Conklin (1975) has examined relationships between perceptions of local crime rates and feelings of personal safety, interpersonal trust, and affect for community within two communities in metropolitan Boston. He found a stronger relationship between perceptions of crime and social response for that community which perceived higher crime rates. These findings lead to the suggestion that a threshold effect may be operating in which social response to crime becomes related to perceptions of the crime rate only when those perceptions reach a certain level of intensity within the community. Secondary analysis of survey data from community areas within Cincinnati, Ohio and Hartford, Connecticut was unable to replicate Conklin's findings with respect to a threshold effect. Instead, the relationships between several perception of crime scales and items indicating attitudes and reactions toward crime and crime-related problems were found to be relatively constant across communities which varied widely with regard to perceptions of the extent of local crime. This paper presents a summary of Conklin's study and reports the procedures and findings of the replication attempt.

Conklin's analysis is concerned with the relationship between direct

victimization and indirect victimization. Direct victimization "refers to the loss incurred by the victim in such 'crimes with victims' as murder, rape, robbery, and burglary. In these crimes...the victim clearly incurs a loss from the criminal act." (pg. 374) Indirect victimization "suggests that an individual may suffer a loss from a crime in which he is not directly involved. To the extent that crimes do become known to the public, attitudes and behavior of individuals not directly victimized may be altered. When these changes are regarded negatively by the individuals themselves, indirect victimization occurs." (pg. 374) Examples of such changes in behavior may include staying home at night, taking taxicabs rather than walking, and securing homes with locks and watch dogs. (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967:87-88)

Conklin, however, does not attempt to ascertain the actual level of direct victimization occuring within the communities he studies. It is by now well recognized that crimes reported to the police under-estimate the actual amount of direct victimization by some unknown quantity. (Ennis, 1967; Reiss, 1967) While victimization surveys almost universally report higher crime rates than are known to the police, a number of questions have been raised concerning the accuracy of these measures, with particular refer-

ence to cross-community applications. (Clarren and Schwartz, 1976) Insofar as the concept of direct victimization rates appears to be an unknown quantity, Conklin assumes that community perceptions of the crime rate may have a more important effect upon aspects of social response. Such perceptions would be influenced at least partially by the actual level of direct victimization, but would also be influenced by the reporting behavior of the mass media, politicians and law enforcement officials, and by mechanisms of communication within the individual community. Conklin emphasizes that "it is this relationship between perceptions of crime in one's community and one's attitudes and behavior which is of central concern in this paper." (pg. 375)

The two communities surveyed by Conklin are both within the Boston metropolitan area. One is described as a suburb in which the residents are predominately from middle-class backgrounds, engaged in white-collar occupations, well-educated, prosperous, and from various ethnic backgrounds. The other is described as an urban neighborhood within Boston in which the residents are predominately working class in background, engaged in blue-collar occupations, less well educated, less prosperous, and of Italian ancestry. The racial composition of both communities is almost all white. From samples of 200 households, 138 residents of the suburb and 128 residents of

the urban community were interviewed.

The measure of local perception of crime consisted of a scale composed of three items concerning respondents' assessment of local crime rates. The wording and coding of these items are presented in table 1. On all three items, residents of the urban community perceived higher crime rates than did residents of the suburb. The differences were significant in excess of .001 when compared with a difference of means test. Inter-item correlations ranged from .34 to .49 and the scale was formed by summing the items. The cross-sample differences remained after controlling for a number of variables, including age, sex, social background, income, education, religion, and ethnicity.

TABLE I.

CONKLIN'S PERCEPTION OF CRIME ITEMS*

	Suburb	Urban Area
1. Do you think that there is (1) more crime, (3) less crime, or (2) about the same amount of crime here in (area) as there is in other communities in the city of Boston and its suburbs? (Percent reporting less crime in area).	83.2	39.1
2. Do you think that the crime rate in (area) is (1) higher than the national crime rate, (2) the same as the national crime rate, or (3) lower than the national crime rate? (Percent reporting lower crime rate in area).	90.7	56.6
3. Would you say that the crime rate in your neighborhood is (1) high, (2) average, or (3) low? (Percent low).	87.4	53.3
4. Perception scale = 1 + 2 + 3 (no values reported).		

* From Conklin, 1971, p. 377.

In addition to perceptions of local crime, Conklin asked his respondents a number of questions which dealt with feelings of personal safety, trust of neighbors and of people in general, and affect or attachment to the local community. For each item, he compared responses between communities and examined the nature of the relationship between the items and perceptions of crime using regression analysis. The wording of each item and the results of the cross-community and regression analysis are presented in Appendix 1. When compared with a t-test, almost all of the individual items showed a cross-sample difference in excess of the .01 level of significance. Most of these differences held up when controlled for the social background variables (age, sex, etc.) mentioned above.

