Table 1.1 Example of the Format of a Data Set From a Survey of 20 College Students

| ID <br> Number | Gender | Age | College Year | GPA | Average Month |  | Religion |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | \# Drinks | \# Times Drugs Used |  |
| 1 | Female | 19 | Sophomore | 2.3 | 45 | 22 | Catholic |
| 2 | Male | 22 | Senior | 3.1 | 30 | 10 | Other |
| 3 | Female | 22 | Senior | 3.8 | 0 | 0 | Protestant |
| 4 | Female | 18 | Freshman | 2.9 | 35 | 5 | Jewish |
| 5 | Male | 20 | Junior | 2.5 | 20 | 20 | Catholic |
| 6 | Female | 23 | Senior | 3.0 | 10 | 0 | Catholic |
| 7 | Male | 18 | Freshman | 1.9 | 45 | 25 | Not religious |
| 8 | Female | 19 | Sophomore | 2.8 | 28 | 3 | Protestant |
| 9 | Male | 28 | Junior | 3.3 | 9 | 0 | Protestant |
| 10 | Female | 21 | Junior | 2.7 | 0 | 0 | Muslim |
| 11 | Female | 18 | Freshman | 3.1 | 19 | 2 | Jewish |
| 12 | Male | 19 | Sophomore | 2.5 | 25 | 20 | Catholic |
| 13 | Female | 21 | Senior | 3.5 | 2 | 0 | Other |
| 14 | Male | 21 | Junior | 1.8 | 19 | 33 | Protestant |
| 15 | Female | 42 | Sophomore | 3.9 | 10 | 0 | Protestant |
| 16 | Female | 19 | Sophomore | 2.3 | 45 | 0 | Catholic |
| 17 | Male | 21 | Junior | 2.8 | 29 | 10 | Not religious |
| 18 | Male | 25 | Sophomore | 3.1 | 14 | 0 | Other |
| 19 | Female | 21 | Junior | 3.5 | 5 | 0 | Catholic |
| 20 | Female | 17 | Freshman | 3.5 | 28 | 0 | Jewish |

Table 1.2
Example of the Data Presented in Table 1.1 as They Would Be Stored in a Computer Data File

| ID Number | Gender | Age | College Year | GPA | Average Month |  | Religion |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | \# Drinks | \# Times Drugs Used |  |
| 1 | 1 | 19 | 2 | 2.3 | 45 | 22 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 22 | 4 | 3.1 | 30 | 10 | 6 |
| 3 | 1 | 22 | 4 | 3.8 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 4 | 1 | 18 | 1 | 2.9 | 35 | 5 | 3 |
| 5 | 2 | 20 | 3 | 2.5 | 20 | 20 | 1 |
| 6 | 1 | 23 | 4 | 3.0 | 10 | 0 | 1 |
| 7 | 2 | 18 | 1 | 1.9 | 45 | 25 | 5 |
| 8 | 1 | 19 | 2 | 2.8 | 28 | 3 | 2 |
| 9 | 2 | 28 | 3 | 3.3 | 9 | 0 | 2 |
| 10 | 1 | 21 | 3 | 2.7 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 11 | 1 | 18 | 1 | 3.1 | 19 | 2 | 3 |
| 12 | 2 | 19 | 2 | 2.5 | 25 | 20 | 1 |
| 13 | 1 | 21 | 4 | 3.5 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| 14 | 2 | 21 | 3 | 1.8 | 19 | 33 | 2 |
| 15 | 1 | 42 | 2 | 3.9 | 10 | 0 | 2 |
| 16 | 1 | 19 | 2 | 2.3 | 45 | 0 | 1 |
| 17 | 2 | 21 | 3 | 2.8 | 29 | 10 | 5 |
| 18 | 2 | 25 | 2 | 3.1 | 14 | 0 | 6 |
| 19 | 1 | 21 | 3 | 3.5 | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| 20 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 3.5 | 28 | 0 | 3 |

## Figure 1.1 Levels of Measurement



## Table 1.3

Ordinal-Level Variables Can Be Added to Create an Index With Interval-
Level Properties: Core Alcohol and Drug Survey

| How Do You Think Your Close Friends Feel <br> (or Would Feel) About You? (mark one for each line) | Do Not <br> Disapprove | Disapprove |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | Strongly |
| :---: |
| Disapprove |$|$| a. Trying marijuana once or twice |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| b. Smoking marijuana occasionally |  |  |
| c. Smoking marijuana regularly |  |  |
| d. Trying cocaine once or twice |  |  |
| e. Taking cocaine regularly |  |  |
| f. Trying LSD once or twice |  |  |
| g. Taking LSD regularly |  |  |
| h. Trying amphetamines once or twice |  |  |
| i. Taking amphetamines regularly |  |  |
| j. Taking one or two drinks of an alcoholic |  |  |
| beverage (e.g., beer, wine, liquor) nearly every |  |  |
| day |  |  |

