



Women's Fear of Victimization: Shadow of Sexual Assault?

Kenneth F. Ferraro

Social Forces, Vol. 75, No. 2 (Dec., 1996), 667-690.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0037-7732%28199612%2975%3A2%3C667%3AWFOVSO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-W>

Social Forces is currently published by University of North Carolina Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/uncpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Women's Fear of Victimization: Shadow of Sexual Assault?*

KENNETH F. FERRARO, *Purdue University*

Abstract

This article considers the thesis that sexual assault may operate as a master offense among women, heightening their fear of other victimizations. Measures of fear and perceived risk of victimization from a national survey of adults are used to examine the "shadow" hypothesis across nine separate offenses. Fear of sexual assault substantially increases the explained variance in fear of personal crime, eliminating or reversing the gender difference. Fear of sexual assault also influences fear of property offenses, but its effect is smaller than for personal crimes. The results show that women are more afraid of all victimizations, but this is principally due to their perceived risk of such offenses and their fear of rape in everyday life.

Research on fear of crime has drawn considerable attention over the last two decades as researchers have sought to understand why some people are so afraid. One of the most recurrent findings is that women are more afraid than men of crime. Although there are exceptions (e.g., Lee 1982), literally dozens of studies report higher "fear" of crime among women (Akers et al. 1987; Lebowitz 1975; Liska, Sanchirico & Reed 1988; Warr 1984). Indeed, among the social characteristics typically considered, gender is consistently the most important predictor — often twice as strong as other variables such as age or socio-economic status. Men are more likely than women to be victims of all types of crime except sexual assault (rape); yet, despite the gender differences in the prevalence of various crime victimizations, women are more afraid of all types of crime (Karmen 1991). Why? One would certainly expect women to manifest higher fear of rape, but why are they more afraid of other crimes? This article addresses why women are more afraid despite their victimization rates being so much lower.¹ I begin with a brief review of research on fear of crime more generally, and then consider how fear may operate differently for women than it does for men.

** Article first presented at the annual meeting of the North Central Sociological Association, Pittsburgh, 20-23 April, 1995. Support for this research was provided by the AARP Andrus Foundation and the Center for Social and Behavioral Sciences, School of Liberal Arts, Purdue University. I appreciate the helpful comments of Carol Brooks Gardner, Randy LaGrange, JoAnn Miller, Jack Spencer, Cathy Streifel, Jeffrey Ulmer, and the anonymous reviewers on an earlier version of this article. Direct correspondence to K.F. Ferraro, Stone Hall, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907-1365. E-mail: ferraro@sri.soc.purdue.edu.*

Research on Fear of Crime

While concern about crime has long been an issue in American society, few scholars were giving direct attention to the problem of fear of crime before the 1970s (Furstenberg 1971). The literature mushroomed in the middle and later portions of that decade probably because of the availability of relevant data from national samples. Both the General Social Survey (GSS) and the National Crime Survey (NCS) were launched in 1972 and have included questions used to assess fear of crime. Indeed, the core of the literature since 1975 hinges on analyses from these two surveys or from surveys which adopted the same questions (e.g., Baumer 1985; Braungart, Braungart & Hoyer 1980; Clarke & Lewis 1982; Clemente & Kleiman 1976, 1977; Kennedy & Krahn 1984; Kennedy & Silverman 1985; Lebowitz 1975; Lewis & Salem 1986; Liska, Lawrence & Sanchirico 1982; Liska, Sanchirico & Reed 1988; Taylor, Gottfredson & Brower 1984).

The questions used in the GSS and NCS are general, referring to hypothetical experiences of walking alone at night, and have been criticized extensively (Ferraro & LaGrange 1987; Garofalo & Laub 1978). Warr and Stafford (1983) made major contributions to the literature on fear of crime as they examined specific victimizations and distinguished fear of crime from perceived risk of crime (see also Stafford & Galle 1984; Warr 1984, 1985, 1990). Building on the work of DuBow, McCabe & Kaplan (1979), they pointed out, first, that fear is an affective response quite distinct from judgments of victimization risk, and, second, that perceived risk has a potent influence on fear. Their work showed more respectable levels of explained variance than that indicated by models based on general references to "crime." They also helped to identify the conditions under which fear is more likely. For instance, Warr (1990) used vignettes in a factorial design to show how much more fearful people are when faced with potential victimizations at night. Other studies, building on the works of Warr and Stafford (1983) and DuBow, McCabe and Kaplan (1979), have shown that some of the findings derived from the GSS and NCS may be misguided. For instance, Ferraro and LaGrange (1992) distinguished fear from perceived risk and found that older people were not more afraid than younger respondents of most victimizations; this contradicted many studies which used data from either the GSS or NCS (Clemente & Kleiman 1976; Hindelang, Gottfredson & Garofalo 1978).

Two additional contributions have been made to the literature in the last decade. First, researchers have examined the importance of "signs of crime" (Skogan & Maxfield 1981) or indicators of incivility (LaGrange, Ferraro & Supancic 1992; Stinchcombe et al. 1980). Wilson and Kelling (1985) hypothesized that in addition to actual victimization, "broken windows" or physical signs of incivility and minor forms of misbehavior (e.g., panhandling, loitering) also elevate fear of crime. Indeed, some studies have found this to be true (Covington & Taylor 1991; Lewis & Salem 1986), but others have demonstrated that incivility is a stronger predictor of perceived risk and has an indirect effect on fear of crime (LaGrange et al. 1992).

A second major contribution to the literature was made by specifying constrained behavior as an outcome to be considered in modeling fear of crime (Liska, Sanchirico & Reed 1988; Liska & Warner 1991; Taylor, Taub & Peterson 1986). It is widely understood that perceived risk is a necessary but not sufficient cause of fear. There are at least two likely reactions when people believe crime is a problem. Of course, one reaction is fear, but the second is constrained behavior — adjustments in routine activities ostensibly to lower the risk. Taylor, Taub & Peterson (1986) hypothesized a link but found none in their analysis after controlling for official risk. Liska, Sanchirico & Reed (1988) found that although people may intend to lower their fear by constraining behavior, their fear usually *rises* by such actions.² Ferraro (1995) tested these relationships and found that constrained behavior increased fear but not vice versa.

To summarize, the literature on fear of crime shows that it is essential to distinguish fear from perceived risk and to measure fear as an emotional reaction to different types of victimizations rather than omnibus references to "crime." Of course, constructs of overall fear may be developed as done by others (e.g., Bankston & Thompson 1989) but single-item indicators of fear of "crime" or walking alone at night are less than ideal for studying fear of victimization. In addition, some recent research shows that it is useful to consider incivility as an influence in the risk interpretation process. Constrained behavior and fear are two likely outcomes when perceived risk is high, and although the empirical base is modest, it appears that constrained behavior actually heightens fear of crime.

Women's Fear of Crime

Regardless of the measures used, most studies report women manifest higher levels of fear. This is true for the studies derived from GSS and NCS data as well as the studies which examine fear of specific victimizations and the sum of each for overall fear (e.g., Bankston & Thompson 1989; Ferraro & LaGrange 1992; Warr 1985). Most scholarly discussion of women's higher levels of fear focuses on the horror of rape that may arise from another face-to-face victimization (Gordon & Riger 1989; Hindelang, Gottfredson & Garofalo 1978; Riger, Gordon & Le Bailly 1978).³ In a sense, then, *any* victimization of women may involve the possibility of sexual assault. In discussing fear of victimization, Warr (1984) asserted that there are perceptually contemporaneous offenses — offenses which people may associate with another victimization (e.g., burglary of one's home while present could lead to assault or murder). Rape certainly qualifies as a perceptually contemporaneous offense to most crimes; but its uniqueness as a form of victimization to women probably escalates the degree of fear attending other crimes committed against women. In other words, sexual assault may "shadow" other types of victimization among women. Rape may operate like a "master offense" among women, especially younger women who have the highest rate of rape, heightening fear reactions for other offenses. In the words of Stanko (1985), rape is "the ever-present terror" (34). If this is the case, one would expect fear of rape to correlate with other forms of fear and to add uniquely to explaining fear of other types of crime.