Of eleven items tested by Conklin, the threshold effect occurs on seven of them. On these items, a significant relationship is found between the item and perceptions of local crime for the urban community, but no relationship is found for the same variables in the suburban community. On three items, no significant relation occurs within either community while a significant relation is found for one item within both communities.

Conklin groups his items into four categories. The first three items refer to feelings of personal security in the community. Correlations of

.33 to .50 between item pairs support the conclusion that these items are tapping the same underlying dimension. According to Conklin, the mean scores suggest "an inverse relationship between feelings of personal safety and perception of crime rates: the more crime perceived by residents of a community, the less those residents will feel personally safe." (pg. 379) However, when this relationship is tested within each area, it is found to be true only for the urban community in which perceptions of crime rates are high. Within the suburban community, in which low crime rates are perceived, such a relationship does not occur. It is this difference in relationships for communities with low and high perceptions of local crime rates which Conklin describes as a potential threshold effect.

The second group of items are designed to measure feelings of interpersonal trust (See Addendix). Inter-item correlations indicated that these items were tapping two dimensions. Items 4 and 5 appear to measure feelings of trust held by the respondent toward his fellow neighbors, whereas items 6 and 7 appear to measure respondents' feelings of trust toward people in general. Within these groups, the threshold effect occurs on those items which measure trust of neighbors, but no relationship occurs on the generalized trust items.

The third group represents a collection of items which are intended

to ascertain the level of affect or attachment to the community felt by the respondent. Inter-item correlations were not reported for this group of questions. Item 8 shows a significant relationship with perceptions of crime within both sample areas. Item 9 shows no relationship towards perceptions of crime, but items 10 and 11 again produce the threshold effect. However, the strength of relationship between item 11 and the perception of crime scale is somewhat weaker within the urban area than were most of the other items.

Surveys conducted in Cincinnati, Ohio and Hartford, Connecticut were analyzed in the attempt to replicate Conklin's findings. The Cincinnati survey was undertaken as part of the Urban Institute's evaluation of a neighborhood team policing program. (Schwartz, et. al., 1975; Clarren and Schwartz, 1975) The Hartford survey was conducted by the Survey Research Program of the University of Massachusetts-Boston and the Hartford Institute of Criminal and Social Justice as part of the evaluation of the Hartford Crime Reduction Program. Both surveys utilized clustered probability designs to sample household units. In Cincinnati, an attitude respondent was chosen at random from among the household members. Both surveys were administered in 1973 and both were conducted with in-person interviews.

Most important, for the purposes of this replication effort, both surveys were designed to focus on specific neighborhoods within their respective urban areas and drew enriched samples of these neighborhoods.

Neither survey, of course, provides an exact duplication of Conklin's design. This is to be expected since both were developed with different purposes in mind. Not all of the items used by Conklin to construct his perception of crime scale are present in the surveys. To achieve scales which were as close an approximation as possible of Conklin's scale, similar items were examined and alternative scales developed on the basis of inter-item correlations.

A similar problem was encountered when replication of the attitude-response items was attempted. Not all of Conklin's items are present and some of those that are do not provide exactly the same wording or coding. Once again, additional related items were examined and inter-item correlations were used to determine the extent to which the items were tapping a similar dimension.

Finally, the characteristics of the neighborhoods examined by these surveys may be different in some important respects from those communities examined by Conklin. Some of the "areas" in these surveys actually represent that portion of the city under study which lies outside the geographic boundaries of the

specifically selected neighborhoods. Thus they do not represent an identifiable community in the sense used by Conklin. Also, those areas which can be characterized as neighborhoods or communities all lie within the central city, no suburban communities were studied in either survey.

The Cincinnati survey was conducted to provide baseline data for an evaluation of a team policing program in Cincinnati's Police District One. Within this district, Mt. Adams, West End, and Over-the-Rhine are recognized as separate neighborhoods or communities both by Cincinnatians in general and by the residents of the neighborhoods. The policing experiment was designed to capitalize on the characteristics of these areas as neighborhoods by assigning a separate police team to be responsible for all of the safety needs of each neighborhood. For these reasons, separate samples of households were drawn for each of the identified neighborhoods. A fourth sample was drawn for the remainder of District One (identified hereafter as "remainder") and a fifth sample was drawn for households in Cincinnati at large which were not within the experimental area (this sample identified hereafter as "outside"). The final survey contained 211 completed household interviews for Mt. Adams, 242 for West End, 245 for Over-the-Rhine, 269 for the remainder sample, and 297 interviews for outside of district one. A more complete explanation of the sampling design for the Cincinnati survey,

as well as descriptions of the neighborhoods which were studied, is presented in a paper by Clarren and Schwartz (1974).