[^0]Table 1.4 Properties of Measurement Levels

| Examples of Comparison Statements | Appropriate Math Operations | Relevant Level of Measurement |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Nominal | Ordinal | Interval | Ratio |
| $A$ is equal to (not equal to) $B$ | $=(\neq)$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| $A$ is greater than (less than) $B$ | $>$ (<) |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| A is three more than (less than) B | + (-) |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| A is twice (half) as large as B | $\times(\div)$ |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |


| Age Group | Number of Victims ( $f$ ) |
| :--- | :---: |
| $12-17$ | 545,370 |
| $18-24$ | 527,410 |
| $24-34$ | 604,500 |
| $35-49$ | 684,150 |
| $50-64$ | 566,990 |
| 65 and older | 112,760 |

## Table 1.5 <br> Violent Crime Victims, Total Population, and Violent Crime Rates per 1,000 by Age Group, 2013

| Age Group | Number of Victims | Total Population | Rate per 1,000 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $12-17$ | 545,370 | $24,633,684$ | 22.1 |
| $18-24$ | 527,410 | $27,143,454$ | 19.4 |
| $24-34$ | 604,500 | $39,891,724$ | 15.2 |
| $35-49$ | 684,150 | $65,240,931$ | 10.5 |
| $50-64$ | 566,990 | $41,860,232$ | 13.5 |
| 65 and older | 112,760 | $34,991,753$ | 3.2 |

Source: Adapted from Criminal Victimization, 2013 by Truman and Langton, 2014, from the Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.

## Table 1.6

Total Number, Number Reported, Proportion, and Percentage of Crimes Reported to Police by Type of Crime (NCVS, 2013)

| Type of Crime | Total Number <br> $(n)$ | Number Reported $(f)$ | Proportion $(f / n)$ | Percent $(f / n) \times 100$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Violent crime | $\mathbf{3 , 0 4 1 , 1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 3 9 8 , 9 3 8}$ | .46 | 46 |
| Rape/Sexual assault | 173,610 | 60,073 | .35 | 35 |
| Robbery | 369,070 | 250,967 | .68 | 68 |
| Assault | $2,600,920$ | $1,118,395$ | .43 | 43 |
| Aggravated assault | 633,090 | 405,177 | .64 | 64 |
| Simple assault | $2,046,600$ | 777,708 | .38 | 38 |
| Domestic violence | 589,140 | 335,809 | .57 | 57 |
| Intimate partner violence | 369,310 | 210,506 | .57 | 57 |
| Stranger violence | $1,244,560$ | 609,834 | .49 | 49 |
| Violence with injury | 849,240 | 305,726 | .56 | 56 |
| Property crime | $\mathbf{1 1 , 5 3 1 , 4 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 1 5 1 , 3 1 1}$ | .36 | 36 |
| Burglary | $2,458,360$ | $1,401,265$ | .57 | 57 |
| Motor vehicle theft | 555,660 | 422,301 | .76 | 76 |
| Personal theft | $9,070,680$ | $2,630,497$ | .29 | 29 |

Source: Adapted from Tables 4 and 6 of Criminal Victimization, 2013 by Truman and Langton, 2014, from the Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.

## Table 1.7 Murder Rates by State per 100,000 Population

| Alabama | 7.2 | Montana | 2.2 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Alaska | 4.6 | Nebraska | 3.1 |
| Arizona | 5.4 | Nevada | 5.8 |
| Arkansas | 5.4 | New Hampshire | 1.7 |
| California | 4.6 | New Jersey | 4.5 |
| Colorado | 3.4 | New Mexico | 6.0 |
| Connecticut | 2.4 | New York | 3.3 |
| Delaware | 4.2 | North Carolina | 4.8 |
| Florida | 5.0 | North Dakota | 2.2 |
| Georgia | 5.6 | Ohio | 3.9 |
| Hawaii | 1.5 | Oklahoma | 5.1 |
| Idaho | 1.7 | Oregon | 2.0 |
| Illinois | 5.5 | Pennsylvania | 4.7 |
| Indiana | 5.4 | Rhode Island | 2.9 |
| lowa | 1.4 | South Carolina | 6.2 |
| Kansas | 3.9 | South Dakota | 2.4 |
| Kentucky | 3.8 | Tennessee | 5.0 |
| Louisiana | 10.8 | Texas | 4.3 |
| Maine | 1.8 | Utah | 1.7 |
| Maryland | 6.4 | Vermont | 1.6 |
| Massachusetts | 2.0 | Virginia | 3.8 |
| Michigan | 6.4 | Washington | 2.3 |
| Minnesota | 2.1 | West Virginia | 3.3 |
| Mississippi | 6.5 | Wisconsin | 2.8 |
| Missouri | 6.1 | Wyoming | 2.9 |
|  |  |  |  |

Source: Adapted from Table 4 of Crime In the United States from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (2013a).

|  | $f$ | Proportion | $\%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Less than $\$ 10$ | 16 |  |  |
| $\$ 10-\$ 49$ | 39 |  |  |
| $\$ 50-\$ 99$ | 48 |  |  |
| $\$ 100-\$ 249$ | 86 |  |  |
| $\$ 250-\$ 999$ | 102 |  |  |
| $\$ 1,000$ or more | 251 |  |  |
|  | $n=542$ |  |  |



Figure 2.1
Rate of Firearm-Related Violent Victimization per 1,000 People 12 Years or Older: National Crime Victimization Survey

In recent years, have gun crimes in America gone up or down?


