MicroCase exercise #1:
An exploration of fear of crime

Introduction

Welcome to the world of data analysis! In the data analysis exercises, we will be exploring some of the theories we have read about in our class text. This first exercise is designed to introduce you to MicroCase and to allow you to do some data exploring. The setup of these exercises is consistent; after completing a number of guided activities, you will be able to conduct similar analyses on your own. There are two homework assignments at the conclusion of each exercise. The first is a general assignment that asks questions about the guided activities. The second ("further exploration") is designed to facilitate further exploration of the researched relationships. In short, these exercises add a "hands-on" component to the study of theories of crime. Our first exercise involves using the General Social Survey to look at public perceptions of crime and criminality.

Description of the dataset

The General Social Survey (GSS) had been administered to a representative sample of Americans nearly every year since 1972. This survey asks a large variety of questions about peoples' opinions and behaviors. The GSS also obtains many demographic descriptors. The data we will be using in the exercises for Part III are from the 1996 GSS. This dataset is a subset of 46 variables that were chosen from the many hundreds of GSS variables for you to include in your research. You will find that the subset allows you to explore many relationships.

MicroCase is not very difficult to operate even if you have never used a computer before. One essential concept is coding. Coding is actually a form of translation from 'Computerese' to English because most humans don't think in terms of numbers. In computer language, strings of numbers are used. Thus if the number '2' were coded to mean 'Female,' then the computer would read the '2' and tell the researcher that a given respondent answered 'Female.' Researchers need codebooks to be able to make the computer understand what they want and also to decipher what the computer prints out.

Consider a coding example from the 1996 GSS, respondent's sex, which has three possible answers: Male, Female, or No Response (a respondent could have chosen not to answer the question at all). If a respondent was male, the response was coded '1.' Females were coded '2'. If the respondent did not answer the question at all, the response was left blank. Luckily, we don't have to worry much about coding because labels are already included to make the data we'll be using more easy to work with. If the labels were not included in the file, we would need a codebook that would help us decipher the computer's printouts. For now, we can put the idea of coding on the back burner because we will not need to use codes unless we try to transform the data (e.g., by recoding a variable into smaller categories).

Before we start, we'll need to load up the dataset and get ready to run our numbers. To do this, hop on any of the computer lab machines and open the 'Statistics' folder. Inside that folder, you'll find two MicroCase icons. To launch/run MicroCase, you need to click on 'MicroCase Net Version 4.x + DATA' (this is the Curriculum Plan, not to be confused with the MicroCase programs that come with MicroCase coursebooks). Once in the program, click the **File Management** button (bold words indicate commands that you need to click on) to access the page from which we load the dataset. Then, click on the yellow **Open File** button. When given the opportunity, click on 'GSS96TAB' to open the dataset. If you don't see it

listed, you might have to locate the subdirectory (probably by accessing the a:\ drive) in which GSS96TAB is located. To get into the program, click **OK** at the page that describes the dataset.

Getting a handle on the data

Now, let's take a quick look at some demographic factors before getting into some serious analyses. Running some preliminary frequencies helps us "get a handle on the data" so that we better understand where our data came from. First, run frequencies on SEX, RACE, AGE, and INCOME. Those four tables appear below the directions for running frequencies in MicroCase.

Blueprint 1: How to run frequencies in MicroCase

1. Click on **Basic Statistics** (in the blue margin on the left of the screen) then **Univariate Statistics**.
2. Click the name of the variable of your choice (MicroCase only allows one variable to be run at a time).
3. Click on the solid right arrow to put the variable name into the box labeled "Primary Variable." If you want to pick a variable further down on the list, simply hit the scroll button to move around the list (or use the search function). You will get a frequency of the variable in this box. Simply highlighting a variable isn't enough; you have to make sure it's listed in the 'Primary Variable' list.
4. Click on **OK** to run the frequency.
5. Click on the **Statistics Summary** button on the left hand side of the screen to get a nice breakdown. Viola! Instant frequency table.
6. If you accidentally include a variable you do not want, don't fret. Just move the variable name you wanted into the "Primary Variable" box and it will replace the old name.
7. Repeat the process for each frequency you wish, making sure to print or save the tables if you will want them for future reference. Use the circular arrow (looks sort of like a recycling symbol) to run another variable. You can also click on the **Menu** button to start over.