Empirical research on the degree to which rape operates as a master offense among women tends to support the thesis. Based on a sample of Seattle residents, Warr (1984, 1985) reported that fear of rape is significantly associated with higher fear of burglary, robbery, auto theft, and obscene phone calls. He further noted that controlling for fear of rape eliminated the gender difference for some crimes, while for others, it reversed the difference. Using national data, Ferraro (1995) also found evidence for the master offense thesis: fear of rape explained a substantial portion of the variance in an additive index of fear of crime. He did not examine differences across various crimes but found that controlling for fear of rape eliminated the gender difference.

The focal research question raised here is whether or not there is evidence that fear of sexual assault "shadows" other crime contingencies. I examine this question using data from a large national sample linked with data on official crime risk from the *Uniform Crime Reports*. This is the first study of which I am aware to examine how women's fear of specific victimizations other than rape are affected by fear of rape using a national data set along with official crime data. While one national study examined the shadow hypothesis on a general measure of fear of crime (Ferraro 1995), here I consider this hypothesis across a range of potential victimizations. I further hypothesize that the effect due to fear of rape should be stronger on the types of victimization fear where the contingency of rape appears greater (e.g., assault, murder) and weaker for those victimizations which are not as likely to be viewed as involving such a contingency (e.g., car theft, cheated or conned out of money). In the present study, I also incorporate the major contributions of research from the past decade. Fear and perceived risk are distinguished, and both are seen as affected by ecological, neighborhood, and personal factors. Constrained behavior was also assessed and considered in the analyses. After testing the shadow thesis, the analysis turns to a consideration of which women are most afraid of rape.

Method

DATA

The *Fear of Crime in America Survey* was conducted via telephone interviews in 1990 using a random-digit dialing procedure. The national sample frame is based on a multistage cluster design (150 primary sampling units), structured so that each adult in the United States living in a household with a telephone has an equal chance of being selected for the sample. The largest 33 metropolitan areas in the United States were included in the sample on a self-weighting basis. An additional 117 smaller metropolitan areas or counties were selected on a probability-proportionate-to-size basis.

Within each household, one respondent was randomly selected. After introducing and explaining the purpose of the survey, the interviewer asked how many persons 18 years of age or older were regular residents of the household. The interviewer then enumerated the household and randomly selected the household respondent to be interviewed. The respondent's name was not known or solicited. The primary bias in the sampling frame is that

some individuals do not have telephones; however, most census data estimates indicate that this group is only about 4% of the population and is highly transient and thus difficult to sample by any method.

A final sample of 1,101 respondents was obtained with a response rate of 61%. This sample approximates the national noninstitutionalized population across several key variables (55% women, 84% white) but has a somewhat higher proportion of metropolitan residents (84% in this sample compared to 77% for the population; U.S. Bureau of the Census 1989). The interview consisted of approximately 70 questions and lasted about 12 minutes. Further details about the sample are provided elsewhere (LaGrange, Ferraro & Supancic 1992). Although the number of cases with complete data varies across the analyses, the smallest number of cases for the full sample analyses presented below is 1,022.

MEASURES

The questions used to measure fear of crime and sample questions for perceived risk of crime measures are presented in Table 1. A range of potential victimizations was probed. Respondents were queried about their fear of being approached on the street by a beggar or panhandler, not a crime per se, to the more serious types of victimizations including murder. As discussed earlier, previous research shows the importance of distinguishing perceived risk from fear of crime. The questions used are similar to those Warr (1984) used in a self-administered format. The focal endogenous variables — fear of crime questions — were asked early in the interview schedule. The fear and risk items were not contiguous in the interview so that respondents would not try to recall their rating for fear of a crime when assessing risk for the same crime. Five questions separated each battery of victimizations.

Constrained behavior was defined in terms of two domains identified in previous research: avoidance behavior and defensive behavior. Three items were used to measure avoidance behavior, and defensive behavior was measured with seven items (see Table 1). Dichotomous responses to these questions were summed to create indexes for the two domains with resulting alpha reliability coefficients equal to .61 for avoidance and .56 for defensive behavior. These two indexes were then used as indicators of the construct referred to as constrained behavior. A confirmatory factor analysis showed that the latent variable fits the two domains well with the measurement path (i.e., λ) equal to .58 for avoidance and .31 for defensive behaviors.

As noted earlier, previous research on fear of crime reveals the importance of ecological and neighborhood characteristics. While many important studies of fear of crime are based on data from only one city, the data here provide for substantial variation across cities and rural areas, and all regions of the U.S. The following indicators of ecological and neighborhood characteristics were gathered from respondents: region, community type, crime watch program, and neighborhood incivility (Wilson & Kelling 1982). The items used to measure incivility are also presented in Table 1. These span the two dimensions of incivility revealed in previous research: physical and social (items 1, 2, 4, and 8 are treated as physical, the remaining as social). Although an additive index of

TABLE 1: Description of Measures

A. Fear or Crime^a

At one time or another, most of us have experienced fear about becoming the victim of crime. Some crimes probably frighten you more than others. We are interested in *how afraid* people are in everyday life of being a victim of different kinds of crimes. Please rate your fear on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means you are *not afraid at all* and 10 means you are *very afraid*. First, rate your fear of . . .

1. Being approached on the street by a beggar or panhandler.
2. Please rate your fear of being cheated, conned, or swindled out of your money.
3. Having someone break into your home while you are away.
4. Having someone break into your home while you are there.
5. Being raped or sexually assaulted.
6. Being murdered.
7. Being attacked by someone with a weapon.
8. Having your car stolen.
9. Being robbed or mugged on the street.
10. Having your property damaged by vandals.

B. Risk of Crime

You have already rated your fear of different kinds of crimes; now I want you to rate *the chance that a specific thing will happen to you during the coming year*. On a scale from 1 to 10 where 1 means *it's not at all likely* and 10 means *it's very likely*, how likely do you think it is that you will . . .

1. Be approached on the street by a beggar or panhandler?
2. Be cheated, conned or swindled out of your money?
(questions 3-10 are the same victimizations as used for fear of crime)

C. Constrained Behavior

1. *Avoidance behavior:*

- a. Do you generally avoid unsafe areas during the day because of crime?
- b. Do you avoid unsafe areas during the night because of crime?
- c. Within the past year, have you limited or changed your daily activities because of crime?

2. *Defensive behavior:*

- a. Engraved I.D. numbers on your possessions?
 - b. Installed extra locks on windows or doors?
 - c. Bought a watchdog?
 - d. Kept a weapon in your home for protection?
 - e. Added outside lighting?
 - f. Learned more about self-defense?
 - g. Started carrying something to defend yourself?
-

TABLE 1: Description of Measures (Continued)

D. Ecological Characteristics

Official Crime. UCR data for rape, murder, robbery, assault, burglary, auto theft.

Region. Midwest, south, west, and northeast as defined by UCR; binary codes for each (0,1).

Community type. Metropolitan (1), nonmetropolitan (0).