Table 2.1 Types of Hate Crime Incidents Reported to Police in 2013

| Basis of Hate | $f$ | Proportion | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Race | 2,871 | .485 | 48.5 |
| Religion | 1,031 | .174 | 17.4 |
| Sexual orientation | 1,233 | .208 | 20.8 |
| Ethnicity/National origin | 655 | .111 | 11.1 |
| Disability | 83 | .014 | 1.4 |
| Gender | 18 | .003 | 0.3 |
| Gender identity | 31 | .005 | 0.5 |
| Total | 5,922 | 1.000 | 100.0 |

Source: Adapted from Hate Crime Statistics-2013 from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (2013b).

Figure 2.2
Types of Hate Crime Incidents Reported to Police in 2013: Frequency Data


Figure 2.3
Types of Hate Crime Incidents Reported to Police in 2013: Frequency and Percentage Data


## Table 2.2

Hate Crime Incidents Reported to Police in 2013 That Were Motivated by Bias Against the Victim's Religion

| Type of Religious Hate | $f$ | Proportion | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anti-Jewish | 625 | .606 | 60.6 |
| Anti-Catholic | 70 | .068 | 6.8 |
| Anti-Protestant | 35 | .034 | 3.4 |
| Anti-Islamic | 135 | .131 | 13.1 |
| Anti-other religions | 117 | .113 | 11.3 |
| Anti-multireligious group | 42 | .041 | 4.1 |
| Anti-agnostic/atheist | 7 | .007 | 0.7 |
| Total | 1,031 | 1.00 | 100.0 |

Source: Adapted from Hate Crime Statistics-2013 from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (2013b).

Figure 2.4
Pie Chart for Antireligious Hate Crime Incidents Reported to the Police in 2013 by Type of Antireligious Sentiment


Figure 2.5
Bar Chart for Frequency of Religious Hate Crime Incidents Reported to the Police in 2013


Type of Religious Hate Crime

| Table 2.3 | Percentage of Arrests for Violent Crimes, Property Crimes, and Total <br> Index Crimes by Gender, 2013 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Crime Type | \% Male |  |
| Violent crimes | 79.9 | \% Female |

Source: Adapted from table 42 of Crime In the United States from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (2013a).

Figure 2.6
Percentage of Total Arrests for Violent, Property, and Total Index Offenses by Gender, 2013


Table 2.4 Hypothetical Response Times of the Police to a 911 Call (in Minutes)

| 7 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 3 | 8 |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 6 |

Table 2.5
Ungrouped Frequency Distribution for 50 Police Response Times to a 911 Call for Service

| Minutes | $f$ | of | $p$ | cp | \% | c\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 5 | 5 | . 10 | . 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 2 | 6 | 11 | . 12 | . 22 | 12 | 22 |
| 3 | 9 | 20 | . 18 | . 40 | 18 | 40 |
| 4 | 8 | 28 | . 16 | . 56 | 16 | 56 |
| 5 | 6 | 34 | . 12 | . 68 | 12 | 68 |
| 6 | 7 | 41 | . 14 | . 82 | 14 | 82 |
| 7 | 3 | 44 | . 06 | . 88 | 6 | 88 |
| 8 | 2 | 46 | . 04 | . 92 | 4 | 92 |
| 9 | 2 | 48 | . 04 | . 96 | 4 | 96 |
| 10 | 1 | 49 | . 02 | . 98 | 2 | 98 |
| 11 | 1 | 50 | . 02 | 1.00 | 2 | 100 |
| Total | 50 |  | 1.00 |  | 100 |  |

Figure 2.7 Police Response Times to 911 Calls


Figure 2.8 Police Response Times to 911 Calls Using Frequencies


Figure 2.9 Police Response Times to 911 Calls Using Percentages


Figure 2.10 Cumulative Percentage of Police Response Times to 911 Calls


## Table 2.6 Number of Days Until Rearrest for Sample of 120 Released Offenders

| 25 | 30 | 31 | 33 | 19 | 36 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37 | 34 | 39 | 32 | 33 | 37 |
| 20 | 27 | 38 | 29 | 23 | 36 |
| 29 | 39 | 30 | 28 | 33 | 35 |
| 27 | 27 | 25 | 24 | 29 | 38 |
| 28 | 26 | 34 | 23 | 36 | 17 |
| 40 | 31 | 29 | 28 | 33 | 38 |
| 26 | 31 | 32 | 35 | 37 | 32 |
| 30 | 29 | 37 | 33 | 33 | 25 |
| 18 | 19 | 33 | 40 | 31 | 29 |
| 27 | 23 | 40 | 24 | 36 | 38 |
| 24 | 27 | 35 | 33 | 32 | 32 |
| 34 | 30 | 31 | 31 | 36 | 36 |
| 24 | 25 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 |
| 34 | 32 | 28 | 35 | 33 | 29 |
| 35 | 29 | 35 | 31 | 28 | 27 |
| 31 | 34 | 37 | 36 | 36 | 35 |
| 40 | 29 | 31 | 34 | 34 | 33 |
| 30 | 32 | 30 | 29 | 29 | 30 |
| 31 | 33 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 34 |