Step by step example 1: Running frequencies

1. Click on **Basic Statistics** (in the blue margin on the left of the screen) then **Univariate Statistics**.
2. Click on SEX (respondent's sex).
3. Click on the solid right arrow to put the variable name into the "Primary Variable" box.
4. Click on **OK** to run the frequency.
5. Click on the **Statistics Summary** button on the left hand side of the screen to get the breakdown we need.
6. Print or save or merely enjoy the breakdown before running the next one.
7. Click on the circular arrow that looks sort of like a recycling symbol to start the process anew for our next variable.

8. Click on RACE (race of respondent), then click on the solid right arrow to put the variable name into the "Primary Variable" box and click **OK** to run the frequency.
9. Click on the **Statistics Summary** button on the left hand side of the screen to get the breakdown we need.
10. Print or save or merely enjoy the breakdown before running the next one.
11. Click on the circular arrow that looks sort of like a recycling symbol to start the process anew for our next variable.
12. Click on AGE (age of respondent), then click on the solid right arrow to put the variable name into the "Primary Variable" box and click **OK** to run the frequency.
13. Click on the **Statistics Summary** button on the left hand side of the screen to get the breakdown we need.
14. Print or save or merely enjoy the breakdown before running the next one.
15. Click on the circular arrow that looks sort of like a recycling symbol to start the process anew for our next variable.
16. Click on INCOME (total family income), then click on the solid right arrow to put the variable name into the "Primary Variable" box and click **OK** to run the frequency.
17. Click on the solid right arrow to put the variable name into the "Primary Variable" box.
18. Click on **OK** to run the frequency.
19. Click on the **Statistics Summary** button on the left hand side of the screen to get the breakdown we need.
20. Print or save or merely enjoy the breakdown before running any other analyses or exiting the program.

Below are the four frequency tables; the first is the frequency table for SEX.

```
-------------------------------------------------------------
SEX -- RESPONDENTS SEX

Mean:        .559        Std.Dev.:    0.497       N:       1500
Median:    2.000         Variance:    0.247       Missing:    0
99% confidence interval +/- mean:  1.526  to   1.592
95% confidence interval +/- mean:  1.534  to   1.584

Category          Freq.    %        Cum.%   Z-Score
 1) MALE          662      44.1     44.1    -1.125
 2) FEMALE        838      55.9     100.0   0.889
-------------------------------------------------------------
```

Below is the frequency table for RACE. One category has been coded as missing to make our analysis easier (that's where the number 86 next to the word 'missing' comes from), leaving just Blacks and Whites.

```
-------------------------------------------------------------
RACE -- RACE OF RESPONDENT
```

```
Mean:      1.144    Std.Dev.:        0.351     N:       1414
Median:    1.000    Variance:        0.123     Missing:   86
99% confidence interval +/- mean:  1.120  to   1.168
95% confidence interval +/- mean:  1.125  to   1.162

Category          Freq.    %       Cum.%    Z-Score
 1) WHITE         1211     85.6    85.6     -0.409
 2) BLACK         203      14.4    100.0    2.442
-------------------------------------------------------------
```

Below is the frequency table for AGE. Notice that there are three categories; the respondents' exact ages were recoded into these categories to make our analysis easier.

```
-------------------------------------------------------------
AGE -- AGE OF RESPONDENT

Mean:      2.083    Std.Dev.:        0.795    N:       1500
Median:    2.000    Variance:        0.632    Missing:    0
99% confidence interval +/- mean:  2.030  to   2.136
95% confidence interval +/- mean:  2.042  to   2.123

Category          Freq.    %       Cum.%    Z-Score
 1) 18-33         417      27.8    27.8     -1.362
 2) 34-49         542      36.1    63.9     -0.104
 3) 50 and old    541      36.1   100.0      1.154
-------------------------------------------------------------
```