Mt. Adams is an all-white, upper middle class neighborhood which closely approximates Conklin's suburban community. Although close to the Central Business District, its position on the top of a bluff helps to insulate it from the rest of district one. This situation has contributed to an in-migration of singles and young married couples who are predominately college educated and engaged in professional occupations. The medium income for Mt. Adams ($11,138 in 1973) is significantly higher than the median for Cincinnati outside of district one. The population of Mt. Adams (based on the survey estimate) is about 3491 persons living in 1372 households.

The West End is an all-black neighborhood with a median income of $2,900 (survey estimate). Housing is mostly rental, predominately in older, three-story buildings with 6 to 9 apartments per unit. A substantial amount of housing is also provided by a number of "low-rise" rent supplement apartment complexes. Average levels of educational attainment are low. The residents are primarily working class, with high unemployment and fairly high degree of transience. 41.6 % of households with two or more members are headed by females. The population, which is skewed toward the younger end of the age distribution, is

approximately 6073 persons in 2226 households.

Over-the-Rhine is a mixed community with approximately 40% of the residents black and 60% white. A highly transient area, it has traditionally been the point of entry for migrants (both black and white) entering Cincinnati from the Appalachian region. Average education is about the same as in the West End, but medium income ($2,300) is somewhat lower. Compared to the West End, a higher proportion of Over-the-Rhine residents are senior citizens. 33.9% of households with two or more members are headed by females. Like the West End, the population is primarily working class with high levels of unemployment. At the time of the survey, there were approximately 6617 persons in Over-the-Rhine living in 3210 households.

Although the remainder and outside of district one samples do not constitute community areas in the sense used by Conklin, they were included in this analysis. This was done in order to observe how the relationship in question behaved for an undifferentiated population in comparison to a specified community at a given level of perception of crime. A sample drawn from an undifferentiated population could be expected to contain respondents from a number of communities or neighborhoods which vary widely with respect to their average levels of perceptions. If the relationship between perceptions of crime and response attitudes is determined in

a stepwise threshold effect by the average level of perceptions within a neighborhood, then one would expect the strength of the relationship to be weaker for an undifferentiated sample than it would be for a sample from a specific community at an equivalent level of perceptions.

Table two presents the items, with their means and standard deviations, which were used to construct the perception of crime scales for the Cincinnati samples. The first two items are similar to two of Conklin's items. There was no item in the Cincinnati survey which was similar to the remaining item used by Conklin. A number of additional items were examined to see if their intercorrelations with the first two Cincinnati questions would permit construction of an expanded perception of crime scale. Of the available questions, item number three performed the best across all five areas. Two scales were subsequently constructed for use in the analysis. The first scale included all three of these questions, while the second scale excluded item number three.

TABLE 2.

CINCINNATI: PERCEPTION OF CRIME ITEMS AND SCALES

	Outside Dist. 1	Mt. Adams	Remndr. Dist. 1	West End	Over Rhin
I. Within the past year or two, do you think that crime in your neighborhood has (1) increased, (2) remained the same, or (3) decreased?	*1.67 **(.626)	1.77 (.710)	1.65 (.668)	1.44 (.624)	1.61 (.635
2. How do you think your neighborhood compares with others in Cincinnati in terms of crime? Would you say it is (1) much more dangerous, (2) more dangerous, (3) about average, (4) less dnagerous, (5) much less dangerous.	3.68 (.838)	3.37 (.900)	3.02 (.773)	3.20 (.728	2.79 .829
3. Do you think that the use of hard drugs, like heroin, is a serious problem in your neighborhood? (1) yes, (5) no.	3.97 (1.76)	3.13 (2.00)	3.04 (2.00)	2.84 (2.00)	2.91 (2.00
4. Scale 1: 1 + 2 + 3, standardized $\left(\frac{X_{1i} - \overline{X_1}}{\sigma_1} + \frac{X_{2i} - \overline{X_2}}{\sigma_2} + \frac{X_{3i} - \overline{X_3}}{\sigma_3}\right)$	.986 (1.87)	.364 (1.99)	-.173 (1.94)	-.492 (1.87)	-.862 (2.05
5. Scale 2: 1 + 2, standardized $\left(\frac{X_{1i} - \overline{X_1}}{\sigma_1} + \frac{X_{2i} - \overline{X_2}}{\sigma_2}\right)$	.608 (1.45)	.409 (1.67)	-.153 (1.48)	-.294 (1.37)	-.534 (1.54

* Mean of item by area.

** Standard deviation of item.

Since the variables were coded in different fashions, each variable was standardized and the two scales were constructed by summing these standardized scores. As a result of the coding and standardizing procedures, a positive score on the scales corresponds to a perception of local crime as being low, while a negative score corresponds to a high perception of local crime. On both scales, the Outside sample displayed the lowest level of perception of crime and Mt. Adams placed second lowest. The Remainder sample fell in the middle, while the West End and Over-The-Rhine samples respectively displayed the second highest and highest levels of perception of crime.