Table 2.7 Time Until Rearrest: Ungrouped Frequency and Percentage Distribution

| Days Until Rearrest | $f$ | \% | c\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| 18 | 1 | 0.8 | 1.6 |
| 19 | 2 | 1.7 | 3.3 |
| 20 | 1 | 0.8 | 4.1 |
| 21 | 0 | 0.0 | 4.1 |
| 22 | 0 | 0.0 | 4.1 |
| 23 | 3 | 2.5 | 6.6 |
| 24 | 4 | 3.3 | 9.9 |
| 25 | 5 | 4.2 | 14.1 |
| 26 | 3 | 2.5 | 16.6 |
| 27 | 7 | 5.8 | 22.4 |
| 28 | 6 | 5.0 | 27.4 |
| 29 | 11 | 9.2 | 36.6 |
| 30 | 7 | 5.8 | 42.4 |
| 31 | 10 | 8.3 | 50.7 |
| 32 | 7 | 5.8 | 56.5 |
| 33 | 12 | 10.0 | 66.5 |
| 34 | 8 | 6.7 | 73.2 |
| 35 | 8 | 6.7 | 79.9 |
| 36 | 8 | 6.7 | 86.6 |
| 37 | 6 | 5.0 | 91.6 |
| 38 | 4 | 3.3 | 94.9 |
| 39 | 2 | 1.7 | 96.6 |
| 40 | 4 | 3.3 | 99.9* |
| Total | $n=120$ | 99.9* |  |

[^1]Figure 2.11 Histogram of Ungrouped Time-Until-Rearrest Data


Table 2.8 Grouped Distribution for Time-Until-Rearrest Data

| Stated Class Limits (days) | $f$ | $c f$ | $p$ | $c p$ | $\%$ | $c \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $17-19$ | 4 | 4 | .0333 | .0333 | 3.33 | 3.33 |
| $20-22$ | 1 | 5 | .0083 | .0416 | 0.83 | 4.16 |
| $23-25$ | 12 | 17 | .1000 | .1416 | 10.00 | 14.16 |
| $26-28$ | 16 | 33 | .1333 | .2749 | 13.33 | 27.49 |
| $29-31$ | 28 | 61 | .2333 | .5082 | 23.33 | 50.82 |
| $32-34$ | 28 | 89 | .2333 | .7415 | 23.33 | 74.15 |
| $35-37$ | 21 | 110 | .1750 | .9165 | 17.50 | 91.65 |
| $38-40$ | 10 | 120 | .0833 | .9998 | 8.33 | 99.98 |
| Total | 120 |  | $.9998^{*}$ |  | $99.98^{*}$ |  |

*Does not sum to 1.0 , or $100 \%$, because of rounding.

Figure 2.12 Histogram of Grouped Frequency Data for Time Until Rearrest


Table 2.9 Grouped Distribution for Time-Until-Rearrest Data Using Interval Width of 2

| Stated Class Limits | $f$ | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $17-18$ | 2 | 1.7 |
| $19-20$ | 3 | 2.5 |
| $21-22$ | 0 | 0.0 |
| $23-24$ | 7 | 5.8 |
| $25-26$ | 8 | 6.7 |
| $27-28$ | 13 | 10.8 |
| $29-30$ | 18 | 15.0 |
| $31-32$ | 17 | 14.2 |
| $33-34$ | 20 | 16.7 |
| $35-36$ | 16 | 13.3 |
| $37-38$ | 10 | 8.3 |
| $39-40$ | 6 | 5.0 |
| Total | 120 | 100.0 |

## Figure 2.13

Histogram of Grouped Frequency Data for Time Until Rearrest Using Interval Width of 2


Stated Class Limits, Real Class Limits, and Midpoints for Grouped Frequency Distribution in Table 2.8

| Stated Class <br> Limits | Real Class <br> Limits | $m_{i}$ | $f$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $17-19$ | $16.5-19.5$ | 18 | 4 |
| $20-22$ | $19.5-22.5$ | 21 | 1 |
| $23-25$ | $22.5-25.5$ | 24 | 12 |
| $26-28$ | $25.5-28.5$ | 27 | 16 |
| $29-31$ | $28.5-31.5$ | 30 | 28 |
| $32-34$ | $31.5-34.5$ | 33 | 28 |
| $35-37$ | $34.5-37.5$ | 36 | 21 |
| $38-40$ | $37.5-40.5$ | 39 | 10 |
|  |  |  | Total $=120$ |