Below is the frequency table for INCOME. Three categories have been coded as missing to make our analysis easier: refusals to answer the question, those who didn't know the answer, and some for whom the question was not applicable. That leaves 1308 cases in our table (the rest are listed as missing). Only the three remaining categories are included in the table.

```
-------------------------------------------------------------
INCOME -- TOTAL FAMILY INCOME

Mean:      1.949    Std.Dev.:        0.816     N:      1308
Median:    2.000    Variance:        0.665     Missing: 192
99% confidence interval +/- mean:  1.891  to   2.007
95% confidence interval +/- mean:  1.905  to   1.993

Category          Freq.    %        Cum.%    Z-Score
 1) LOWER         470      35.9     35.9     -1.163
 2) MIDDLE        435      33.3     69.2      0.063
 3) HIGHER        403      30.8    100.0      1.289
-------------------------------------------------------------
```

The first thing many students notice about the frequencies produced by MicroCase is the columnar format in which they are printed and the amount of information presented. Don't let this overwhelm you. For now, ignore all the information except for the category breakdowns at the bottom of each frequency output.

As for the columns, the first column contains the value labels for the variable we want

to study, one for each category (e.g., 'Male' and 'Female').

The second column contains the frequency, or number, of cases that fall into each category (e.g., 662 of the 1500 respondents in this sample were male).

The third column contains the percentage of cases falling into each category (e.g., 44.1% of the 1500 respondents in this sample were male). This is sometimes called the 'raw percent' because it has not been transformed in any way.

The fourth column presents the cumulative percent. This percent shows the percentage of cases falling in all the value categories up to and including the value category in question. To illustrate cumulative percentages, look briefly at the table for AGE. The table shows that 27.8% of the respondents were aged 33 or younger, 63.9% of the respondents were younger than age 49 (27.8% + 36.1% = 63.9%), and 100% (all) of the respondents were in the three categories combined. Cumulative percentages are most useful when the variable in question has many sequential categories (e.g., ages in exact years instead of the categories used in this dataset). Cumulative percentages are meaningless when used with nominal data (i.e., data that cannot be rank ordered, such as sex or race).

The fifth and final column contains the 'Z-score,' which you can ignore for now. The Z-score is simply a "standardized" score, and you'll work with these in your stats classes, but not for these exercises. For now, don't let them bother you.

From the frequency tables, we can see that slightly more than half of our sample is female. We can also see that our dataset contains responses from a large percentage (85.6%) of Whites and a smaller number (14.4%) of Blacks.

Looking at AGE, we can see that our sample contains responses from a nice cross-section of individuals; roughly one-third fall into each of the three age categories. INCOME is also divided into somewhat equal categories. You can run frequencies on other respondent characteristics if you wish to get a better handle on the data.

Exploration with crosstabulation tables

Now, let's run some analyses of our own to explore a little about how Americans view crime. For this exercise, we'll look at fear of crime (FEAR).

Fear of crime was measured by asking respondents if they were afraid to walk at night in their neighborhoods. To see the breakdown, use the directions above in Blueprint 1 to run a frequency table for FEAR. The frequency table is replicated below.

```
-------------------------------------------------------------
FEAR -- AFRAID TO WALK AT NIGHT IN NEIGHBORHOOD

Mean:      1.584    Std.Dev.:        0.493    N:       972
Median:    2.000    Variance:        0.243    Missing: 528
99% confidence interval +/- mean:  1.544  to   1.625
95% confidence interval +/- mean:  1.553  to   1.615

Category    Freq.    %        Cum.%    Z-Score
 1) YES     404      41.6      41.6    -1.185
 2) NO      568      58.4     100.0     0.843
-------------------------------------------------------------
```

As you can tell, more than 40% (41.6%) respondents said they were afraid to walk in their neighborhoods at night compared to nearly 60% (58.4%) who said they were not afraid. Let's

see if women are more fearful than men about walking in their neighborhoods at night. Let's also check to see if fear is related to a person's race, age, or socioeconomic status as measured by income.

Now, to see if any of our four demographic variables plays a role in fear of crime. A good technique for examining differences between groups is the crosstabulation table. You've seen many of these before, but may not have known the name for them. When you see political polls broken out by party or gender, you're actually examining crosstabulation tables. Most crosstabulation tables, including all of the ones we will look at in this chapter's exercises, present two variables; one variable appears at the top of the table and the other variable is on the left-hand side.

Crosstabulation tables are easy to make. Just follow the directions in Blueprint 2.

