Illinois Wesleyan University
Digital Commons @ IWU

Projects | Action Research Center

2010

Westside of Bloomington: Crime Climate Survey

Ryan Lambert, '10
Illinois Wesleyan University

Recommended Citation
Lambert, '10, Ryan, "Westside of Bloomington: Crime Climate Survey" (2010). *Projects.* Paper 1.
http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/arc_projects/1

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Action Research Center at Digital Commons @ IWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Projects by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ IWU. For more information, please contact sdaviska@iwu.edu.
©Copyright is owned by the author of this document.

Action Research Center

Westside of Bloomington:
Crime Climate Survey

Ryan Lambert

December 10th, 2010

The results of this survey have provided some expected but interesting results. Ethnicity and age appeared to play a major role in predicting how residents felt in their neighborhood. For instance middle aged residents felt the least safe in their neighborhood, while younger and older residents felt much safer. Ethnicity though is the standout variable. Whites fear crime at a higher rate and believe certain crimes are much more frequent than non-whites, particularly when it comes to drugs and assault crimes. One more figure of importance, shows a reported victimization rate of 23.7%. The survey was completed by 202 residents, resulting in a margin of error +/- 8%. The responses were evenly distributed within the designated survey area.

Background

The city of Bloomington conducted a large city-wide survey at the end of 2009. One of the major revelations from this survey was that the west-side of Bloomington had a higher perception rate of crime in comparison to other parts of the city. Members of the Bloomington Police Department (BPD) theorized that one of the possible causes for this heightened perception was due to victimization. Victimization occurs when people refuse or neglect to report crimes, thus fostering an atmosphere where crimes could occur unpunished. This caused Karen Schmidt, a city council member, to set out and create a survey focused on the west-side. In cooperation with the BPD a survey was created focusing on victimization along with the following other aspects: fear of crime, causes of crimes, frequency of crimes, and community involvement. The hopes for this survey were to provide insight into what has caused the west-side to differ from the rest of Bloomington and possibly how to solve these issues.

Purpose

The goal of the survey is to provide a more precise measurement of the climate of crime on the west side of Bloomington. The questions asked sought to identify numerous factors that lead to an increase in fear among residents, along with other related factors to crime within the neighborhood. The questions were created in cooperation with the Bloomington Police Department and alderwoman Karen Schmidt. On March 5th, 2010 a meeting was held in which the main concerns of the BPD were discussed in order to ensure that the survey could be a useful tool for the city. Eight questions were created that focused on crime in the neighborhood, fear of crime, and how to possibly prevent or reduce crime (*Appendix*).

Procedure and Implementation

The survey was conducted in the neighborhood that lies south of Empire Street, north of Oakland Avenue, west of Roosevelt Avenue, and east of the tracks that run parallel to South Lumber Street. This area was chosen because according to the 2009 city-wide survey, this neighborhood showed high rates of fear of crime. Each survey was conducted by volunteers who went door to door in order to illicit responses. The volunteers were asked to read a letter of consent to the surveyed residents, which was then given to each resident after the survey, was completed. The total amount of surveys collected was 202, which were evenly distributed throughout the surveyed area. All surveys were collected between May and September of 2010.

Survey

The survey consisted of eight opinion questions and four demographic questions. Listed below is each question along with a brief description of why this question was chosen. Also detailed below are the frequencies for each question. The questions are listed as they appeared on the survey.

Question 1 – Safety in Neighborhood

On a scale of 1 to 10 how safe do you feel in your neighborhood? (1-very unsafe and 10-very safe)

This question provides a general barometer to assess how safe people feel in their neighborhood. The question asked residents to rate how safe they feel in the neighborhood on a scale from 1 to 10, with 1 equal to unsafe and 10 equal to very safe. The responses were then coded into three categories with the following breakdowns: unsafe 1-4, neutral 5-7, and very safe 8-10.

Safety

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unsafe	26	12.5	12.6	12.6
	Semi-Safe	90	43.3	43.5	56.0
	Very Safe	91	43.8	44.0	100.0
	Total	207	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.5		
Total		208	100.0		

Question 2 – Fear of Crime

Do you personally fear that a crime will be committed against you or someone close to you in the future?