E. Neighborhood Perceptions

Incivility. Now I will mention a few things that people sometimes consider to be problems in their local neighborhood. After I read each item, please tell me *how serious* a problem it is in *your* neighborhood by indicating whether it's not a problem, somewhat of a problem, or a very serious problem. How great a problem is . . .

1. Trash and litter lying around your neighborhood?
2. Neighborhood dogs running loose?
3. Inconsiderate or disruptive neighbors?
4. Vacant houses and unkept lots?
5. Unsupervised youth?
6. Too much noise?
7. People drunk or high on drugs in public?
8. Abandoned cars or car parts lying around?

Crime watch. Watch present in respondent's neighborhood (1), otherwise (0).

F. Personal Characteristics

Age. Years since birth.

Gender. Women (1), men (0).

Race. Nonwhite (1), white (0).

Education. Schooling completed (5 = post graduate, 1 = grade school).

Health. Self-assessed health (4 = excellent, 1 = poor).

Housing tenure. Years in current residence (6 = 31+ years, 1 = 1 or fewer years).

Victimization (direct). In the past year, have you been the victim of any crime? (1 = yes, 0 = no).

Indirect victimization. In the past year, has a close friend or relative of yours been the victim of a crime? (1 = yes, 0 = no).

^a Items were asked in the order listed. Three percent of the respondents reported not having a car; their responses were recoded to the mean.

these items has an alpha coefficient of reliability of .77, a variable was created from additive indexes of the two domains using confirmatory factor analysis for the present research. The lambda (λ) coefficients for the two indicators are .65 and .76 respectively.

In order to link the survey responses with additional ecological information, each respondent was asked to identify their zip code. Zip codes and telephone numbers (used as cross-checking mechanisms) allowed for the reliable identification of each respondent's state and county of residence. Thus, the survey data were linked to official crime risk, in the form of county crime rates, similar to the procedures used by Miethe and Lee (1984) in their study of fear of crime in the state of Washington. The national estimates of crime for the counties were acquired from what are widely known as the *Uniform Crime Reports*, or UCR (Federal Bureau of Investigation 1989). Although both "offenses known to the police" and arrest rates are available, the former are used here as the more reliable measures of actual crime prevalence (during 1989, the year before the survey data were collected). Offenses known to the police are generally seen as an underestimate of crime, but the rank order for prevalence of types of crime compares favorably to that found in victimization surveys. The same cannot be said of arrest data. Although the UCR data are not perfect estimates of actual risk, they are *official risk* and have been used by many investigators in previous studies as some of the best available measures of risk (Gove, Hughes & Geerken 1985; Nettler 1974).

Because of the salience of previous victimization to perceived levels of risk and fear, respondents were asked: "In the past year, have you been the victim of any crime?" About 19% of the sample indicated that they had been victimized. About 31% reported that a close friend or relative had been the victim of crime during the past year, and thus they had experienced indirect victimization. Whereas the relationship between age and fear of victimization has been shown to be curvilinear in some previous research (e.g., Ferraro & LaGrange 1992), this possibility was tested by including a quadratic term for age in all models. The measurement of most of the remaining variables is fairly straightforward; all variables are described in Table 1.

ANALYTIC PLAN

The analytic plan was divided into two major steps related to the research questions: (1) test the shadow hypothesis and (2) examine fear of rape. First, the shadow hypothesis was tested by estimating ordinary least squares models with and without fear of sexual assault and the official rape rate as predictors of fear of the other victimizations. When available, indicators of official crime risk from the UCR — matching the victimization — were included in the models.⁴ The victimizations were classified as personal or violent offenses (e.g., murder, robbery) and nonpersonal or property offenses (e.g., car theft, vandalism). As shown in Table 1, two questions were asked about burglary, one in which respondents were to imagine being in their home, the other away from home. A confirmatory factor analysis and previous research both point to considering burglary while at home as a personal offense and burglary while away as a nonpersonal offense (cf., Federal Bureau of Investigation 1989; Hepburn 1984).

Second, a set of ecological, neighborhood, and personal characteristics were examined as predictors of fear of rape among women. All equations presented below were estimated with ordinary least squares, but maximum likelihood estimates with LISREL were obtained for supplementary analyses (i.e., measurement and nonrecursive modeling).

Findings

Table 2 presents means and standard deviations of fear and perceived risk by sex for each type of crime. For each battery of victimizations, the personal offenses are listed first. Consistent with most previous research, women in the Fear of Crime in America survey are more fearful of all of the 10 offenses considered. The differences are greater for the personal crimes including rape, burglary, and robbery, but the difference in fear of sexual assault is particularly dramatic. Women in this sample were more afraid of rape than murder. Similar to findings presented by Warr (1984), these data show that fear is consistently higher for women, but this is not necessarily the case when making gender comparisons with perceived risk. While the difference in total victimization fear is over 14, the difference in the total across types of perceived risk is less than four. Men are more likely than women to perceive high risk of being approached by a panhandler and cheated or conned out of money. There is no significant gender difference in perceived risk of car theft.

Note that, as indicated in Table 2, women do not estimate their risk of sexual assault to be very high; women judge their risk of several victimizations to be higher than their risk of rape: burglary while away from home, approach by a beggar or panhandler, cheat/con, auto theft, robbery, and vandalism. Despite the relatively low level of perceived *risk* of rape, *fear* of rape is quite high. Indeed, rape as well as both types of burglary and physical assault evoke high levels of fear among women — greater than 5 on a scale of 10. The fact that women have high levels of fear of rape and the violent victimizations suggests some support for the shadow of sexual assault thesis. Also, examining a correlation matrix of the fear items among women reveals that fear of rape correlates most strongly with fear of victimizations explicitly involving face-to-face contact. Correlations between fear of rape and of the nonpersonal (property) crimes for women range from .27 to .53 while correlations between fear of rape and other personal crimes range from .64 to .79. The parallel correlations among men are much smaller: fear of rape and nonpersonal crimes range from .21 to .30 while correlations between fear of rape and other personal crimes range from .37 to .51. Also, the correlation between perceived risk of rape and fear of rape in the total sample is quite substantial ($r = .50$): even modest levels of perceived rape risk are sufficient to spark intense fear of rape.

To probe this idea more rigorously, multivariate models for fear of each of the victimizations were estimated. If rape is perceived as a contemporaneous offense, then fear of it should influence fear of other victimizations, and the effect should be stronger for the personal or violent victimizations than for the nonpersonal offenses. This shadowing effect is tested by estimating models for each other victimization with and without the rape variables as independent

TABLE 2: Means and Standard Deviations for Victimization Fear and Perceived Risk by Sex^a

	Men	Women	Mean Difference
<i>Type of fear</i>			
Sexual assault	2.21 + 2.47	6.09 + 3.36	3.88**
Murder	3.48 + 3.05	5.30 + 3.67	1.82**
Robbery	3.66 + 2.54	5.05 + 3.16	1.39**
Assault	4.31 + 2.92	5.69 + 3.40	1.38**
Burglary/home	3.85 + 2.97	5.90 + 3.42	2.05**
Car theft	4.25 + 2.79	4.76 + 2.90	.51**
Burglary/away	5.18 + 2.82	6.18 + 2.98	1.00**
Cheat/con	3.40 + 2.56	3.89 + 2.90	.49**
Vandalism	4.31 + 2.58	4.89 + 2.95	.58**
Panhandler	2.36 + 1.86	3.36 + 2.57	1.00**
Fear (total) ^b	37.02 + 18.41	51.22 + 23.25	14.20**
<i>Type of risk</i>			
Sexual assault	1.38 + 1.03	2.98 + 2.33	1.60**
Murder	1.80 + 1.64	2.27 + 2.19	.47**
Robbery	2.66 + 1.98	3.21 + 2.51	.55**
Assault	2.38 + 1.85	2.76 + 2.34	.38**
Burglary/home	2.07 + 1.77	2.79 + 2.21	.72**
Car theft	3.60 + 2.43	3.79 + 2.66	.19
Burglary/away	3.55 + 2.29	4.20 + 2.57	.65**
Cheat/con	4.08 + 2.90	3.60 + 2.78	-.48**
Vandalism	3.37 + 2.34	3.72 + 2.75	.35*
Panhandler	4.54 + 3.48	3.83 + 3.31	-.71**
Risk (total) ^b	29.34 + 13.84	33.26 + 17.98	3.92**

^a Differences assessed by t test of means.