Blueprint 2: How to run crosstabulation tables in MicroCase

1. Click on **Basic Statistics** (in the blue margin on the left of the screen) then **Cross-tabulations**.
2. Highlight your dependent variable (i.e., the variable you want to "predict").
3. Click on the arrow to the left of the 'Row Variable' box move your selection into that box.
4. If you accidentally include a variable you do not want, don't fret. Just move the variable name you wanted into the "Row Var" box and it will replace the old name.
5. Highlight your independent variable (i.e., the variable that you want to use to "predict" your dependent variable). Any easy way to remember which variable is which is that the value of the dependent variable 'depends' on the values of the independent variable. For example, likelihood of getting an A in your course depends on how much you study. Hours spend studying is the independent variable and course grade is the dependent variable. A diagram would look like this: STUDY –> GRADE; note that the arrow does not imply causality, it merely proposes a relationship in which grades are related to the number of hours studied). Demographic descriptors of respondents are usually always independent variables.
6. Click on the arrow to the left of the 'Column Variable' box move your selection into that box.
7. Click **OK** to generate the crosstabulation table.
8. Click on the '**Column %**' button on the left hand side of the screen to see the column percents.
9. Click **Statistics Summary** to see tests of significance for nominal variables (more on nominal variables later).
10. Repeat the process for each crosstabulation table you wish, making sure to print or save the tables if you will want them for future reference. Use the circular arrow (looks sort of like a recycling symbol) to run another variable. You can also click on the **Menu** button to start over.

Step by Step example 2: Running crosstabulation tables

1. Click on **Basic Statistics** (in the blue margin on the left of the screen) then **Cross-tabulations**.

2.	Highlight 'FEAR (afraid to walk home at night in neighborhood). This is our dependent variable.
3.	Click on the arrow to the left of the 'Row Variable' box move our selection into that box.
4.	Highlight 'SEX (respondent's sex)', then click on the arrow beside the 'Col Variable' box. This is the first of four independent variables.
5.	Click **OK** to generate the crosstabulation table.
6.	Click on the '**Column %**' button on the left hand side of the screen to see the column percents and the **Statistics Summary** to see the tests of significance.
7.	Print or save or merely enjoy the table before running the next one(s).
8.	Click on the circular arrow if to run another crosstabulation table and run a table for RACE, then for AGE, and then INCOME.

The tables are replicated below, followed by an explanation of each. The first is the table for SEX, the statistics appear below the table.

```
------------------------------------------------------------
FEAR       by       SEX

           MALE     FEMALE   TOTAL
YES        103      301      404
           23.8%    55.8%    41.6%
NO         330      238      568
           76.2%    44.2%    58.4%
Missing    229      299      528

TOTAL      433      539      972
           100.0%   100.0%

Row Variable:  FEAR
Column Variable:  SEX

Nominal Statistics:
Chi-Square:   101.590    (DF  =        1;   Prob. =    0.000)
V:          0.323  C:          0.308
Lambda:     0.212  Lambda:     0.156  Lambda:     0.185
(DV=38)                    (DV=13)

Ordinal Statistics:
Gamma:     -0.604  Tau-b:     -0.323 Tau-c:     -0.317
s.error     0.056  s.error     0.030 s.error     0.029

Dyx:       -0.321  Dxy:       -0.326
s.error     0.030  s.error     0.030
Prob. =             0.000
------------------------------------------------------------
```

From the first crosstabulation table, we learn that 55.8% of women say they are afraid to walk at night in their neighborhoods compared to only 23.8% of men (you can find these numbers in the cells of the table). The difference between the two percentages is 32.0%, so the finding is potentially interesting (had the percentage been only a few percent we would say the difference

is negligible. In fact, women are more than twice as likely to report fear. That sounds like a real finding, but we need to look at the statistics to make sure our finding isn't due to chance or random fluctuations in our data. The Cramer's V (labeled 'V' in the summary statistics) value is .323, which means that we can do 32.3% better predicting fear when we know a respondent's gender. Alternatively, we can say that 32.3% of the variance in fear can be explained by gender. We can classify the strength of a relationship based on the Cramer's V value. One rule of thumb says that a Cramer's V less than .10 indicates a weak relationship, a Cramer's V between .10 and .30 indicates a moderate relationship, and a Cramer's V larger than .30 indicates a strong relationship. In the case of SEX and FEAR, the relationship would be considered strong.