This question differs from question 1 by addressing the personal fear of a crime being committed against someone or people close to them, rather than a general barometer for how safe the neighborhood feels. The question asked residents if they fear a crime will be committed against themselves or someone close to them by giving an affirmative or negative response.

Fear of Crime

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	82	39.4	39.6	39.6
	No	125	60.1	60.4	100.0
	Total	207	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.5		
Total		208	100.0		

Question 3 – Witnessed a Crime

Have you ever witnessed a crime—or had one committed against you—and not reported it to the police?

This question attempts to measure the rate of victimization that occurs in the neighborhood, which as noted earlier is one of the concerns for the BPD. Respondents were asked if they have ever witnessed a crime or had one committed against themselves and not reported it to the police. This question then subsequently led to a follow up question if answered affirmatively.

Witnessed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	49	23.6	23.7	23.7
	No	158	76.0	76.3	100.0
	Total	207	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.5		
Total		208	100.0		

Question 4 – Crime Occurred

If so, what type of crime occurred?

This question acted as a follow up to question 3. It was therefore only asked to residents that said yes to question 3. Verbatim answers were then recorded and tallied.

Response	**Total**
Assault/Domestic Abuse	*18*
Vandalism	*10*
Robbery	*9*
Drug Related Crimes	*7*
Prostitution/Public Indecency	*2*
Shootings	*2*
Other	*3*

Question 5 – Most Frequent Crimes

What crimes do you feel are most frequent in your neighborhood? (Circle all that apply)
a. Robbery
b. Drug Sales/Usage
c. Assault/Battery
d. Residential/Auto Burglary
e. Gang Crime
f. Vandalism
g. Other

This question seeks to find out which crimes residents believe to be most frequent in their neighborhood. A list of six crimes was compiled, along with the option of answering 'other'. These particular crimes were chosen because they included most crimes that are committed and still have enough focus to produce concise results. Each crime's frequency is listed, but all were included in one question on the survey in which respondents could pick as many choices that they felt applied.

Robbery

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	55	26.4	26.4	26.4
	No	153	73.6	73.6	100.0
	Total	208	100.0	100.0	

Drug

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	100	48.1	48.1	48.1
	No	108	51.9	51.9	100.0
	Total	208	100.0	100.0	

Assault

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	56	26.9	26.9	26.9
	No	152	73.1	73.1	100.0
	Total	208	100.0	100.0	

Residential

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	54	26.0	26.0	26.0
	No	154	74.0	74.0	100.0
	Total	208	100.0	100.0	

Gang

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	51	24.5	24.5	24.5
	No	157	75.5	75.5	100.0
	Total	208	100.0	100.0	

Vandalism

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	88	42.3	42.3	42.3
	No	120	57.7	57.7	100.0
	Total	208	100.0	100.0	

Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	19	9.1	9.1	9.1
	No	189	90.9	90.9	100.0
	Total	208	100.0	100.0	

Question 6 – Causes of Crime

What factors, in your opinion, contribute to the crimes you have witnessed? (Circle all that apply)

a. Poor Property Maintenance
b. Low Police Visibility
c. Poor Lighting
d. Lack of Neighborhood Resident Involvement
e. Unreported Crimes
f. Other

This question attempts to reveal what factors lead to crime and fear in the neighborhood. Just as with question 5, each respondent was given a list of choices and asked to choose as many as they felt applied. Each response's frequency is listed individually below.

Property

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	47	22.6	22.6	22.6
	No	161	77.4	77.4	100.0
	Total	208	100.0	100.0	

Police

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	83	39.9	39.9	39.9
	No	125	60.1	60.1	100.0
	Total	208	100.0	100.0	

Light

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	86	41.3	41.3	41.3
	No	122	58.7	58.7	100.0
	Total	208	100.0	100.0	

Neighborhood

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	69	33.2	33.2	33.2
	No	139	66.8	66.8	100.0
	Total	208	100.0	100.0	

Unreported

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	49	23.6	23.6	23.6
	No	159	76.4	76.4	100.0
	Total	208	100.0	100.0	

Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	32	15.4	15.4	15.4
	No	176	84.6	84.6	100.0
	Total	208	100.0	100.0	

Question 7 – Community Watch

Would you be interested in forming a community watch for your neighborhood?