^b Alpha coefficient of reliability is .90 for fear and .87 for perceived risk.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

(presented in Table 3).⁵ The rape variables include fear of rape as well as the official rate of rape for the respondent's county. Rape is a high profile crime that, when reported, often garners important media coverage. If rape is high in the respondent's county of residence, this may elevate fear for other types of crime. Model 1 excludes the rape covariates, while model 2 adds the relevant rape variables.

The results from model 1 for fear of murder reveal effects due to age (a reverse *j*-shaped curve), gender, race, indirect victimization, perceived risk, and constrained behavior. Of course, the gender effect shows that women have higher fear of crime. All of the independent variables with significant effects in Model 1 are also significant in model 2, although in several cases the effects are

more modest. Two differences are noteworthy. First, fear of rape is strongly related to fear of murder ($\beta = .62$) causing the explained variance to increase from 23 to 40% (a 74% increase). Second, once fear of rape is considered, the effect due to gender is reversed so that men manifest higher fear of murder. In other words, women are more afraid of murder, but this is largely due to their fear of rape. Once that fear is considered, men are actually slightly more likely to be afraid of murder. It is women's substantial fear of rape that explains their fear of murder.

The model 1 results for fear of robbery are in many ways similar to those for fear of murder: the reverse j-shape effect by age, higher fear for women, nonwhite persons, those with recent indirect victimization, and higher perceived risk and constrained behavior. Fear of robbery is also slightly higher in the North East. Again, adding fear of rape to the model is important, as the explained variance increases to .49. When this addition is made, interestingly, both the age and gender effects become nonsignificant. Fear of assault in model 1 is higher in urban areas, among women, those with recent indirect victimization, and higher perceived risk and constrained behavior. When the rape variables are added in model 2, one again sees a strong effect due to fear of rape while the gender effect is reversed and reduced in magnitude.

Turning to the equations for fear of burglary while the respondent was at home, there is a slight negative effect due to age but fairly substantial effects due to gender, perceived risk, and constrained behavior. When the rape variables are added in model 2, fear of rape is again significant, but there is also a slight positive effect due to the official rape rate: fear of burglary while home is higher in counties where the rape rate is higher. A slight negative effect is observed for the official crime rate for burglary and for health, the latter probably being due to a sense of vulnerability with a potential confrontation in one's home. People with the poorest health probably feel the least capable of defending themselves if actually confronted by a burglar. Finally, note that the explained variance nearly doubled from .26 to .51, and the gender effect is no longer significant. For each equation, fear is higher for persons with high perceived risk but also for those with higher constrained behavior. Constraining behavior does not reduce fear of victimization; rather, it is associated with higher fear. Neighborhood characteristics such as incivility and crime watch programs were nonsignificant in each equation. Official crime was significant only in the equation for burglary while at home. In three out of the four equations, fear of rape had the strongest predictive effect. Perceived risk had the second strongest effect, except in the case of fear of robbery where it superseded fear of rape. The percent increase in explained variance in these models ranged from 36.1 for fear of robbery to 96.1 for fear of burglary while at home.

Table 4 presents parallel equations for the nonpersonal or property offenses. Results from model 1 for fear of car theft again show the reverse j-shaped effect for age but no difference by gender. A glance back at Table 2 shows that car theft is the victimization with the smallest difference of means for men and women, and the findings from Table 4 show that the differences are actually due to age, race, and perceived risk of crime. Adding the rape variables in model 2 reveals a modest effect for fear of rape; the R^2 increases only 7.8%. Model 1 for fear of burglary while the person is away from the home shows

TABLE 3: Predicting Fear of Victimization: Personal Offenses

Independent variables	Murder		Robbery		Assault		Burglary/Home	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
<i>Ecological</i>								
Official crime	-.00 ^a	-.00	-.00	-.00	-.00	-.00	-.00	-.00*
	-.03 ^b	-.04	-.03	-.02	-.03	-.03	-.04	-.10
South ^c	-.15	-.10	.00	.08	-.29	-.23	.01	.09
	-.02	-.01	.00	.01	-.04	-.03	.00	.01
West	-.25	-.17	-.02	.03	-.11	-.00	.10	.19
	-.03	-.02	-.00	.00	-.01	-.00	.01	.02
Northeast	.05	-.06	.48*	.44*	-.05	-.12	.13	.04
	.00	-.01	.07	.06	-.01	-.02	.02	.00
Urban	.38	.34	.35	.32	.69**	.65**	.31	.27
	.04	.04	.04	.04	.08	.07	.03	.03
<i>Neighborhood</i>								
Incivility	-.13	-.06	-.06	-.00	-.08	-.00	.04	.12
	-.04	-.02	-.03	-.00	-.03	-.00	.01	.04
Crime watch	-.01	.07	-.10	-.15	.02	.09	.18	.28
	-.00	.01	-.01	-.02	.00	.01	.02	.03
<i>Personal</i>								
Age	-.22**	-.07**	-.07**	-.04	-.06	-.02	-.07*	-.03
	-.58	-.33	-.38	-.21	-.31	-.09	-.35	-.12
Age ²	.00**	.00*	.00*	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
	.44	.26	.32	.21	.22	.08	.28	.13
Gender (women)	1.29**	-.48**	.92**	.00	.84**	-.56**	1.41**	-.12
	.18	-.07	.15	.00	.13	-.09	.21	-.02
Race (nonwhite)	.60*	.44*	.72**	.69**	.26	.19	-.06	-.19
	.06	.05	.09	.08	.03	.02	-.01	-.02

higher fear among women and persons with higher perceived risk and constrained behavior. Fear of rape adds significantly to the explained variance, but, again, perceived risk remains the strongest predictor. Model 2 also shows slightly higher fear among persons living in neighborhoods characterized by incivility.