Looking to the significance column (labelled 'Prob = ' in the top line of the statistics), we can see that the Cramer's V value is significant at the .000 level (NOTE: this is not zero; the computer rounded it off to .000, but it's probably something like .0001). Significance values sound scarier than they are. All they do is alert the researcher (that's you) to the possibility that his/her findings are due to chance rather than due to a real relationship between two variables. Significance ranges from 0 to 1. A significance value of 1 means there is a 100% chance the finding is due to chance so it cannot be trusted. A significance value of 0 means there is almost no chance the finding is due to chance so it can be trusted. Very few relationships have significance values of 1 or 0, however, so researchers had to develop a scale of when they would trust their findings. Many years ago, they decided that they would accept any finding with a significance level of .05 or lower because that would mean there is only a 5% chance (or lower) that the finding is due to chance. In our SEX --> FEAR crosstabulation, there is almost no chance that our observed relationship (i.e., that women report more fear than men) is due to chance.

> POINTS TO PONDER: What are some explanations for this finding? Make sure you consider information from the readings from Part II in your explanations.

Now let's look at our crosstabulation table for RACE.

FEAR	by	RACE		
	WHITE	BLACK	Missing	TOTAL
YES	310	73	21	383
	39.7%	53.7%		41.8%
NO	470	63	35	533
	60.3%	46.3%		58.2%
Missing	431	67	30	528
TOTAL	780	136	86	916
	100.0%	100.0%		

Row Variable: FEAR
Column Variable: RACE

Nominal Statistics:
Chi-Square: 9.240 (DF = 1; Prob. = 0.000)

```
V:          0.100  C:           0.100
Lambda:     0.000  Lambda:     0.026  Lambda:      0.019
(DV=33)                    (DV=13)

Ordinal Statistics:
Gamma:     -0.275  Tau-b:     -0.100 Tau-c:     -0.070
s.error     0.093  s.error     0.034 s.error     0.024

Dyx:       -0.139  Dxy:       -0.072
s.error     0.047  s.error     0.024
Prob. =             0.003
```

The first thing we notice is that Blacks are much more likely than Whites to report being afraid to walk in their neighborhoods at night (53.7% vs. 39.7%). The difference between the two percentages is 14%, so the finding is potentially interesting. The Cramer's V value is -.10, indicating that we do 10% better predicting fear when we know a respondent's race, and the significance level is .002, well within the statistically significant range. According to the Cramer's V value, this relationship would be considered moderate. This crosstabulation shows that race and fear of crime are related.

> POINTS TO PONDER: What are some explanations for this finding? Make sure you consider information from the readings from Part II in your explanations.

Now, it's your turn to examine and interpret the remaining two tables. The easiest way is to look at each value of the dependent variable, one at a time. So, in the AGE -- > FEAR crosstabulation, you would want to look at the percentages of individuals who said they were fearful. First, note what percent of respondents aged 18-33 said they were fearful, then the percentage of individuals aged 34-49, then the percent of people aged 50 and higher. Do the percentages differ? If so, is the difference substantial enough to warrant our interest? What is the Cramer's V value (NOTE: we use Cramer's V for this table because there are three columns which makes it larger than a 2x2 table)? Is the finding significant/meaningful? If you have problems with this table, go back and go over the first two crosstabulation tables, using the text to check your work.

FEAR by AGE

	18-33	34-49	50 and old	TOTAL
YES	105	139	160	404
	37.4%	40.1%	46.5%	41.6%
NO	176	208	184	568
	62.6%	59.9%	53.5%	58.4%
Missing	136	195	197	528
TOTAL	281	347	344	972
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

```
Row Variable:  FEAR
Column Variable:  AGE
```

```
Nominal Statistics:
Chi-Square:     5.830    (DF  =        2;   Prob. =    0.054)
V:          0.077  C:          0.077
Lambda:     0.034  Lambda:     0.000  Lambda:       0.020
(DV=4)                      (DV=13)

Ordinal Statistics:
Gamma:     -0.126  Tau-b:     -0.071 Tau-c:     -0.081
s.error     0.053  s.error     0.030 s.error     0.034

Dyx:       -0.061  Dxy:       -0.084
s.error     0.026  s.error     0.035
Prob. =              0.018
-------------------------------------------------------------
```

Notice that nasty significance value in the table for AGE --> FEAR; this one is so close to .05 that it requires a judgement call! Usually, we say it's not significant (since it's not .05 or less), but we can tell the reader the exact value so s/he knows it was a close call. Either way, the relationship is weak because it's less than .10.