One of the possible methods used to combat crime involved using community watches. This question asks if respondents would simply be interested in forming or participating in a community watch.

Community Watch

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	94	45.2	45.6	45.6
	No	112	53.8	54.4	100.0
	Total	206	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.0		
Total		208	100.0		

Question 8 – Police Interaction

On a scale of 1 to 10, how important is it for you to know the police officers in your neighborhood? (1—not important and 10 –very important)

The final substantive question flushes out whether people believe it is important to know their police officers. One of the actions the BPD hoped to take in combating fear and crime in the neighborhood is to have their officers perform door to door talks with residents. They hope that citizens will be less fearful of crime and report more crimes if they know the police on a more one on one level. The question was based on a 10 point scale in which 1 equaled 'not important' and 10 equaled 'very important'. The results were then coded as follows: 1-4 equals not important, 5-7 equals average importance, and 8-10 equals very important.

Knowing the Police

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	46	22.1	23.0	23.0
	Average	61	29.3	30.5	53.5
	Very Important	93	44.7	46.5	100.0
	Total	200	96.2	100.0	
Missing	System	8	3.8		
Total		208	100.0		

Question 9 – Age

What is the year of your birth?

Resident's ages were asked in order to find out if age played a major role in the results. The ages were coded into the following categories: 18-29, 30-54, and 55+. These groups were chosen because they roughly represent different stages in life.

Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18-29	44	21.2	21.3	21.3
	30-54	115	55.3	55.6	76.8
	55+	48	23.1	23.2	100.0
	Total	207	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.5		
Total		208	100.0		

Question 10 – Gender

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	92	44.2	44.9	44.9
	Female	113	54.3	55.1	100.0
	Total	205	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.4		
Total		208	100.0		

Question 11 – Ethnicity

Ethnicity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	White	111	53.4	54.1	54.1
	Non-White	94	45.2	45.9	100.0
	Total	205	98.6	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.4		
Total		208	100.0		

Data

Presented below are ten crosstabs and the explanation of two questions that were modified in order to find out if some correlations were present but not visible using the original eight survey questions. Each crosstab compares two questions from the survey in order to find out if they are correlated thus demonstrating that a relationship is present. Only ten crosstabs are presented because they were the only relationships that were statistically significant. Statistical significance is crucial in determining if the relationship occurred randomly along with an appropriate chi-square. Thus the following correlations can be interpreted as legitimate relationships and not simply occurring by chance if they are statistically significant at the .05 level or lower and if the chi-square figure is equal to or larger than the chi-square value found in a degree of freedom chart. To sum this up the following crosstabs present correlations which can be determined to have not occurred by random chance. Therefore the following data from a sample of residents can be generalized to the greater population on the west side of Bloomington. Also presented are two more frequencies for questions 5 and 6. These two frequencies looked at the number of responses given for each question because respondents were asked to report all answers that they felt applied to their neighborhood. These new sets of data were also used just like the survey questions in order to find any possible correlations.

Combined Question 5

The number of crimes the residents said were 'frequent' is recorded in order to give an overall view how many different crimes residents believe are common in their neighborhood. If a resident gave 0-2 responses then they would fall into the first category, if they gave 3-4 responses then they fall into a second category, and if they gave 5-7 responses they fall into a third category. These breakdowns divide the respondents into three distinct categories, from a few frequent crimes to many frequent crimes occurring in their neighborhood. The frequency chart presented shows that residents believe that only a few crimes are occurring frequently with 72.6% of the residents saying that 0-2 crimes occur frequently. This may mean that the

neighborhood is actually not as unsafe as some may believe. These results though do not measure how strongly residents believe each crime is in the neighborhood. Thus one cannot be sure if some residents only gave one response, but believe the one response is a very grave matter for the neighborhood.