The attitude-response items used in this analysis are presented in table 3. Items 1 and 2 are very similar to two of Conklin's safety in the community items, 7 and 8 correspond approximately to Conklin's interpersonal trust items (neighborhood specific), and 9 is similar to one of Conklin's affect questions. The additional items were chosen on the basis of face validity and their correlations with other items in each group.[1] Analysis of variance was applied to determine the amount of variance on each item which was accounted for by area differences. The areas were significantly different from each other on every item in excess of a probability of .001. Although the order of response by area was not the same for every item, the average order was identical to the order

obtained on the perception of crime scales.

Three control items were utilized to determine if the area differences could be explained by some demographic factor. For each attitude-response item, the effects of race, income, and education were examined. A multiple analysis of variance technique was applied in order to test the effect of the control variables singly and in the aggregate. In almost all cases, controlling for these three variables did not reduce the significance of the area differences below the .001 level of probability.

TABLE 3.

CINCINNATI: SAFETY, TRUST, AND AFFECT ITEMS

	Outside Dist. 1	Mt. Adams	Remndr. Dist. 1	West End	Over t Rhine
A. Safety in the Community Items					
1. How safe do you feel or would you feel being out alone in your neighborhood at night? (1) very safe, (2) reasonable safe, (3) somewhat unsafe, (4) very unsafe.	*2.22 **.984	1.81 .969	2.83 1.008	2.78 .995	2.99 .969
2. Which statement do you agree with most? My chances of being attacked or robbed have (1) gone up in the past few years, (2) my chances haven't changed, (3) my chances have gone down.	1.98 1.911	1.62 1.079	1.88 1.657	1.78 1.506	1.89 1.717
3. How safe do you feel or would you feel being out alone in your neighborhood during the day? (1) very safe, (2) reasonably safe, (3) somewhat unsafe, (4) very unsafe.	1.42 .644	1.21 .515	1.72 .737	1.81 .770	1.86 .745
4. Do you think that most people in this neighborhood have limited or changed their activities in the past few years because they are afraid of crime? (1) yes, (5) no.	3.66 1.892	3.95 1.763	3.16 1.998	2.79 1.993	2.98 2.004
5. In general, have you limited or changed your activities in the past few years because of crime? (1) yes, (5) no.	3.66 1.892	3.95 1.763	3.16 1.998	2.79 1.993	2.98 2.004
B. Interpersonal Trust Items					
6. How about any crimes which may be happening in your neighborhood? Would you say they are committed (1) mostly by people who live here, or (3) mostly by outsiders? (coded (2) if answer was 'equally by both')	2.21 .898	2.48 .808	2.13 .884	2.18 .791	2.00 .822
7. Would residents in your neighborhood (1) usually, (2) occasionally, or (3) seldom take a hand if juveniles and children were causing trouble or were on the verge of breaking the law?	1.67 .833	1.81 .847	2.21 .815	2.10 .752	2.24 .815

TABLE 3.

	Outside Dist. 1	Mt. Adams	Remndr. Dist. 1	West End	Over Rhin
8. From your viewpoint, would residents in your neighborhood (1) usually, (2) occasionally, or (3) seldom report crimes they observe to the police?	1.44 .726	1.41 .671	2.00 .852	2.08 .789	2.10 .831
C. Affect for Community Items					
9. Is there anything you don't like about this neighborhood? (1) yes, (5) no.	4.03 1.717	2.31 1.883	3.22 1.992	3.32 1.979	3.32 1.97
10. Do you think people in this neighborhood could get the police to change the way they do things if a change were needed? (1) yes, (5) no.	2.50 1.941	1.84 1.636	3.28 1.985	2.26 1.862	3.40 1.96

* Mean of item by area
** Standard deviation of item by area

Having developed perception of crime scales as similar as possible to the one used by Conklin, selected appropriate attitude-response items, and examined the strength of area differences, the next step was to test the relationship between the perception scales and the attitude-response items. To do this, a Pearson correlation coefficient was computed for each area separately between both scales and each attitude response item. This statistic is identical to the standardized regression coefficient obtained by Conklin's use of a regression analysis model. The resulting correlation coefficients are reported in Table 4.