Now, look at INCOME --> FEAR crosstabulation table and interpret it. What can we say about fear of crime based on these four tables?

```
-------------------------------------------------------------
FEAR       by       INCOME

          LOWER     MIDDLE    HIGHER    Missing    TOTAL
YES       159       105       92        48         356
          50.5%     37.1%     34.3%                41.1%
NO        156       178       176       58         510
          49.5%     62.9%     65.7%                58.9%
Missing   155       152       135       86         528

TOTAL     315       283       268      192         866
          100.0%    100.0%    100.0%

Row Variable:  FEAR
Column Variable:  INCOME

Nominal Statistics:
Chi-Square:    18.383    (DF  =        2;   Prob. =    0.000)
V:          0.146  C:          0.144
Lambda:     0.040  Lambda:     0.008  Lambda:     0.028
(DV=19)                     (DV=13)

Ordinal Statistics:
Gamma:               0.227  Tau-b:     0.130  Tau-c:      0.148
s.error     0.056  s.error     0.032 s.error     0.036

Dyx:        0.111  Dxy:        0.152
s.error     0.027  s.error     0.037
Prob. =              0.000
-------------------------------------------------------------
```

Do you see the downward trend in the INCOME -- > FEAR table indicating that lower incomes are more afraid to walk at night in their neighborhoods?

Further exploration

What else might influence fear of crime? There are plenty of other variables in the dataset for you to look at. Maybe you feel that how often respondents read the newspaper (NEWS) or the level of urban development where they live (SRCBELT) have some effects on their fear of crime. For the "further exploration" homework assignment, you will pick one of these variables (or one of your own choosing) and explore its effects on fear of crime using the same procedures we used for SEX, RACE, AGE, and INCOME.

On your own

Now that we have explored fear of crime, you could look at other opinions regarding crime and criminality. Two such variables in the 1996 GSS dataset are support for the death penalty for murder (CAPPUN) and support for legalization of marijuana (GRASS). If you want, you could run the analyses we ran for fear of crime, and try adding some independent variables of your own. Perhaps you feel that a person's religion (RELIG) or the strength of their affiliation with their religion (RELITEN) affects their support for the death penalty. If you wish, take a look and find out. While you are exploring Americans' opinions on crime and criminality, think about the readings and how they help explain people's opinions. The possibilities are endless, so have fun!

[PLEASE DO NOT TURN IN THESE PRECEDING SHEETS WITH YOUR ASSIGNMENT- THEY ARE FOR YOU TO KEEP]

Homework for MicroCase #1: General questions
(fear of crime)

Name: _____ Date:_____

Directions: Complete the following exercises by filling in the blanks or circling the appropriate responses. A couple of answers have been filled in for you to make sure you're on the right track.

Getting a handle on the data:

1. In the 1996 GSS sample, there were 662 males, and they comprise _____% of the sample. There were _____ females; they were _____% of the sample.

2. In the 1996 GSS sample, _____% of the sample was White; _____% were Black. This division *is / is not* roughly equal.

3. In the 1996 GSS sample, the largest age grouping was _____, comprising _____% of the sample. The second largest age grouping was _____, comprising _____% of the sample. The smallest age grouping was _____, comprising _____% of the sample.

4. In the 1996 GSS sample, there were _____ higher income individuals, and they comprise _____% of the sample. There were _____ middle income people; they were _____% of the sample. Finally, there were _____ lower income individuals, comprising _____% of the sample.

Exploration through crosstabulation tables:

1. In the 1996 GSS sample, _____% of the sample was afraid to walk at night in their

neighborhoods compared to _____% who were not afraid to walk at night in their neighborhoods.