Number of Choices for Question 5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-2	151	72.6	72.6	72.6
	3-4	47	22.6	22.6	95.2
	5-7	10	4.8	4.8	100.0
	Total	208	100.0	100.0	

Combined Question 6

This frequency mirrors the "combined question 5" frequency, except for its breakdown into different categories. If a resident gave 0-1 answers for question six they fall into the first category, if they gave 2-3 answers then they fall into a second category, and if they gave 4-6 answers they fall into a third category. Just as with the previous combined question, most residents only gave a few responses, with a total of 77.9% giving 0-1 answers. The results can be interpreted as an indicator of the number of issues that residents feel need to be resolved in order to deal with the crime issues in the neighborhood. The theory would be that if residents only gave 0-1 responses then they most likely believe there are a few select issues that can be addressed, thus indicating that a solution seems possible. While a resident that gave 5-7 responses may be less optimistic about improving the neighborhood. Therefore few responses indicate a safer neighborhood and a more optimistic view of the neighborhood. One important note though is that this does not measure to which degree each problem plays in the neighborhood. For instance if a resident felt 'resident involvement' was a major issue and would likely not be resolved then they would fall into the first category thus possibly indicating a more optimistic view even if they felt this problem was very problematic. Nevertheless this data does reveal how many issues residents believe are plaguing their neighborhood.

Number of Choices for Question 6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-1	162	77.9	77.9	77.9
	2-3	38	18.3	18.3	96.2
	4-6	8	3.8	3.8	100.0
	Total	208	100.0	100.0	

Age → Safety in Neighborhood

Crosstab

			Age			Total
			18-29	30-55	55+	
Safety	Unsafe (1-4)	Count	2	20	4	26
		% within Age	4.7%	17.4%	8.3%	12.6%
	Semi-Safe (5-7)	Count	16	53	20	89
		% within Age	37.2%	46.1%	41.7%	43.2%
	Safe (8-10)	Count	25	42	24	91
		% within Age	58.1%	36.5%	50.0%	44.2%
Total		Count	43	115	48	206
		% within Age	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.333[a]	4	.053
Likelihood Ratio	9.827	4	.043
Linear-by-Linear Association	.490	1	.484
N of Valid Cases	206		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.43.

This crosstab seeks to identify if age is correlated to how safe one feels in their neighborhood. The correlation is ***not*** *statistically significant because it falls outside the .05 level. Given that this correlation is not statistically significant, one cannot rule out that this relationship could occur by chance. This relationship is the only one reported which is not statistically significant, but is reported, nevertheless, because of how close to statistical significance it is and what the results show. One note is that middle aged people seem to feel less safe in their neighborhood. For instance 17.4% of 30-55 year olds felt unsafe and 36.5% felt safe. This differs quite a bit from the other two age categories that both had less than 10% that felt unsafe and 50% or greater that felt safe. It also has a chi-square value that falls just short of the cutoff point. This demonstrates a moderately weak relationship between the two variables. It is important to note that this correlation is only provided for further research but cannot be scientifically supported because it is not statistically significant.*

Ethnicity → Drug Crime Frequency

Crosstab

			Ethnicity		
			White	Non-White	Total
Drug	Yes	Count	68	30	98
		% within Ethnicity	61.3%	31.9%	47.8%
	No	Count	43	64	107
		% within Ethnicity	38.7%	68.1%	52.2%
Total		Count	111	94	205
		% within Ethnicity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.567[a]	1	.000
Continuity Correction[b]	16.411	1	.000
Likelihood Ratio	17.865	1	.000
Fisher's Exact Test			
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.482	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	205		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 44.94.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

This crosstab seeks to find a correlation between ethnicity and if one believes drug crimes are frequent in their neighborhood. The correlation is statistically significant at the .000 level, and it has a chi-square value that surpasses the critical value needed, therefore this relationship is strong. Clearly whites believe that drug related crimes are frequent in their neighborhood, while non-whites disagree. With 61.3% of whites believe drugs are a frequent crime, where only 31.9% of non-whites share that belief.