Figure 2.14 Example of a Normal or Symmetrical Distribution


Figure 2.15 Example of a Negatively Skewed Distribution


Figure 2.16 Example of a Positively Skewed Distribution


Annual Rates (per 100,000) of Rape, Robbery, and Aggravated Assault
Table 2.11
Known to the Police and Reported to the FBl's Uniform Crime Reports Program, 1972-2013

| Year | Rape Rate | Robbery Rate | Aggravated Assault Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1972 | 22.5 | 180.7 | 188.8 |
| 1973 | 24.5 | 183.1 | 200.5 |
| 1974 | 26.2 | 209.3 | 215.8 |
| 1975 | 26.3 | 220.8 | 227.4 |
| 1976 | 26.6 | 199.3 | 233.2 |
| 1977 | 29.4 | 190.7 | 247.0 |
| 1978 | 31.0 | 195.8 | 262.1 |
| 1979 | 34.7 | 218.4 | 286.0 |
| 1980 | 36.8 | 251.1 | 298.5 |
| 1981 | 36.0 | 258.7 | 289.3 |
| 1982 | 34.0 | 238.9 | 289.0 |
| 1983 | 33.7 | 216.5 | 279.4 |
| 1984 | 35.7 | 205.4 | 290.6 |
| 1985 | 37.1 | 208.5 | 304.0 |
| 1986 | 37.9 | 225.1 | 347.4 |
| 1987 | 37.4 | 212.7 | 352.9 |
| 1988 | 37.6 | 220.9 | 372.2 |
| 1989 | 38.1 | 233.0 | 385.6 |
| 1990 | 41.2 | 257.0 | 422.9 |
| 1991 | 42.3 | 272.7 | 433.4 |
| 1992 | 42.8 | 263.7 | 441.9 |
| 1993 | 41.1 | 256.0 | 440.5 |
| 1994 | 39.3 | 237.8 | 427.6 |
| 1995 | 37.1 | 220.9 | 418.3 |
| 1996 | 36.3 | 201.9 | 391.0 |
| 1997 | 35.9 | 186.2 | 382.1 |
| 1998 | 34.5 | 165.5 | 361.4 |
| 1999 | 32.8 | 150.1 | 334.3 |
| 2000 | 32.0 | 144.9 | 323.6 |
| 2001 | 31.8 | 148.5 | 318.6 |
| 2002 | 33.1 | 146.1 | 309.5 |
| 2003 | 32.3 | 142.5 | 295.4 |
| 2004 | 32.4 | 136.7 | 288.6 |
| 2005 | 31.8 | 140.8 | 290.8 |
| 2006 | 30.9 | 149.4 | 287.5 |
| 2007 | 30.1 | 155.7 | 292.6 |
| 2008 | 29.4 | 154.0 | 281.6 |
| 2009 | 28.9 | 139.6 | 268.3 |
| 2010 | 27.8 | 122.7 | 255.5 |
| 2011 | 26.8 | 117.1 | 243.5 |
| 2012 | 26.7 | 116.3 | 246.5 |
| 2013 | 23.1 | 112.9 | 233.7 |

## Figure 2.17

Time Plot of Forcible Rape, Armed Robbery, and Aggravated Assault Rates Using Both y Axes, 1972-2013


Time Plot of Forcible Rape, Armed Robbery, and Aggravated Assault Rates Using Only One y Axis, 1972-2013


| Stated Class Limits | $f$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| $0-7$ | 0 |
| $7-10$ | 35 |
| $10-15$ | 40 |
| $16-30$ | 50 |
| Total | 125 |


| Stated Class Limits | $f$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| $7-9$ | 35 |
| $10-12$ | 25 |
| $13-15$ | 15 |
| $16-18$ | 20 |
| $19-21$ | 10 |
| $22-24$ | 5 |
| $25-27$ | 10 |
| $28-30$ | 5 |
| Total | 125 |


| Number Correct | Gender |
| :---: | :---: |
| 15 | Male |
| 16 | Female |
| 11 | Male |
| 10 | Male |
| 14 | Male |
| 15 | Male |
| 15 | Female |
| 11 | Female |
| 10 | Male |
| 10 | Male |
| 20 | Female |
| 15 | Female |
| 14 | Male |
| 16 | Male |
| 15 | Male |
| 19 | Female |
| 11 | Male |
| 13 | Male |
| 15 | Female |
| 13 | Female |
| 10 | Male |
| 20 | Male |
| 15 | Male |
| 16 | Female |
| 10 | Male |


| 17 | 22 | 13 | 24 | 15 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 12 | 30 | 17 | 27 | 16 |
| 21 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 18 |
| 18 | 27 | 19 | 18 | 25 |
| 11 | 19 | 11 | 26 | 30 |
| 28 | 28 | 23 | 14 | 35 |
| 8 | 13 | 26 | 22 | 21 |
| 17 | 20 | 15 | 39 | 15 |
| 26 | 24 | 16 | 30 | 31 |
| 31 | 25 | 24 | 23 | 6 |
| 15 | 32 | 29 | 38 | 36 |
| 34 | 16 | 12 | 34 | 12 |
| 20 | 12 | 33 | 35 | 34 |
| 7 | 21 | 11 | 37 | 19 |
| 11 | 21 | 20 | 43 | 35 |


| Victimi- <br> zation <br> Year | Rate per <br> 1,000 <br> Households | Victimi- <br> zation <br> Year | Rate per <br> 1,000 <br> Households |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1993 | 351.8 | 2004 | 167.5 |
| 1994 | 341.2 | 2005 | 159.5 |
| 1995 | 315.5 | 2006 | 169.0 |
| 1996 | 289.3 | 2007 | 154.9 |
| 1997 | 267.1 | 2008 | 142.6 |
| 1998 | 237.1 | 2009 | 132.6 |
| 1999 | 210.6 | 2010 | 125.4 |
| 2000 | 190.4 | 2011 | 138.7 |
| 2001 | 177.7 | 2012 | 155.8 |
| 2002 | 168.2 | 2013 | 131.4 |
| 2003 | 173.4 |  |  |