The equations for cheat/con show no gender difference. Rather, model 1 shows the reverse *j* shape for age and a negative effect for education. Perceived risk and constrained behavior also heighten fear. Findings from model 2 reveal a significant effect for fear of rape, but the effect due to perceived risk is not attenuated. Higher fear of being conned is also observed among persons

TABLE 3: Predicting Fear of Victimization: Personal Offenses (continued)

	Murder		Robbery		Assault		Burglary/Home	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
<i>Independent variables</i>								
<i>Personal (cont'd)</i>								
Education	-.11 -.04	-.06 -.02	.00 .00	.02 .01	-.10 -.04	-.06 -.02	-.08 -.03	-.03 -.01
Health	-.08 -.02	-.10 -.02	.05 .01	.04 .01	-.05 -.01	-.08 -.02	-.24 -.05	-.26* -.06
Housing tenure	.04 .02	-.02 -.01	.07 .04	.03 .02	.07 .03	.03 .01	-.04 -.02	-.08 -.04
Victimization	-.13 -.01	-.30 -.03	-.04 -.01	-.14 -.02	.20 .02	.05 .01	.45 .05	.28 .03
Indirect victimization	.66** .09	.38* .05	.61** .10	.46** .07	.55** .08	.32 .05	.18 .03	-.04 -.01
Perceived risk	.47** .26	.61** .33	.60** .46	.60** .46	.51** .33	.56** .36	.50** .31	.60** .37
Constrained behavior	.89** .18	.58** .12	.50** .12	.36** .09	.98** .21	.76** .17	.74** .16	.45** .09
<i>Rape</i>								
Official rape rate		.00 .08		.00 .03		.00 .06		.00* .11
Fear of rape		.71** .62		.37** .39		.57** .54		.60** .55
Intercept	6.10	5.29	3.00	2.87	4.54	3.99	5.17	4.43
R ²	.23	.40	.36	.49	.27	.51	.26	.51

^a Unstandardized coefficient

^b Standardized coefficient

^c Midwest serves as the reference group for the regional comparisons.

* p < .05 ** p < .01

reporting high incivility, older respondents, those with less education, and those who have lived in their current dwelling for shorter periods of time. The R^2 increases from .15 to .22, nearly 47%, but is still much lower than that observed in fear of car theft or burglary while away. Perceived risk of vandalism and constrained behavior explains 30% of the fear of vandalism (model 1). Fear of rape adds to the explained variance as expected and, again, incivility is significant in model 2. Fear of being approached by a beggar or panhandler is higher among the older subjects, women, nonwhites, those with less education, and those with higher perceived risk and constrained behavior (model 1). Adding the rape variables shows positive effects for both the official rape rate and fear of rape. The effect of perceived risk is weak, and the model only explains 16% of the variance. Adding the rape variables also led to incivility and housing tenure becoming statistically significant.

The results from the nonpersonal offenses considered in Table 4 are quite different from the findings for the personal offenses. The percent increase in explained variance when adding the rape variables for the personal victimizations ranged from 36.1 to 96.1. For the nonpersonal offenses, it ranged from 7.8 to 46.6. Gender effects were present for each of the personal crimes considered in the reduced models and were eliminated or reversed when in the full models. For the nonpersonal offenses, gender differences were observed only for two of the five offenses considered, and these effects remained significant after adding the rape variables. In general, there appears to be evidence for the thesis that fear of sexual assault shadows how women think about other potential victimizations. This is certainly the case for fear of the personal offenses. There, the magnitude of the effect due to fear of rape is striking; it is stronger than perceived risk of the victimization in three of the four offenses considered. For the nonpersonal offenses, however, the shadow of sexual assault fear appears much smaller.

There is also the possibility that fear of murder is implicated in fear of rape. That is, murder may be another perceptually contemporaneous offense. As Gordon and Riger (1989) describe, "The threat of death during a rape attack is a very real one to many women, since women believe that on the average at least 25% of rape victims are killed during their attacks" (9). While the actual figure is only about 3%, it is possible that fear of death rather than fear of rape explains women's higher fear of other offenses. To examine this possibility, two analyses were undertaken. First, fear of rape was regressed on the independent variables and compared to an equation that included fear of murder as a control variable. This was done in order to see if doing so would also reverse the gender effect (as happened in Table 3). The results of those equations (not presented) indicate that the gender effect was attenuated in the equation with fear of murder as a control variable, but that gender was still highly significant ($\beta = .31$). Second, eight additional equations were estimated for the other offenses, substituting fear of murder for fear of rape. These eight equations were then compared to the model 1 equations from Tables 3 and 4. In no instance did adding fear of murder reverse the gender effect. Fear of murder was significant in each equation. Murder may also be perceived as a contemporaneous offense, but fear of it cannot explain gender differences in fear of other victimizations as was evident with fear of rape in results from Tables 3 and 4.

Because fear of rape is the major determinant of fear of victimization among women, the next logical question to ask is, What heightens fear of rape? The results of a regression analysis to identify the factors that influence fear of rape are presented in Table 5. The first column presents results for all women while the latter two are specific to age groups. In the first column, the official rape rate is negatively associated with fear of rape, and fear of rape is generally higher in the northeastern region of the country. The age relationship is significant, but no curvilinear relationship is evident: younger women are more afraid of rape. The most important determinant of fear of rape is perceived risk of rape. Constrained behavior also affects fear of rape in a manner consistent with earlier findings: constraining one's behavior actually heightens fear.⁶

Seeing the impact of age in shaping fear of rape, the sample was next divided into age groups to examine the effects more closely. Again, it is the youngest women who are most afraid of rape. After breaking age into seven categories and conducting a multiple classification analysis, we see that the youngest age group (18-24) expressed the highest fear, 7.37, while women in the 65-74 age range expressed the least fear, 5.26. With a grand mean of 6.1 on a scale of 1 to 10, it is quite clear that fear of rape is high, especially among the youngest women.⁷ It is intriguing that this age group of women is precisely the category most likely to be victimized in some type of sexual assault. Estimates vary, but women age 18-24 probably have an annual rape rate over 4 per 1,000 based on victimization data, not on official statistics of reported rape (Harlow 1991). The rate for women 25-34 is approximately 2.3 per 1,000 women, while the rate falls to below 1 per 1,000 after age 35 (the rates differ by ethnicity, with African Americans having higher victimization rates at all ages). Thus, the high levels of fear among young women are not surprising.

Given the absence of a significant curvilinear relationship by age and the high rate of rape victimization among women 34 year of age and younger, two additional equations are presented in Table 5 estimating fear of rape among the two age groups. Note that the explained variance in the younger age group is nearly twice the amount for the older group of women. Among those 18-34 years of age, perceived risk is the single most important predictor of fear of rape followed by constrained behavior, housing tenure, and age. Even among women age 18-34, the age relationship is strong, demonstrating the keen fear among the youngest women. The effect of housing tenure is negative, indicating that women who have more recently moved are more afraid of rape. The overall picture of the fear experienced by these women is vexing to say the least. They feel their risk of rape is high, and they have recently taken measures to reduce their risk of being victimized due to any crime; yet, the youngest ones, who are quite likely to relocate due to career and family transitions, experience dread in daily life and especially just after moving to new housing.

For women 35 years of age and older, their fear is generally lower and almost totally shaped by perceived risk. Fear is higher among the younger women in this analysis, again reflecting congruence with victimization rate data. Note also that women in the northeastern portion of the country have higher fear of rape; no regional effects were observed among the younger women, but regional differences among the more mature women are about equal to the age effect.