Ethnicity → Fear of Crime

Crosstab

			Ethnicity		
			White	Non-White	Total
Fear of Crime	Yes	Count	50	30	80
		% within Ethnicity	45.5%	31.9%	39.2%
	No	Count	60	64	124
		% within Ethnicity	54.5%	68.1%	60.8%
Total		Count	110	94	204
		% within Ethnicity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.898[a]	1	.048
Continuity Correction[b]	3.351	1	.067
Likelihood Ratio	3.926	1	.048
Fisher's Exact Test			
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.879	1	.049
N of Valid Cases	204		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 36.86.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

This crosstab seeks to find out if there is a correlation between ethnicity and if one fears that a crime will be committed against someone close to them or themselves. The correlation is statistically significant at the .048 level and has a chi-square value that is just over the cutoff point. This information reveals that this relationship is strongly correlated and chance can be ruled out. According to the crosstab white's fear that a crime will be committed against themselves more than non-whites. While 45.5% of whites felt fearful, only 31.9% of non-whites shared the same feeling of fear.

Fear of Crime → Robbery Crime Frequency

Crosstab

			Fear of Crime		
			Yes	No	Total
Robbery	Yes	Count	29	26	55
		% within FearCrime	35.4%	20.8%	26.6%
	No	Count	53	99	152
		% within FearCrime	64.6%	79.2%	73.4%
Total		Count	82	125	207
		% within FearCrime	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.385[a]	1	.020
Continuity Correction[b]	4.664	1	.031
Likelihood Ratio	5.308	1	.021
Fisher's Exact Test			
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.359	1	.021
N of Valid Cases	207		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.79.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

This crosstab seeks to find a correlation between if one fears that a crime will be committed against someone they know or themselves and if one feels robbery is a frequent crime in their neighborhood. Thus fear of crime affects if someone believes robbery is a frequent crime. It appears that people that fear crime more, do not necessarily believe robbery is a frequent crime. Out of the people that fear crime, 64.6% do not believe robbery is a frequent crime. This correlation is statistically significant at the .20 level and has a chi-square value that exceeds the critical cutoff point; therefore the relationship is strong.

Fear of Crime → Assault Crime Frequency

Crosstab

			FearCrime		Total
			Yes	No	
Assault	Yes	Count	29	27	56
		% within FearCrime	35.4%	21.6%	27.1%
	No	Count	53	98	151
		% within FearCrime	64.6%	78.4%	72.9%
Total		Count	82	125	207
		% within FearCrime	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.755[a]	1	.029
Continuity Correction[b]	4.083	1	.043
Likelihood Ratio	4.690	1	.030
Fisher's Exact Test			
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.732	1	.030
N of Valid Cases	207		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.18.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

This crosstab is similar to the previous one except it replaces robbery with assault. This relationship reveals that how much one fears crime affects if they feel assault crimes are frequent in their neighborhood. Almost 15% more 'fearful' people felt assault crimes were frequent, in comparison to people who did not fear crime in their neighborhood. This relationship is statistically significant at the .029 level, along with having a chi-square value that surpasses the critical value. This then allows one to rule out that the correlation occurred by random chance and demonstrates that this is a strong relationship. One can assume a resident who fears crime will also believe assault crimes are more frequent.

Fear of Crime → Safety in Neighborhood

Crosstab

			FearCrime		
			Yes	No	Total
Safety	Unsafe	Count	21	5	26
		% within FearCrime	25.9%	4.0%	12.6%
	Semi-Safe	Count	46	43	89
		% within FearCrime	56.8%	34.4%	43.2%
	Safe	Count	14	77	91
		% within FearCrime	17.3%	61.6%	44.2%
Total		Count	81	125	206
		% within FearCrime	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	46.276[a]	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	49.233	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	45.821	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	206		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.22.