Source: Data taken from the Bureau of Justice Statistics at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/.

| Year | Number of <br> Arrests | Year | Number of <br> Arrests |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1994 | 117,300 | 2004 | 83,700 |
| 1995 | 116,200 | 2005 | 85,600 |
| 1996 | 106,400 | 2006 | 90,800 |
| 1997 | 92,300 | 2007 | 92,400 |
| 1998 | 86,900 | 2008 | 94,200 |
| 1999 | 79,200 | 2009 | 95,000 |
| 2000 | 78,600 | 2010 | 85,100 |
| 2001 | 81,900 | 2011 | 82,900 |
| 2002 | 81,200 | 2012 | 82,200 |
| 2003 | 82,300 |  |  |

Source: Data taken from Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics at www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezaucr/asp/ucr_display.asp.

| Table 3.1 | Types of Hate Crime Incidents <br> Reported to Police in 2013 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $f$ | Proportion | $\%$ |
| Basis of Hate | 2,871 | .485 | 48.5 |
| Race | 1,031 | .174 | 17.4 |
| Religion | 1,233 | .208 | 20.8 |
| Sexual orientation | 655 | .111 | 11.1 |
| Ethnicity/National origin | 83 | .014 | 1.4 |
| Disability | 18 | .003 | 0.3 |
| Gender | 31 | .005 | 0.5 |
| Gender identity | 5,922 | 1.000 | 100.0 |
| Total |  |  |  |

Source: Adapted from Hate Crimes Statistics-2013 from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (2013b).

| Table 3.2Number of Prior Arrests for <br> a Sample of Armed Robbery <br> Suspects |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | $f$ | $\%$ |  |
| 0 | 38 | 25.33 |  |
| 1 | 35 | 23.33 |  |
| 2 | 10 | 6.67 |  |
| 3 | 9 | 6.00 |  |
| 4 | 14 | 9.33 |  |
| 5 | 7 | 4.67 |  |
| 6 | 11 | 7.33 |  |
| 7 | 8 | 5.33 |  |
| 8 | 10 | 6.67 |  |
| 9 | 5 | 3.33 |  |
| 10 or more | 3 | 2.00 |  |
| Total | $n=150$ | $99.99^{*}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |

*Percentages may not sum to $100 \%$ due to rounding.

Figure 3.2 Number of Prior Arrests Among 150 Suspected Armed Robbers


| Grouped Frequency Distribution <br> for Time-Until-Rearrest Data for <br> 120 Released Offenders |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stated Limits (Days) | $f$ | Midpoint |
| $17-19$ | 4 | 18 |
| $20-22$ | 1 | 21 |
| $23-25$ | 12 | 24 |
| $26-28$ | 16 | 27 |
| $29-31$ | 28 | 30 |
| $32-34$ | 28 | 33 |
| $35-37$ | 21 | 36 |
| $38-40$ | 10 | 39 |
|  | $n=120$ |  |

Figure 3.3 Histogram of Grouped Frequency Data for Time Until Rearrest


| Number of New Charges for <br> Domestic Violence for 60 Men <br> Arrested for Domestic Abuse |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Number of New Charges | $f$ |
| 0 | 14 |
| 1 | 7 |
| 2 | 5 |
| 3 | 8 |
| 4 | 6 |
| 5 | 4 |
| 6 | 3 |
| 7 | 3 |
| 9 | 5 |
| 10 or more | 3 |
|  | 2 |
| 2 | 60 |


| Rank | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 1 minute |
| 2 | 2 minutes |
| 3 | 3 minutes |
| 4 | 6 minutes |
| 5 | 9 minutes |
| 6 | 12 minutes |
| 7 | 15 minutes |


| Rank | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 1 minute |
| 2 | 2 minutes |
| 3 | 3 minutes |
| 4 | 6 minutes |
| 5 | 9 minutes |
| 6 | 12 minutes |
| 7 | 15 minutes |
| 8 | 18 minutes |


| Table 3.5 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reported Number of Times |  |  |  |  |
| Committing Vandalism for 77 Boys |  |  |  |  |
| \# of Times | $f$ | $c f$ | $\%$ | $c \%$ |
| 0 | 15 | 15 | 19 | 19 |
| 1 | 10 | 25 | 13 | 32 |
| 2 | 5 | 30 | 7 | 39 |
| 3 | 11 | 41 | 14 | 53 |
| 4 | 7 | 48 | 9 | 62 |
| 5 | 8 | 56 | 10 | 72 |
| 6 | 5 | 61 | 7 | 79 |
| 7 | 4 | 65 | 5 | 84 |
| 8 | 5 | 70 | 7 | 91 |
| 9 | 4 | 74 | 5 | 96 |
| 10 or more | 3 | 77 | 4 | 100 |
| Total | $n=77$ |  | 100 |  |