If Conklin's threshold effect were operating, we would expect to see a pattern of low correlations in the left-hand columns and higher correlations in the right-hand columns. In other words, Mt. Adams and the area outside of district one, with low perceptions of local crime, should display a weak relationship between perceptions of crime and attitude - response items whereas the West End and Over-the-Rhine, with high perceptions of local crime, should display stronger relationships. As can be seen from the table, there is little evidence which supports the existence of such a threshold pattern. While Mt. Adams displays the lowest overall correlations, the area outside of district one, with lower perceptions of crime, displays a consistently higher level of relationships. Over-the-Rhine, with highest perceptions of crime, and the remainder area of

district one both display relationships which are very similar to those displayed by the outside area. Finally, the West End, with the second highest level of perceptions of crime, shows some degree of variation from item to item. Occasionally, it shows relationships similar to those of Over-the-Rhine and outside of district one, but primarily it shows relationships which are as weak or weaker than those of Mt. Adams.

TABLE 4.

CINCINNATI: CORRELATIONS OF SAFETY, TRUST, AND AFFECT ITEMS

WITH PERCEPTION OF CRIME SCALES

	Correlation of Item with Scale 1					Correlation of Item with Scale 2				
	Out of Dist. 1	Mt. Adams	Remndr. Dist. 1	West End	Over the Rhine	Out of Dist. 1	Mt. Adams	Remndr. Dist. 1	West End	Over th Rhine
1.	*-.38 **.001	-.23 .002	-.23 .001	-.23 .002	-.27 .001	-.37 .001	-.12 .07	-.26 .001	-.11 .06	-.23 .001
2.	.17 .01	.13 .06	.17 .01	.14 .05	.32 .001	.13 .02	.15 .03	.24 .001	.13 .03	.27 .001
3.	-.39 .001	-.21 .004	-.26 .001	-.31 .001	-.29 .001	-.34 .001	-.10 .10	-.16 .01	-.17 .01	-.28 .001
4.	.35 .001	.26 .001	.31 .001	.20 .01	.30 .001	.32 .001	.13 .05	.30 .001	.06 .20	.26 .001
5.	.22 .001	.19 .01	.24 .001	.01 .44	.28 .001	.22 .001	.07 .20	.21 .001	-.01 .44	.26 .001
6.	.25 .001	.07 .21	.32 .001	.29 .001	.27 .001	.23 .002	.00 .49	.28 .001	.29 .001	.27 .001
7.	-.26 .001	-.13 .06	-.14 .02	-.14 .05	-.20 .01	-.23 .001	-.10 .10	-.14 .02	-.11 .06	-.18 .01
8.	-.14 .02	-.05 .27	-.08 .11	-.27 .001	-.22 .002	-.12 .03	-.09 .14	-.13 .02	-.09 .11	-.18 .01
9.	.23 .001	.18 .01	.28 .001	.18 .01	.36 .001	.22 .001	.15 .03	.18 .003	.13 .03	.34 .001
10.	-.15 .02	.02 .42	.05 .25	-.09 .15	-.20 .01	-.12 .04	.00 .48	.02 .40	.02 .38	-.23 .001

* Correlation coefficient
** Significance of r

In addition to the mixed character of the relationships by area, there also appear to be some differences of relationship resulting from differences in the two scales which were used as indicators of perceptions of crime. In Mt. Adams, 5 variables showed a significant relationship ($p \leq .01$) to the first perception of crime scale, which included a drug-related item. None of these items were significantly related at the same level to the second perception of crime scale, which excluded the drug-related question, and four of the five were not even significant at the .05 level. A similar phenomenon occurred for the West End area. Of six variables which were significantly related at the .01 level to the first scale, only two showed as strong a relationship with the second scale. However, these inter-scale differences were absent with respect to the other three areas. There were no items in any of these areas which showed as substantial a difference in the strength of relationship to the two scales.

Although the magnitude of local perceptions of crime does not appear to be directly related to the strength of relationships between such perceptions and individual attitudes and reactions toward crime, the data in this survey do suggest that some other factors may be operating to produce such differences. It is possible that such factors may operate independently of the level of perceptions

or in some fashion which intervenes with the effect of perception levels. Conklin's findings, with only two areas observed, could have occurred in the presence of either of these alternative explanations.

In addition to individual factors which may vary between communities, the differential reactions of Mt. Adams and West End to the two perception scales suggests that such relationships may also be dependent upon perceptions of more specific aspects of the crime problem. Mt. Adams and West End tend to demonstrate stronger relationships when a drug-related question is included as aprt of the measure of local crime perception. The other areas do not appear to make this distinction. It is possible that feelings of personal safety, etc. are related to specific aspects of criminal behavior which vary from area to area, and that questions concerning general perceptions of crime tap this concern with respect to aspects of the crime problem in some areas, but not in others. Thus, rather than assume a general threshold effect between levels of crime perception and dimensions of social response, it would perhaps be more profitable to explore how social response is related to specific aspects of crime within an individual community. Following this approach, it would then be reasonable to explore the relationship among perceptions of specific crime probelms. From this it may become possible to predict on the basis of a community's characteristics those

aspects of the crime probelm which are likely to be of greatest concern to the residents of a given community.