2. In the SEX -- > FEAR crosstabulation, _103_ (_____%) of the male respondents said they were afraid to walk at night in their neighborhoods, compared to _____ (_____%) of the female respondents. The difference between the two percentages is _____%, which appears to be *negligible / potentially interesting*. The Cramer's V value is _____, which means that we can do _____% better predicting FEAR when we know a respondent's gender. This relationship is *weak / moderate / strong*. The approximate significance is _____, which means there is a __negligible__% that the relationship between SEX and FEAR is due to chance [NOTE: **when MicroCase says the significance is .000, we label it "negligible" rather than "zero' because we recognize there is an infinitesimal possibility of error due to chance**]. This relationship *is / is not* statistically significant.

Many researchers have found found that women report a higher fear of crime than do men. The relationship between gender and fear of crime found using the 1996 GSS data *is similar to / differs greatly from* the findings regarding sex reported by others.

3. In the RACE -- > FEAR crosstabulation, _____ (_____%) of the White respondents said they were afraid to walk at night in their neighborhoods, compared to _____ (_____%) of the Black respondents. The difference between the two percentages is _____%, which appears to be *negligible / potentially interesting*. The Cramer's V value is _____, which means that we can do _____% better predicting FEAR when we

know a respondent's race. This relationship is *weak / moderate / strong*. The approximate significance is _____, which means there is a _____% chance that the relationship between RACE and FEAR is due to chance. This relationship *is / is not* statistically significant.

Many researchers report that Blacks are more fearful of crime. The relationship between race and fear of crime found using the 1996 GSS data *is similar to / differs greatly from* the findings reported by other researchers.

4. In the AGE --> FEAR crosstabulation, _____ (_____%) of the young (aged 18-33) respondents said they were afraid to walk at night in their neighborhoods, compared to _____ (_____%) of the middle category (aged 34-49), and _____ (_____%) of the oldest respondents (aged 50 or higher). The largest difference between the three percentages is _____%, which appears to be *negligible / potentially interesting*. The Cramer's V value is _____, which means that we can do _____% better predicting FEAR when we know a respondent's age category. This relationship is *weak / moderate / strong*. The approximate significance is _____, which means there is a _____% chance that the relationship between AGE and FEAR is due to chance. This relationship *is / is not* statistically significant.

Historically, research has shown that older individuals are more afraid of crime. The relationship between age and fear of crime found using the 1996 GSS data *is similar to / differs from* the findings reported in historical research.

5. In the INCOME --> FEAR crosstabulation, _____ (_____%) of the lower income respondents said they were afraid to walk at night in their neighborhoods, compared to _____ (_____%) of the middle income group, and _____ (_____%) of the highest income respondents. The largest difference between the three percentages is _____%, which appears to be *negligible / potentially interesting*. The Cramer's V value is _____, which means that we can do _____% better predicting FEAR when we know a respondent's income category. This relationship is *weak / moderate / strong*. The approximate significance is _____, which means there is a _____% chance that the relationship between INCOME and FEAR is due to chance. This relationship *is / is not* statistically significant.

Many researchers have found that wealthier individuals are less afraid of crime than are poorer people. The relationship between income and fear of crime found using the 1996 GSS data *is similar to / differs greatly from* the findings reported by others.

Homework for MicroCase #1: "Further exploration" questions
(fear of crime)

Name: _____ Date:_____

TASK: Expand your list of variables that may affect on fear of crime (e.g., NEWS or SRCBELT). Run the same type of analyses we ran above.

Directions: Complete the following exercises by answering the questions.

Further exploration:

1. Which variables did you choose as your independent variables?

2. How did your first independent variable affect fear of crime? Make sure to provide a description that includes the percentages, Cramer's V value, the strength of the relationship, and the significance value.

3. How did your second independent variable affect fear of crime? Make sure to provide a description that includes the percentages, Cramer's V value, the strength of the relationship, and the significance value.

If you included more than two independent variables, you may summarize the findings on the back of this page for future reference.

Affirmation of Independent Work

Submission of this assignment constitutes a statement on your part that apart from technical help with MicroCase, you completed this assignment on your own. Plagiarism will be reported to University authorities and can result in expulsion from the University.

Your Name: _____ *Signature:* _____