TABLE 4: Predicting Fear of Victimization: Nonpersonal Offenses

Independent variables	Car Theft		Burglary/Away		Cheat/Con		Vandalism		Panhandler	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
<i>Ecological</i>										
Official crime	.00 ^a .05 ^b	.00 .00	-.00 -.02	-.00 -.04	—	—	—	—	—	—
South ^c	-.13 -.02	-.16 -.03	-.15 -.02	-.10 -.02	.01 .00	.05 .01	-.14 -.02	-.13 -.02	.09 .02	.13 .03
West	-.21 -.03	-.25 -.03	.09 .01	.16 .02	-.13 -.02	.10 .01	-.36 -.05	-.29 -.04	-.13 -.02	-.26 -.04
Northeast	.18 .03	.16 .02	.16 .02	.13 .02	.38 .06	.33 .05	-.10 -.01	-.13 -.02	.27 .05	.27 .05
Urban	.12 .02	.14 .02	.15 .02	.13 .02	-.00 -.00	.03 .00	.01 .00	.00 .00	.15 .02	.08 .01
<i>Neighborhood</i>										
Incivility	-.01 -.00	.02 .01	.09 .04	.13* .06	.11 .05	.15* .07	.10 .05	.14* .06	.11 .06	.12* .07
Crime watch	-.11 -.01	-.17 -.02	-.08 -.01	-.05 -.01	-.19 -.02	-.24 -.03	.06 .01	.04 .00	-.04 -.01	-.02 -.00
<i>Personal</i>										
Age	-.08** -.45	-.06* -.36	-.03 -.20	-.01 -.07	-.07* -.42	-.05 -.29	-.00 -.02	.01 .07	-.04 -.30	-.04 -.25
Age ²	.00** .40	.00* .34	.00 .18	.00 .09	.00** .45	.00** .36	.00 .09	.00 .02	.00** .46	.00** .45
Gender (women)	.18 .03	-.22 -.04	.43** .07	-.34* -.06	.33 .06	-.26 -.05	.23 .04	-.29 -.05	.66** .14	.33* .07
Race (nonwhite)	.54** .07	.58** .07	-.01 -.00	-.03 -.00	-.23 -.03	-.19 -.02	.27 .04	.30 .04	.66** .10	.55** .09

TABLE 4: Predicting Fear of Victimization: Nonpersonal Offenses (Continued)

Independent variables	Car Theft		Burglary/Away		Cheat/Con		Vandalism		Panhandler	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
<i>Personal</i>										
Education	-.12 -.05	-.10 -.04	-.03 -.01	-.02 -.01	-.25** -.10	-.23** -.09	-.03 -.01	-.02 -.01	-.17** -.09	-.17** -.08
Health	-.03 -.01	-.05 -.01	-.09 -.02	-.12 -.03	-.05 -.01	-.06 -.02	-.02 -.00	-.03 -.01	-.15 -.05	-.14 -.04
Housing tenure	.08 .04	.07 .04	.04 .02	.02 .01	-.11 -.06	-.13* -.07	.03 .02	.02 .01	-.08 -.05	-.11* -.07
Victimization	-.13 -.02	-.18 -.03	-.01 -.00	-.09 -.01	-.10 -.01	-.13 -.02	.15 .02	.09 .01	-.05 -.01	-.10 -.02
Indirect victimization	.17 .03	.06 .01	.16 .03	.04 .01	.02 .00	-.04 -.01	.32 .05	.22 .04	-.07 -.01	-.17 -.03
Perceived risk	.62** .56	.62** .56	.60** .50	.61** .52	.29** .30	.30** .31	.50** .46	.51** .47	.05* .07	.04* .06
Constrained behavior	.21 .05	.16 .04	.50** .12	.38** .09	.34** .09	.27* .07	.43** .11	.37** .09	.51** .16	.48** .15
<i>Rape</i>										
Official rape rate		.00 .07		.00 .04		-.00 -.06		.00 .00		.00* .08
Fear of rape		.17** .18		.31** .33		.25** .28		.22** .24		.13** .17
Intercept	4.11	4.08	4.26	4.03	5.36	5.15	2.47	2.35	3.80	3.82
R ²	.38	.41	.35	.44	.15	.22	.30	.35	.13	.16

^a Unstandardized coefficient

^b Standardized coefficient

^c Midwest serves as the reference group for the regional comparisons.

* p < .05 ** p < .01

TABLE 5: Predicting Fear of Rape among Women

Independent variables	All Women	Age 18-34	Age 35+
<i>Ecological</i>			
Official crime (rape)	-.00 ^{a*} -.11 ^b	-.00 -.13	-.00 -.09
South ^c	-.17 -.02	-.33 -.05	-.08 -.01
West	.10 .01	.07 .01	.11 .01
Northeast	.83* .10	.93 .12	.10* .12
Urban	.41 .04	.65 .07	.25 .03
<i>Neighborhood</i>			
Incivility	-.14 -.05	-.17 -.07	-.14 -.05
Crime watch	.28 .03	-.33 -.03	.42 .04

Discussion

This investigation has implications for the study of fear of victimization more generally as well as for understanding why women are more afraid of crime than men are. These results confirm the importance of distinguishing perceived risk from fear of crime (Bankston & Thompson 1989; Warr & Stafford 1983). Perceived risk was a significant influence on all forms of fear, and its effects were quite substantial in most cases. Second, following the work of others (Liska, Sanchirico & Reed 1988; Taylor, Taub & Peterson 1986), it is important also to consider constrained behavior in the risk interpretation process. Constrained behavior significantly influenced fear of victimization in all models, and its effects were positive in each situation. In other words, constrained behavior actually increased the degree of fear reported. In addition, several nonrecursive models were estimated to examine the possibility of an escalating loop, such as found by Liska, Sanchirico and Reed (1988), but a significant reciprocal effect was never uncovered.⁸

Although not anticipated, personal victimization was not a significant independent predictor for fear of any offense. Indirect victimization (being aware of a friend's or family member's recent victimization) was significant for

TABLE 5: Predicting Fear of Rape among Women (continued)

Independent variables	All Women	Age 18-34	Age 35+
<i>Personal</i>			
Age	-.09*	-.12**	-.03*
	-.45	-.19	-.13
Age ²	.00	—	—
	.30		
Race (nonwhite)	.26	.24	.15
	.03	.03	.01
Education	-.21	-.22	-.18
	-.06	-.07	-.06
Health	.12	.07	.07
	.02	.01	.02
Housing tenure	-.05	-.64**	.12
	-.02	-.24	.06
Victimization	.26	.41	.25
	.03	.05	.03
Indirect victimization	.33	-.13	.65
	.05	-.02	.08
Perceived risk (rape)	.43**	.43**	.45**
	.29	.32	.30
Constrained behavior	.66**	1.17**	.42
	.13	.25	.08
Intercept	6.68	10.54	4.60
N	554	173	381
R ²	.21	.30	.16

^a Unstandardized coefficient

^b Standardized coefficient

^c Midwest serves as the reference group for the regional comparisons.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

fear of murder, robbery, and assault. Official crime rates were available for rape and six of the nine other offenses considered. Nevertheless, official crime for each victimization was not important except in the cases of burglary while at home and rape. In all, the victimization information is not nearly as conse-

quential to fear as some might suggest (Janson & Ryder 1983; Stafford & Galle 1984). Supplementary analyses regressing perceived risk of victimization on the covariates revealed that victimization was significant for property or nonpersonal crime risk, and thus indirectly influencing fear, but that it was nonsignificant for personal crime fear. Incivility was the most substantial predictor of perceived risk and had its strongest effect on the nonpersonal victimizations. While much of the effect of incivility on fear appears to be indirect (LaGrange et al. 1992), there was still an independent effect of incivility on the most of the nonpersonal victimizations considered here.

The results also have important implications for better understanding women's fear of crime. The present investigation shows clearly that fear of rape influences fear of other types of crime. Its effect is stronger for fear of the personal or violent forms of victimization such as murder, assault, and burglary while at home. In each of these three cases, the effect due to fear of rape was stronger than that due to perceived risk of the victimization under consideration. That is, whenever face-to-face confrontation is likely, most women fear rape, and such fear explains much of why women are more afraid of crimes for which they have low rates of victimization relative to men. For the nonpersonal offenses considered, the effect of fear of rape was significant in each instance but not nearly as strong as for the personal offenses. Only for fear of being approached by a beggar or panhandler was the effect due to fear of rape more substantial than perceived risk of crime. The other intriguing difference was that the gender differences in fear of the nonpersonal victimizations were modest and remained (with women more afraid) after adding fear of rape to the models. For the personal offenses, gender differences were generally larger and changed by the addition of fear of rape to the models. For fear of robbery and burglary while at home, adding fear of rape eliminated the gender effect. For fear of murder and assault, it reversed them, parallel to what Warr (1985) observed. In other words, when fear of rape is controlled, men display higher fear of murder and assault, echoing the victimization data.