This crosstab hopes to find out if there is a correlation between fear of crime being committed against someone or someone close to themselves and how safe one feels in their neighborhood. Not surprisingly people who fear crime also feel disproportionately unsafe in their neighborhood. This goes the same for people that do not fear crime. A total of 61.6% of these people also felt safe in their neighborhood while only 4% felt unsafe. This relationship can be considered reliable because it has a chi-square value outside the critical level and is statistically significant at the .000 level

Fear of Crime → Community Watch Involvement

Crosstab

			FearCrime		Total
			Yes	No	
CommWatch	Yes	Count	48	46	94
		% within FearCrime	59.3%	37.1%	45.9%
	No	Count	33	78	111
		% within FearCrime	40.7%	62.9%	54.1%
Total		Count	81	124	205
		% within FearCrime	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.693[a]	1	.002
Continuity Correction[b]	8.821	1	.003
Likelihood Ratio	9.735	1	.002
Fisher's Exact Test			
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.645	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	205		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 37.14.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

This crosstab seeks to find out how fear of crime correlates to the willingness of people to join or start a community watch. Not surprisingly people who did fear crime were also much more willing to participate in a community watch. Over 59% of people who feared crime also were willing to participate in a community watch. While 37.1% of those that said they do not fear crime were willing to participate in a community watch. This difference of over 20% is statistically significant at the .002 level and has a chi-square value that exceeds the critical value. Thus the chance that the relationship occurred randomly can be ruled out and one can determine that this relationship is strong.

Safety in Neighborhood → Drug Crime Frequency

Crosstab

			Safety			Total
			Unsafe	Average	Safe	
Drug	Yes	Count	19	47	33	99
		% within Safety1	73.1%	52.2%	36.3%	47.8%
	No	Count	7	43	58	108
		% within Safety1	26.9%	47.8%	63.7%	52.2%
Total		Count	26	90	91	207
		% within Safety1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.216[a]	2	.002
Likelihood Ratio	12.498	2	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.055	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	207		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.43.

This crosstab seeks to find a correlation between how safe one feels in their neighborhood and if one believes drug crimes are frequent in the neighborhood. For people who felt unsafe, 73.1% felt drug crimes were frequent, while for people who felt safe, only 36.3% felt drug crimes were frequent. This relationship is statistically significant at the .002 level and has a chi-square value that is larger than the necessary critical value. Therefore the relationship is strong and one can rule out the null hypothesis.

Safety in Neighborhood → Gang Crime Frequency

Crosstab

			Safety			Total
			Unsafe	Average	Safe	
Gang	Yes	Count	12	23	16	51
		% within Safety1	46.2%	25.6%	17.6%	24.6%
	No	Count	14	67	75	156
		% within Safety1	53.8%	74.4%	82.4%	75.4%
Total		Count	26	90	91	207
		% within Safety1	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.963[a]	2	.011
Likelihood Ratio	8.320	2	.016
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.010	1	.005
N of Valid Cases	207		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.41.

This crosstab seeks to find out if a correlation exists between how safe one feels in their neighborhood and if one believes gang crimes are frequent in their neighborhood. Just as with the similar crosstab between safety and drug crimes, people who felt unsafe also felt gang crimes were frequent in their neighborhood. For instance of those that felt safe in their neighborhood, did not believe gang crimes were frequent, with only 17.6% responding that gang crimes were frequent, while 46.2% of those that felt unsafe believed gang crimes were frequent in their neighborhood. This relationship is statistically significant at the .011 level but has a moderately low chi-square value. Therefore one can rule out that this relationship occurred by chance, but it appears the relationship is not a very strong one because the critical value surpasses the found chi-square value.

Ethnicity → Amount of Most Frequent Crimes

Crosstab

			Ethnicity		
			White	Non-White	Total
Number of Crimes	0-2	Count	75	74	149
		% within Ethnicity	67.6%	78.7%	72.7%
	3-4	Count	32	14	46
		% within Ethnicity	28.8%	14.9%	22.4%
	5-7	Count	4	6	10
		% within Ethnicity	3.6%	6.4%	4.9%
Total		Count	111	94	205
		% within Ethnicity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.082[a]	2	.048
Likelihood Ratio	6.233	2	.044
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.125	1	.289
N of Valid Cases	205		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.59.