In comparison to Cincinnati, the Hartford data does not appear to be as intrinsically useful for the purposes of this analysis. The two neighborhoods examined by this study, North End and Asylum Hill, are quite similar in terms of demographic characteristics and shared problems. The other two areas consist of those census tracts which were adjacent to the study neighborhoods, and the remainder of Hartford. The magnitude of differences by area to the perception of crime items are not as great as they are for Cincinnati. Therefore, a failure to uncover a threshold effect could be due to an insufficient range of variation on the perception of crime items. However, the Hartford data had been previously analyzed in conjunction with another project. (Baumer, 1976) Partly because this work could facilitate the Conklin replication, it was decided to examine the Hartford data as a supplement to the Cincinnati analysis.

Table 5 presents the wording and coding of those items used to construct the perception of crime scales for Hartford. Scale one is composed of those items which were most similar to the questions used by Conklin. Scale two consists of a series of items in which people were asked to assess the extent to which specific types of criminal behavior were a problem in their neighborhoods.

suggested by a preliminary
This scale was factor analysis of items addressing neighborhood problems which was performed as part of a related paper. (Baumer, 1976). Since the coding sceme for each of these items was the same, both scales were constructed by summing the individual items. This was the same procedure used by Conklin in his study.

TABLE 5.

HARTFORD: PERCEPTION OF CRIME ITEMS AND SCALES

	North End	Asylum Hill	Adjacent	Remnd
1. Burglary as you know involves someone illegally entering a home to steal something. Do you think there is (1) more burglary here in the neighborhood than in the rest of the city, is there (3) less burglary, or is it (2) about the same here as in the rest of Hartford?	*2.23 **(.675)	2.33 (.726)	2.38 (.656	2.45 (.67
2. How about crimes such as robbery--taking something from people by force--is there (1) more here, (3) less, or (2) about the same as in the rest of Hartford?	2.17 (.705)	2.22 (.754)	2.44 (.632)	2.49 (.67
3. From what you've heard, have crimes like robbery and burglary (1) gone up in Hartfoed, (3) gone down, or (2) stayed about the same over the past year or so?	1.66 (.730)	1.91 (.815)	1.79 (.801)	1.74 (.76
4. I am going to read you a list of crime-related problems that exist in some areas. For each, I want you to tell me whether it is a (1) big problem, (2) some problem, or (3) almost no problem in your neighborhood. How much of a problem is prostitution?	2.47 (.766)	2.30 (.834)	2.69 (.624)	2.79 (.54
5. Stealing cars?	2.21 (.843)	2.37 (.765)	2.45 (.698)	2.46 (.69
6. Burglary-breaking into people's homes?	1.97 (.806)	2.44 (.774)	2.24 (.793)	2.30 (.70
7. Robbing people on the street?	2.11 (.801)	2.19 (.766)	2.37 (.735)	2.47 (.68
8. Holding up and robbing small stores or businesses?	2.27 (.800)	2.34 (.804)	2.33 (.765)	2.43 (.727
9. People being beaten up or hurt on the streets?	2.32 (.798)	2.39 (.737)	2.49 (.721)	2.59 (.63

TABLE 5.

	North End	Asylum Hill	Adjacent	Remndr.
10. Scale1: 1 + 2 + 3	6.06 (1.60)	6.44 (1.62)	6.62 (1.48)	6.67 (1.62)
11. Scale 2: 4 + 5 + 6 + 7 + 8 + 9	13.28 (3.79)	13.87 (3.66)	14.56 (3.41)	15.07 (3.01)

* Mean of item by area
** Standard deviation of item

The Hartford survey included numerous items pertaining to feelings of personal safety in the community. Items one through nine in Table 6 represent those questions which were most similar to Conklin's safety in the community category. Questions 10, 11, 12 are those which were most similar to the interpersonal trust classification. There were no useful items in the Hartford survey pertaining to community affect. Items 13 and 14 are scales composed of questions concerning precautions and protective measures undertaken by respondents. They include such actions as carrying a weapon or obtaining an escort when walking in dangerous areas (personal protection) and installing burglar alarms or acquiring theft insurance (home protection). Table 6 presents the wording and coding of these items and the results of the correlation analysis between the items and the perception of crime scales.

TABLE 6.