## Table 3.6 <br> Grouped Frequency Distribution for Time-Until-Rearrest Data for 120 Inmates

| Stated Limits | Real Limits | $f$ | cf |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $17-19$ days | $16.5-19.5$ days | 4 | 4 |
| $20-22$ days | $19.5-22.5$ days | 1 | 5 |
| $23-25$ days | $22.5-25.5$ days | 12 | 17 |
| $26-28$ days | $25.5-28.5$ days | 16 | 33 |
| $29-31$ days | $28.5-31.5$ days | 28 | 61 |
| $32-34$ days | $31.5-34.5$ days | 28 | 89 |
| $35-37$ days | $34.5-37.5$ days | 21 | 110 |
| $38-40$ days | $37.5-40.5$ days | 10 | 120 |
|  |  | $n=120$ |  |

## Table 3.7 Rape Rates (per 100,000 People) for Selected U.S. Cities in 2013

| Rank | City | Rate | Rank | City | Rate | Rank | City | Rate |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | Binghamton, NY | 22.2 | 1 | Binghamton, NY | 22.2 | 1 | Goldsboro, NC | 4.0 |
| 2 | Albany, GA | 23.5 | 2 | Albany, GA | 23.5 | 2 | Binghamton, NY | 22.2 |
| 3 | Redmond, OR | 28.0 | 3 | Redmond, OR | 28.0 | 3 | Albany, GA | 23.5 |
| 4 | Cedar Rapids, IA | 28.1 | 4 | Cedar Rapids, IA | 28.1 | 4 | Redmond, OR | 28.0 |
| 5 | Charleston, SC | 28.4 | 5 | Charleston, SC | 28.4 | 5 | Cedar Rapids, IA | 28.1 |
| 6 | Boston, MA | 33.8 | 6 | Boston, MA | 33.8 | 6 | Charleston, SC | 28.4 |
| 7 | Akron, OH | 38.4 | 7 | Akron, OH | 38.4 | 7 | Boston, MA | 33.8 |
|  |  |  | 8 | Anchorage, AK | 133.2 | 8 | Akron, OH | 38.4 |

Source: Adapted from Crime In the United States from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (2013a).

| Table 3.8 | Response Times to 911 <br> Calls for Police Assistance |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minutes | $f_{i}$ | $x f_{i}$ |
| 1 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | 6 | 12 |
| 3 | 9 | 27 |
| 4 | 8 | 32 |
| 5 | 6 | 30 |
| 6 | 7 | 42 |
| 7 | 3 | 21 |
| 8 | 2 | 16 |
| 9 | 2 | 18 |
| 10 | 1 | 10 |
| 11 | 1 | 11 |
|  | $n=50$ | $\Sigma=224$ |

Table 3.9
Calculating a Mean Using Grouped Data: Time Until Rearrest for 120 Inmates

| Stated Limits (Days) | $F$ | Midpoint | $m f_{i}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $17-19$ | 4 | 18 | 72 |
| $20-22$ | 1 | 21 | 21 |
| $23-25$ | 12 | 24 | 288 |
| $26-28$ | 16 | 27 | 432 |
| $29-31$ | 28 | 30 | 840 |
| $32-34$ | 28 | 33 | 924 |
| $35-37$ | 21 | 36 | 756 |
| $38-40$ | 10 | 39 | 390 |
|  | $n=120$ |  | $\Sigma=3,723$ |


| Table 3.10 | Calculating a Mean Using Ungrouped Data: Time Until Rearrest for 120 Inmates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $x_{i}$ | $f_{i}$ | $x_{i} f_{i}$ |
| 17 | 1 | 17 |
| 18 | 1 | 18 |
| 19 | 2 | 38 |
| 20 | 1 | 20 |
| 21 | 0 | 0 |
| 22 | 0 | 0 |
| 23 | 3 | 69 |
| 24 | 4 | 96 |
| 25 | 5 | 125 |
| 26 | 3 | 78 |
| 27 | 7 | 189 |
| 28 | 6 | 168 |
| 29 | 11 | 319 |
| 30 | 7 | 210 |
| 31 | 10 | 310 |
| 32 | 7 | 224 |
| 33 | 12 | 396 |
| 34 | 8 | 272 |
| 35 | 8 | 280 |
| 36 | 8 | 288 |
| 37 | 6 | 222 |
| 38 | 4 | 152 |
| 39 | 2 | 78 |
| 40 | 4 | 160 |
|  | $n=120$ | $\Sigma=3,729$ |


| $X$ | $f$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| None | 20 |
| Some | 85 |
| Most | 30 |
| All | 10 |