Rape can be seen as another outcome of any victimization, but it is especially germane to those offenses which involve face-to-face contact. Resisting a robber or struggling against an assault can be effective. Yet, the possibility exists that it will not be, and resistance itself could inflame some offenders. Regardless of whether or not one resists or attempts to fight off an offender, sexual assault of women is a contingency for any face-to-face offense, especially when the offense is committed by a man or a group of men. It appears that when women think about the possibility of victimization, they also contemplate the likelihood that sexual assault will accompany a given offense.

These and other findings give substantial support to the shadow thesis: fear of rape influences other victimization fears, and the degree of the effect is associated with personal contact and seriousness of the offense. The list of victimizations used here covers offenses where there is a fairly high probability of personal contact; this is true even of several of the property crimes. It would be useful in future research to add other victimizations which would explicitly not involve face-to-face contact (e.g., mail-order fraud). If the shadow thesis is accurate, the effect of fear of rape on such crime should be very weak or nonexistent.

The results of this investigation also show that fear of rape is very high among younger women, reflecting national victimization data. Younger women, who move often during educational, career, or family transitions, are especially afraid of crime when they are in new environments. Despite their attempts to avoid victimization, fear of rape influences their daily life. Women in the northeastern region of the U.S. are also more likely to be afraid of rape, but this is largely because of the higher than expected levels of fear among women in this region who are 35 years of age or older. It matters not whether women have been personally victimized or not; the imagined horror of sexual assault is sufficient to spark such fear.

Gordon and Riger (1989) studied rape and fear of rape in three American cities — Chicago, Philadelphia, and San Francisco — and documented both the pervasiveness and the intensity of what they call the “female fear.” They assert that fear of rape rivals fear of death for some women as evidenced by the prevalence of suicide or suicidal thoughts among victims: “some women have killed themselves after surviving rape attacks, and many other victims consider it” (9). Gordon and Riger (1989) go on to argue that rape is the most stigmatizing form of victimization, affecting every domain of life and personhood (see also Riger & Gordon 1981; Stanko 1985). While such an idea has not been tested here, the evidence presented reveals the pervasiveness of this form of fear and its utility for explaining fear of other victimizations.

Notes

1. Based on recent crime data, women's rate of violent crime victimization, excluding rape, is about three-fifths the rate for men. When one considers changes over time, however, “the difference between men's and women's rates of victimization from violent crime has slowly decreased” (Harlow 1991:1). This is in part due to the rate of sexual assault quadrupling since 1960 (Federal Bureau of Investigation 1990). Yet, while some men report being sexually assaulted, the rate of sexual assault against women has consistently been over 10 times the rate for men (Harlow 1991). In addition to gender, increased rates of other violent crimes, especially those committed by intimates, probably also contribute to higher fear of violent crime (Dean & deBruyn-Kops 1982; Harlow 1991). Despite these changes, however, that women are more afraid of crime than men are has been long established in the literature — even before the crime wave of the late 1960s and early 1970s.

2. Both of these studies are exemplary for specifying constrained behavior as an outcome but each has some of the measurement limitations addressed earlier (see also Ferraro 1995; Ferraro & LaGrange 1987). Taylor, Taub & Peterson (1986) treat measures of both perceived risk and fear as indicators of fear, while Liska, Sanchirico & Reed (1988) use the two NCS measures as indicators of fear. In addition, neither paper specifies perceived risk as a separate concept to be tested as advocated by Warr (1984) and others. It may be argued that the entire concept of constrained behavior is predicated upon a crime risk assessment (not necessarily fear as specified by Liska, Sanchirico & Reed [1988]).

3. Rape is a particularly vexing experience, and women are especially susceptible to it. The physical pain and harm caused by rape is horrible, but women's accounts of the emotional and psychological damage indicate that it is often worse; and the intensity of the emotional pain endures for years — albeit sometimes in latent form (Gordon & Riger 1989; Parks 1990; Schram 1978). Theories of why rape occurs are numerous, but most recent ones focus on gender inequality, pornography, social disorganization, and the cultural acceptance of legitimate violence (Baron & Straus 1989; Bourque 1989).

4. Some victimizations considered here were not assessed in the UCR, and vice versa. Two forms of a burglary question were asked in the survey, distinguishing whether or not the respondent was at home. The measure of official crime in each case is the county UCR data for burglary.
5. To be consistent with the work of others (e.g., Warr 1984), fear is interpreted as the residual of the fear measure on the perceived risk measure. Thus, it is appropriate to add not only the fear indicator but also either (1) the perceived risk and fear of rape or (2) the residual of fear of rape regressed on perceived risk of rape. It was estimated both ways, but the latter approach is displayed because of its ease in presentation and interpretation. Unstandardized residual scores are used.
6. Performing acts presumably to reduce risk may actually heighten fear. This is not to imply that constraining one's behavior creates fear where there was none — only that it intensifies such feelings if present. Although his interest was the power of role performances, Berger's (1963:96) eloquent description of how actions shape emotions is germane to the present investigation: "Roles carry with them both certain actions and the emotions and attitudes that belong to these actions. The professor putting on an act that pretends to wisdom comes to feel wise. The preacher finds himself believing what he preaches . . . In each case, while the emotion or attitude may have been present before the role was taken on, the latter inevitably strengthens what was there before." One should assume not that constraining one's behavior will automatically spur fear, but instead that it can do precisely that *in some cases*. The key is whether or not a person senses high victimization risk. If he or she does, then fear is the most likely outcome. High perceived risk may also prompt constraining one's behavior, but doing so does not appear to reduce fear, only to add to it.
7. The net means for each group were as follows: 18-24 years of age, 7.37; 25-34, 6.42; 35-44, 6.20; 45-54, 5.88; 55-64, 5.27; 65-74, 5.26; and 75+, 5.64.
8. These models were estimated with LISREL. Liska, Sanchirico & Reed (1988) did not include perceived risk in their models, and it is plausible that the difference in the findings is due to this omission. All the models showed a positive effect from constrained behavior to fear, showing the influence of behavioral adjustments on fear.

References

- Akers, Ronald L., Anthony J. LaGreca, Christine Sellers, and John Cochrane. 1987. "Fear of Crime and Victimization among the Elderly in Different Types of Communities." *Criminology* 25:487-505.
- Bankston, William B., and Carol Y. Thompson. 1989. "Carrying Firearms for Protection: A Causal Model." *Sociological Inquiry* 59:75-87.
- Baron, Larry, and Murray A. Straus. 1989. *Four Theories of Rape in American Society*. Yale University Press.
- Baumer, Terry L. 1985. "Testing a General Model of Fear of Crime: Data from a National Sample." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 22:239-55.
- Berger, Peter L. 1963. *Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective*. Anchor.
- Bourque, Linda Brookover. 1989. *Defining Rape*. Duke University Press.
- Braungart, Margaret M., Richard G. Braungart, and William J. Hoyer. 1980. "Age, Sex, and Social Factors in Fear of Crime." *Sociological Focus* 13:55-56.
- Clarke, Alan H., and Margaret Lewis. 1982. "Fear of Crime among the Elderly." *British Journal of Criminology* 22:49-62.
- Clemente, Frank, and Michael Kleiman. 1976. "Fear of Crime among the Aged." *Gerontologist* 16:207-10.

