.285	.199	.219	.000	.000	
	N	235	234	233	235	235	235	235	235
How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the night?	Pearson	-.340**	-.231**	-.235**	-.193**	-.245**	-.014	.017	.100
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.003	.000	.826	.798	.125
	N	238	237	236	238	238	238	238	235
Religiosity	Pearson	-.003	-.021	-.073	-.055	-.066	.759**	.755**	.815**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.962	.753	.265	.400	.310	.000	.000	.000
	N	235	234	233	235	235	235	235	235
Fear of crime collapsed	Pearson	-.386**	-.292**	-.287**	-.180**	-.270**	.011	.073	.138*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.005	.000	.869	.262	.035
	N	238	237	236	238	238	238	238	235
RaceRecode	Pearson	-.010	-.005	-.048	.024	-.050	.098	.111	.119
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.876	.934	.464	.718	.439	.131	.087	.068
	N	238	237	236	238	238	238	238	235
Age	Pearson	-.101	.007	.061	-.026	-.002	.064	-.015	.065
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.125	.915	.360	.698	.973	.334	.816	.326
	N	232	231	230	232	232	232	232	229
Genderrecode	Pearson	-.181**	-.139*	-.043	-.045	.010	-.052	-.027	.059
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.032	.507	.492	.880	.422	.678	.371
	N	238	237	236	238	238	238	238	235
Perceived Risk	Pearson	.721**	.701**	.703**	.682**	.714**	-.006	-.028	-.105
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.927	.671	.112
	N	234	234	234	234	234	234	234	231

		How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the night?	Religiosity	Fear of crime collapsed	RaceRecode	Age	Genderrecode	Perceived Risk
Household Income	Pearson	.170*	-.052	.156*	-.123	.194**	-.020	.057
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.013	.453	.023	.076	.005	.778	.416
	N	211	209	211	211	205	211	207
Education	Pearson	.047	.094	.039	-.139*	.289**	-.018	.034
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.471	.149	.551	.033	.000	.780	.601
	N	238	235	238	238	232	238	234
How often did you attend religious services during the past year?	Pearson	-.004	.705**	.000	.140*	-.029	.032	-.055
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.949	.000	.995	.030	.662	.628	.402
	N	238	235	238	238	232	238	234
How important is religion in your life?	Pearson	.028	.800**	.059	.126	.033	-.025	-.015
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.665	.000	.367	.053	.621	.696	.823
	N	238	235	238	238	232	238	234
How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the day?	Pearson	.380**	.036	.826**	-.132*	.028	.121	-.293**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.579	.000	.042	.673	.063	.000
	N	238	235	238	238	232	238	234
Being approached by a pandhandler	Pearson	-.130*	-.021	-.191**	-.066	.006	-.020	.558**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.045	.753	.003	.308	.931	.758	.000
	N	238	235	238	238	232	238	234
Being sexually assaulted	Pearson	-.359**	-.086	-.330**	-.104	-.054	-.463**	.617**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.186	.000	.109	.411	.000	.000
	N	238	235	238	238	232	238	234
Being assaulted by someone with a weapon	Pearson	-.295**	-.040	-.347**	-.032	-.071	-.097	.689**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.543	.000	.626	.281	.138	.000
	N	237	234	237	237	231	237	234

		How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the night?	Religiosity	Fear of crime collapsed	RaceRecode	Age	Genderrecode	Perceived Risk
Being mugged	Pearson	-.340**	-.003	-.386**	-.010	-.101	-.181**	.721**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.962	.000	.876	.125	.005	.000
	N	238	235	238	238	232	238	234
Having someone break into your place of residence while you are there	Pearson	-.231**	-.021	-.292**	-.005	.007	-.139*	.701**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.753	.000	.934	.915	.032	.000
	N	237	234	237	237	231	237	234
Having someone break into your place of residence while you are not there	Pearson	-.235**	-.073	-.287**	-.048	.061	-.043	.703**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.265	.000	.464	.360	.507	.000
	N	236	233	236	236	230	236	234
Having your car stolen	Pearson	-.193**	-.055	-.180**	.024	-.026	-.045	.682**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.400	.005	.718	.698	.492	.000
	N	238	235	238	238	232	238	234
Having your property stolen	Pearson	-.245**	-.066	-.270**	-.050	-.002	.010	.714**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.310	.000	.439	.973	.880	.000
	N	238	235	238	238	232	238	234
How often do you pray?	Pearson	-.014	.759**	.011	.098	.064	-.052	-.006
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.826	.000	.869	.131	.334	.422	.927
	N	238	235	238	238	232	238	234
Religion influences how I live my life	Pearson	.017	.755**	.073	.111	-.015	-.027	-.028
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.798	.000	.262	.087	.816	.678	.671
	N	238	235	238	238	232	238	234
I would describe myself as very religious	Pearson	.100	.815**	.138*	.119	.065	.059	-.105
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.125	.000	.035	.068	.326	.371	.112
	N	235	235	235	235	229	235	231

		How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the night?	Religiosity	Fear of crime collapsed	RaceRecode	Age	Genderrecode	Perceived Risk
How safe do you feel being outside and alone in your own neighborhood during the night?	Pearson	1	.054	.762**	-.076	.191**	.357**	-.344**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.414	.000	.244	.003	.000	.000
	N	238	235	238	238	232	238	234
Religiosity	Pearson	.054	1	.065	.108	.066	-.030	-.077
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.414		.318	.100	.324	.643	.244
	N	235	235	235	235	229	235	231
Fear of crime collapsed	Pearson	.762**	.065	1	-.086	.107	.251**	-.386**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.318		.185	.104	.000	.000
	N	238	235	238	238	232	238	234
RaceRecode	Pearson	-.076	.108	-.086	1	-.175**	-.033	-.051
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.244	.100	.185		.008	.618	.441
	N	238	235	238	238	232	238	234
Age	Pearson	.191**	.066	.107	-.175**	1	-.003	-.039
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.324	.104	.008		.960	.562
	N	232	229	232	232	232	232	228
Genderrecode	Pearson	.357**	-.030	.251**	-.033	-.003	1	-.155*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.643	.000	.618	.960		.018
	N	238	235	238	238	232	238	234
Perceived Risk	Pearson	-.344**	-.077	-.386**	-.051	-.039	-.155*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.244	.000	.441	.562	.018	
	N	234	231	234	234	228	234	234

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).