This crosstab seeks to find a relationship between ethnicity and how many crimes respondents said were, most frequent, in question five. There is a slight difference highlighted between whites and non-whites within this crosstab. With a percentage of 28.8%, whites who appeared to believe that there were anywhere between 3-4 types of crimes that occur frequently, while only 14.9% of non-whites agree with this assessment. There is also a larger portion of non-whites who believe that there is only 0-2 frequently occurring crimes in their neighborhood. These

differences point to a divide between whites and non-whites and how many crimes they believe to be frequently occurring in their neighborhood. This relationship is also statistically significant at the .048 level but has a low chi-square value. One can assume then that this is a weak relationship with .048 significance.

Conclusion

The results of this survey may not surprise some, but they do reveal a distinct difference within the community. There is clearly a distinction between how whites and non-whites view their neighborhood in terms of safety and fear. A common theme revealed in the data points to a higher rate of fear among whites. This is perhaps due to the fact they whites also believe certain crimes are more frequent and that overall there are more crimes being committed in their neighborhood. One of these crimes deals with drugs. Whites seem to have drawn a connection between drugs and safety, which non-whites have failed to do to, to a certain extent. As was noted in the crosstab on 'Ethnicity → Drug Crime Frequency' over 60% of whites believe drug crimes are frequent, which in turn leads to them feeling unsafe in their neighborhood, as is revealed in the crosstab correlating 'Safety in Neighborhood → Drug Crime Frequency'. Non-whites on the other hand believe drug crimes to be less frequent and thus feel safer in their neighborhood. Along with ethnicity, age also seemed to be a major factor. As is visible in the first crosstab, there seems to be a clear generation of people from 30-55 who feel less safe in their neighborhood. They may fear more for their families or simply be more aware of the crimes, but whatever the theory they should be a main focus group for the BPD. One other focus for the BPD dealt with victimization. Question three revealed a victimization rate of 23.7%, which is very respectable when compared to other equally sized, urban areas. According to a survey by U.S. Department of Justice, urban areas with a population between 50,000 and 249,000 had an average victimization rate of 32.5%.[1] A low victimization rate is definitely an encouraging finding. Another reason for optimism is revealed in the final crosstab discussed. It is promising that both whites and non-whites believe that 0-2 crimes are frequently occurring in the neighborhood. There may be a heightened sense of fear in the neighborhood but it seems that the solution is within sight, if the BPD and community residents can just conquer a few specific crimes in the neighborhood.

Special Thanks to Dr. Tari Renner, Dr. James Simeone, Councilwoman Karen Schmidt, Drew Wolschlag, Sean Gower, and the ARC community summer interns. Without all of their help and collaboration this survey would have never have been possible. Thank you for your dedication.

[1] United States, U.S. Department of Justice: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Criminal Victimization in the United States, 2005 Statistical Tables (Washington: 2005) 16.

Appendix

Survey

Westside of Bloomington Survey

1. On a scale of 1 to 10 how safe do you feel in your neighborhood? (1-very unsafe and 10-very safe)
   Response:

2. Do you personally fear that a crime will be committed against you or someone close to you in the future?
   Response:

3. Have you ever witnessed a crime—or had one committed against you—and not reported it to the police?
   Response:

4. If so, what type of crime occurred?
   Response:

5. What crimes do you feel are most frequent in your neighborhood? (Circle all that apply)
   a. Robbery
   b. Drug Sales/Usage
   c. Assault/Battery
   d. Residential/Auto Burglary
   e. Gang Crime
   f. Vandalism
   g. Other

   Response:

6. What factors, in your opinion, contribute to the crimes you have witnessed? (Circle all that apply)
    a. Poor Property Maintenance
    b. Low Police Visibility
    c. Poor Lighting
    d. Lack of Neighborhood Resident Involvement
    e. Unreported Crimes
    f. Other

    Response:

7. Would you be interested in forming a community watch for your neighborhood?

    Response:

8. On a scale of 1 to 10, how important is it for you to know the police officers in your neighborhood? (1—not important and 10 –very important)

9. What is the year of your birth?

Interviewer Only Questions

1. Gender
    - Male
    - Female

2. Ethnicity
    - White/Caucasian
    - African American
    - Hispanic
    - Asian
    - Other

3. Street or Block?