- _____. 1977. "Fear of Crime in the United States: A Multivariate Analysis." *Social Forces* 56:519-31.
- Covington, Jeanette, and Ralph B. Taylor. 1991. "Fear of Crime in Urban Residential Neighborhoods: Implications of Between- and Within-Neighborhood Sources for Current Models." *Sociological Quarterly* 32:231-49.
- Dean, Charles W., and Mary deBruyn-Kops. 1982. *The Crime and Consequences of Rape*. Charles C. Thomas.
- DuBow, Fredric, Edward McCabe, and Gail Kaplan. 1979. *Reactions to Crime: A Critical Review of the Literature*. National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. 1990 (and previous years: 1960-1989). *Uniform Crime Reports for the United States (Crime in the United States)*. Government Printing Office.
- Ferraro, Kenneth F. 1995. *Fear of Crime: Interpreting Victimization Risk*. SUNY Press.
- Ferraro, Kenneth F., and Randy LaGrange. 1987. "The Measurement of Fear of Crime." *Sociological Inquiry* 57:70-101.
- _____. 1992. "Are Older People Most Afraid of Crime? Reconsidering Age Differences in Fear of Victimization." *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences* 47:S233-44.
- Furstenberg, Frank F., Jr. 1971. "Public Reaction to Crime in the Streets." *American Scholar* 40:601-10.
- Garofalo, James, and John Laub. 1978. "The Fear of Crime: Broadening Our Perspective." *Victimology* 3:242-53.
- Gordon, Margaret T., and Stephanie Riger. 1989. *The Female Fear*. Free Press.
- Gove, Walter R., Michael Hughes, and Michael Geerken. 1985. "Are Uniform Crime Reports a Valid Indicator of the Index Crime? An Affirmative Answer with Minor Qualifications." *Criminology* 23:451-501.
- Harlow, Caroline Wolf. 1991. *Female Victims of Violent Crime*. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Hepburn, John R. 1984. "Occasional Property Crime." Pp. 73-94 in *Major Forms of Crime*, edited by Robert F. Meier. Sage.
- Hindelang, Michael J., Michael R. Gottfredson, and James Garofalo. 1978. *Victims of Personal Crime: An Empirical Foundation for a Theory of Personal Victimization*. Ballinger.
- Janson, Philip, and Louise K. Ryder. 1983. "Crime and the Elderly: The Relationship between Risk and Fear." *The Gerontologist* 23:207-12.
- Karmen, Andrew A. 1991. "Victims of Crime," Pp. 121-38 in *Criminology: A Contemporary Handbook*, edited by Joseph F. Sheley. Wadsworth.
- Kennedy, Leslie W., and Harvey Krahn. 1984. "Rural-urban Origin and Fear of Crime: The Case for 'Rural Baggage.'" *Rural Sociology* 49:247-60.
- Kennedy, Leslie W., and Robert A. Silverman. 1985. "Significant Others and Fear of Crime among the Elderly." *International Journal of Aging and Human Development* 20:241-56.
- LaGrange, Randy L., Kenneth F. Ferraro, and Michael Supancic. 1992. "Perceived Risk and Fear of Crime: Role of Social and Physical Incivilities." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 29:311-34.
- Lebowitz, Barry. 1975. "Age and Fearfulness: Personal and Situational Factors." *Journal of Gerontology* 30:696-700.
- Lee, Gary R. 1982. "Sex Differences in Fear of Crime among Older People." *Research on Aging* 4:284-98.
- Lewis, Dan A., and Greta Salem. 1986. *Fear of Crime: Incivility and the Production of a Social Problem*. Transaction.
- Liska, Allen E., Joseph Lawrence, and Andrew Sanchirico. 1982. "Fear of Crime as a Social Fact." *Social Forces* 60:760-70.

- Liska, Allen E., Andrew Sanchirico, and Mark D. Reed. 1988. "Fear of Crime and Constrained Behavior: Specifying and Estimating a Reciprocal Effects Model." *Social Forces* 66:827-37.
- Liska, Allen E., and Barbara D. Warner. 1991. "Functions of Crime: A Paradoxical Process." *American Journal of Sociology* 96:1441-63.
- Miethe, Terance D., and Gary R. Lee. 1984. "Fear of Crime among Older People: A Reassessment of the Predictive Power of Crime-Related Factors." *Sociological Quarterly* 25:397-415.
- Nettler, Gwynne. 1974. *Explaining Crime*. McGraw-Hill.
- Parks, M. Jean. 1990. "Rape Victims' Perceptions of Long-Term Effects Three or More Years Post Rape." Pp. 21-37 in *The Victimology Handbook: Research Findings, Treatment, and Public Policy*, edited by Emilio C. Viano. Garland Publishing.
- Riger, Stephanie, and Margaret T. Gordon. 1981. "The Fear of Rape: A Study in Social Control." *Journal of Social Issues* 37:71-92.
- Riger, Stephanie, Margaret T. Gordon, and Robert Le Bailly. 1978. "Women's Fear of Crime: from Blaming to Restricting the Victim." *Victimology* 3:274-84.
- Schram, Donna D. 1978. "Rape." Pp. 53-79 in *The Victimization of Women*, edited by Jane Roberts Chapman and Margaret Gates. Sage.
- Skogan, Wesley G., and Michael G. Maxfield. 1981. *Coping with Crime*. Sage.
- Stafford, Mark C., and Omer R. Galle. 1984. "Victimization Rates, Exposure to Risk, and Fear of Crime." *Criminology* 22:173-85.
- Stanko, Elizabeth A. 1985. *Intimate Intrusions: Women's Experience of Male Violence*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Stinchcombe, Arthur L., Rebecca Adams, Carol A. Heimer, Kim Lane Scheppele, Tom W. Smith, and D. Garth Taylor. 1980. *Crime and Punishment: Changing Attitudes in America*. Jossey Bass.
- Taylor, D. Garth, Richard P. Taub, and Bruce Peterson. 1986. "Crime, Community Organization, and Causes of Neighborhood Decline." Pp. 161-77 in *Metropolitan Crime Patterns*, edited by Robert Figlio, Simon Hakim, and George Rengert. Willow Tree Press.
- Taylor, Ralph B., Stephen D. Gottfredson, and Sidney Brower. 1984. "Block Crime and Fear: Defensible Space, Local Social Ties, and Territorial Functioning." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 21:303-31.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1989. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1989*. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Attorney General's Commission on Pornography. 1986. *Final Report of the Attorney General's Commission on Pornography*. U.S. Department of Justice, Government Printing Office.
- Warr, Mark. 1984. "Fear of Victimization: Why Are Women and the Elderly More Afraid?" *Social Science Quarterly* 65:681-702.
- _____. 1985. "Fear of Rape among Urban Women." *Social Problems* 32:238-50.
- _____. 1990. "Dangerous Situations: Social Context and Fear of Victimization." *Social Forces* 68:891-907.
- Warr, Mark, and Mark Stafford. 1983. "Fear of Victimization: A Look at the Proximate Causes." *Social Forces* 61:1033-43.
- Wilson, James Q., and George L. Kelling. 1982. "Broken Windows." *Atlantic Monthly* 249:29-38.
- _____. 1985. "Broken Windows: The Police and Neighborhood Safety." Pp. 220-28 in *The Ambivalent Force*, edited by Abraham S. Blumberg and Arthur Niederhoffer. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.