HARTFORD: SAFETY AND TRUST ITEMS AND PROTECTIVE MOBILIZATION

SCALES CORRELATED WITH PERCEPTION OF CRIME SCALES

	North End	Asylum Hill	Adjacent	Remndr.
A. Safety in the Community Items				
1. In the daytime, how worried are you about being held up on the street, threatened, beaten up or anything of that sort in your neighborhood? Would you say you are (1) very worried, (2) somewhat worried, (3) just a little worried, (4) not at all worried?	*3.14 **.27 ***.34	3.26 .31 .39	3.27 .22 .23	3.32 .33 .37
2. How about at night, how worried are you about that sort of thing in your neighborhood (being held up, etc.) -- (1) very worried, (2) somewhat worried, (3) just a little worried, (4) not al all worried?	2.31 .34 .27	2.41 .33 .31	2.39 .13 .16	2.42 .32 .23
3. How worried are you about your home being broken into or entered illegally in the daytime when no one is home? Are you (1) very worried, (2) somewhat worried, (3) just a little worried, (4) not worried at all?	2.52 .27 .28	3.03 .31 .34	2.73 .33 .40	2.87 .26 .36
4. How about at night, how worried are you about your home being broken into then when you're not at home- (1) very worried, (2) somewhat worried, (3) just a little worried, (4) not at all worried.	2.44 .31 .25	3.08 .23 .22	2.60 .34 .37	2.74 .23 .30
5. Think of a scale from 0 to 10. Zero stands for no possibility at all and ten stands for extremely likely. During the course of a year, how likely is it that someone would break into your house or apartment when no one is home?	5.70 -.34 -.35	3.49 -.43 -.33	4.48 -.31 -.33	3.85 -.39 -.42
6. During the course of a year, how likely is it that someone would break into your home when someone is home? (1) no possibility at all, (10) extremely likely.	2.13 -.15 -.24	1.46 -.34 -.24	1.86 -.16 -.26	2.00 -.26 -.41
7. During the course of a year, how likely is it that your purse or wallet would be snatched in your neighborhood? (0) no possibility at all, (10) extremely likely.	4.20 -.25 -.42	4.10 -.35 -.47	3.31 -.23 -.32	3.00 -.34 -.43

TABLE 6.

	North End	Asylum Hill	Adjacent	Remndr.
8. During the course of a year, how likely is it that someone would take something from you on the street by force or threat in your neighborhood? (0) no possibility at all, (10) extremely likely.	4.20 -.25 -.35	4.10 -.35 -.47	3.31 -.23 -.26	3.00 -.34 -.35
9. During the course of a year, how likely is it that someone would beat you up or hurt you on the street in your neighborhood? (0) no possibility at all, (10) extremely likely.	3.64 -.20 -.36	3.67 -.33 -.48	2.84 -.19 -.23	2.47 -.30 -.50
B. Interpersonal Trust Items				
10. During the day when no one was home, how hard would it be for a stranger to break into your home without a neighbor being suspicious and calling the police? Let (0) stand for extremely easy, and (10) stand for extremely difficult.	5.39 .14 .16	5.68 .21 ,10	5.93 .11 .10	5.90 .13 .19
11. How many people living in this area do you think would report a crime to the police, such as burglary, if they saw it happening to someone they did not know? (1) all of them, (2) most of them, (3) some of them, (4) a few of them, (5) almost none.	2.90 -.22 -.07	2.43 -.13 -.08	2.64 -.20 -.16	2.37 -.24 -.19
12. In some neighborhoods, people do things together and help each other--in other neighborhoods, people mostly go their own ways. In general, what kind of neighborhood would you say this is mostly - (1) one where people help each other or (2) one where people go their own ways.	1.57 -.21 -.08	1.63 -.10 -.00	1.56 -.09 -.03	1.51 -.23 -.13
C. Protective Mobilization Scales				
13. Mobilization for personal protection scale. (0) no measures for personal protection undertaken, (1) one or more measures for personal protection undertaken.	.32 -.03 -.05	.26 -.05 -.11	.16 .06 .08	.15 .00 .08
14. Mobilization for home protection scale. (0) no measures for home protection undertaken, (1) one or more measures for personal protection undertaken.	.75 .04 .01	.83 -.05 -.04	.76 .00 .08	.69 -.02 -.05

* Mean of item by area
** Correlation coefficient of item with Scale 1
*** Correlation coefficient of item with Scale 2

The analysis found very little variation in the nature of the relationships by area or between the two scales. The nine safety items show fairly strong correlations in all four of the areas. The areas are also similar to each other on the interpersonal trust items, though the strength of relationship here is somewhat weaker. Finally, it is interesting to note that there is no relationship between perceptions of crime and the exercise of protective measures for any of the areas. This seems particularly significant given the strong relationship between the two scales and the personal safety items.

These results allow for numerous explanations. As mentioned previously, the failure to uncover a threshold effect could be due to an insufficient range of area differences on the perception of crime scales. The similarity of relationships also suggests that the areas may have enough in common in terms of demographic make-up and shared experiences so as to react similarly to crime problems, regardless of levels of perception for local neighborhoods. Finally, it should be noted that the two scales address specific aspects of crime; burglary and robbery in the first scale, and a wider range of problems in the second. The lack of inter-scale differences suggests that all areas in this study respond to burglary and/or robbery problems. However, the possibility exists that differential reactions to these two problems could be uncovered by more specifically

focused analysis.

In conclusion, it cannot be stated with great conviction that Conklin's threshold effect has been conclusively supported or refuted. While the findings tend to point toward a refutation of the hypothesis, there is nonetheless some evidence that the effect may exist as part of a more complex set of inter-relationships between perceptions of various aspects of crime and a variety of individual and social responses. Thus, the most valuable outcome of having followed Conklin's lead in this analysis is the range of new questions which this effort has generated.

REFERENCES

1. Baumer, Terry. "Dimensions of Fear", Reactions to Crime Project; Northwestern University, Center for Urban Affairs (Summer, 1976). Working paper in process.

2. Clarren, Sumner N. and Alfred I. Schwartz. Measuring A Program's Impact On Crime With Victimization Surveys. Washington D.C.: The Urban Institute (January 14, 1976).

3. Clarren, Sumner N. and Alfred I. Schwartz. Cincinnati's Team Policing Program: 18 Months of Evaluation. Washington D.C.: The Urban Institute (August 8, 1975).

4. Clarren, Sumner N. and Alfred I. Schwartz. An Evaluation of Cincinnati's Team Policing Program. Washington D.C.: The Urban Institute (October 8, 1974).

5. Conklin, John E. The Impact of Crime. New York: Macmillan (1975).

6. Conklin, John E. :Dimensions of Community Response to the Crime Problem", Social Problems 18:3 (Winter, 1971), 373-385.

7. Ennis, Philip H. Criminal Victimization in the United States, A Report of a National Survey. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office (1967).

8. Mangione, Thomas W. and Cassandra Noble. "Baseline Survey Measurement Including Updata Survey Information for the Evaluation of a Crime Control Model", University of Massachusetts-Boston (1975). Draft report.

9. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office (1967).

10. Reiss, Albert J. "Measurement of the Nature and Amount of Crime", Studies in Crime and Law Enforcement in Major Metropolitan Areas. Vol. 1. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office (1967).

11. Schwartz, Alfred I., Sumner N. Clarren, Thomas Fischgrund, Eric F. Hollins, and Paul G. Nalley. Evaluation of Cincinnati's Community Sector Team Policing Program. Progress Report: After One Year Summary of Major Findings. Washington D.C.: The Urban Institute (March 17, 1975).

APPENDIX I.

CONKLIN'S ATTITUDE-RESPONSE ITEMS

	Suburb	Urban Communi
A. Safety in the Community Items		
1. Some people worry a great deal about having their house broken into, and other people are not as concerned. Are you very concerned, somewhat concerned, or not at all concerned about this? (Percent not at all concerned).	51.1 *r=.07 **P=NS	35.7 r=-.29 P=.001
2. How safe do you feel walking alone in your neighborhood when it's dark? (Percent very safe and somewhat safe).	85.6 -.08 P=NS	63.1 -.28 P=.002
3. How likely is it that a person walking around here at night will be hald up or attacked? (Percent very unlikely and somewhat unlikely).	84.9 -.06 P=NS	65.8 -.46 P=.001
B. Interpersonal Trust Items		
4. Most people in this neighborhood can be trusted. (Percent agree and strongly agree).	88.3 -.07 P=NS	67.2 -.35 P=.001
5. Most people in this neighborhood are truthful and dependable. (Percent agree and strongly agree).	83.9 .01 P=NS	65.4 -.31 P=.001
6. Nice as it may be to have faith in your fellow man, it seldom pays off. (Percent disagree and strongly disagree).	70.8 -.10 P=NS	46.9 -.01 P=NS
7. The world is full of people who will take advantage of you if you give them the slightest opportunity. (Percent disagree and strongly disagree).	37.5 -.05 P=NS	15.6 -.07 P=NS
C. Affect for Community Items		
8. Do you think that this community is a good place to bring up children? (Percent yes).	94.9 -.34 P=.001	47.7 -.33 P=.001

APPENDIX 1.

	Suburb	Urban Commun
9. Would you someday like to move to another neighborhood? (Percent no).	55.1 -.09 P=NS	37.5 -.13 P=NS
10. On the whole, do you like living in this community or not? (Percent no).	95.6 -.01 P=NS	61.7 -.28 P=.00
11. How would you describe the attitudes of your neighbors toward strangers from outside the neighborhood? (Percent very friendly or somewhat friendly).	51.6 -.05 P=NS	52.4 -.17 P=.06

* Correlation coefficient between item and perception of crime scale.
** Significance of r.