| City | Homicide Rate |
| :--- | :---: |
| Boston, MA | 6.8 |
| Cincinnati, OH | 4.5 |
| Denver, CO | 6.0 |
| Las Vegas, NV | 8.8 |
| New Orleans, LA | 43.3 |
| New York, NY | 8.7 |
| Pittsburgh, PA | 10.5 |
| Salt Lake City, UT | 5.6 |
| San Diego, CA | 4.3 |
| San Francisco, CA | 7.7 |


| Person <br> Number | Number <br> of Crimes <br> Committed | Person <br> Number | Number <br> of Crimes <br> Committed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 4 | 11 | 4 |
| 2 | 16 | 12 | 11 |
| 3 | 10 | 13 | 10 |
| 4 | 7 | 14 | 88 |
| 5 | 3 | 15 | 9 |
| 6 | 112 | 16 | 12 |
| 7 | 5 | 17 | 8 |
| 8 | 10 | 18 | 5 |
| 9 | 6 | 19 | 7 |
| 10 | 2 | 20 | 10 |


| Request | Frequency |
| :--- | :--- |
| Offense against person | 213 |
| Offense against property | 496 |
| Other criminal offense | 238 |
| Potential offense | 3,784 |
| Individual in distress | 139 |
| Noncriminal incident | 986 |


| Narcotics Investigation (\%) | Frequency |
| :---: | :---: |
| $0-9$ | 5 |
| $10-19$ | 13 |
| $20-29$ | 26 |
| $30-39$ | 38 |
| $40-49$ | 14 |
| $50-59$ | 2 |
| $60-69$ | 2 |


| Year | \# of Executions |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 42 |
| 2008 | 37 |
| 2009 | 52 |
| 2010 | 46 |
| 2011 | 43 |
| 2012 | 43 |
| 2013 | 39 |
| 2014 | 35 |


| Number of Times Assaulted | Frequency |
| :---: | :---: |
| $0-1$ | 85 |
| $2-3$ | 70 |
| $4-5$ | 30 |
| $6-7$ | 15 |


| Person | Resting <br> Heart Rate | Person | Resting <br> Heart Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 59 | 11 | 60 |
| 2 | 62 | 12 | 55 |
| 3 | 69 | 13 | 52 |
| 4 | 62 | 14 | 70 |
| 5 | 64 | 15 | 52 |
| 6 | 70 | 16 | 57 |
| 7 | 54 | 17 | 53 |
| 8 | 66 | 18 | 61 |
| 9 | 51 | 19 | 64 |
| 10 | 56 | 20 | 63 |

Table 4.1
Number of Years of Prison Time for Convicted Armed Robbery Defendants

| Defendant | Judge 1 | Judge 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sentence Given | Sentence Given |
| 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 2 | 7 | 2 |
| 3 | 7 | 2 |
| 4 | 7 | 3 |
| 5 | 7 | 3 |
| 6 | 7 | 3 |
| 7 | 8 | 4 |
| 8 | 8 | 4 |
| 9 | 8 | 5 |
| 10 | 8 | 8 |
| 11 | 9 | 9 |
| 12 | 9 | 10 |
| 13 | 9 | 11 |
| 14 | 10 | 14 |
| 15 | 11 | 15 |
| 16 | 11 | 15 |
| 17 | 11 | 16 |
| 18 | 12 | 17 |
| 19 | 12 | 18 |
| 20 | 14 | 20 |
| $n=20$ | $\begin{gathered} \Sigma=180 \\ \bar{X}=9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \Sigma=180 \\ \bar{X}=9 \end{gathered}$ |

Figure 4.1 Sentence Length in Years Given by Two Judges


| Table 4.2 | Type and Frequency of Patrolling |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Used in Police Shifts in One U.S. City |  |  |$|$|  | $f$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Foot patrol only | 5 |
| Car patrol only | 30 |
| Foot and car patrol | 10 |
| Total number of shifts | 45 |


| Table 4.3Type of Hate Crime Incident Reported to <br> Police in 2013 |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Basis of Hate |  |  |  |
| Race | 2,871 | .485 | 48.5 |
| Religion | 1,031 | .174 | 17.4 |
| Sexual orientation | 1,233 | .208 | 20.8 |
| Ethnicity/National origin | 655 | .111 | 11.1 |
| Disability | 83 | .014 | 1.4 |
| Gender | 18 | .003 | 0.3 |
| Gender identity | 31 | .005 | 0.5 |
| Total | 5,922 | 1.0 | 100.0 |

Source: Adapted from Hate Crime Statistics—2013 from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (2013b).

## Table 4.4 Hypothetical Hate Crime Data

| Type of Hate | $f$ | Proportion |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Racial | 4,975 | .840 |
| Religious | 414 | .070 |
| Sexual orientation | 272 | .046 |
| Ethnicity/National origin | 148 | .025 |
| Disability | 53 | .009 |
| Gender | 30 | .005 |
| Gender identity | 30 | .005 |
| Total | 5,922 | 1.000 |

## Table 4.5 Hypothetical Hate Crime Data

| Type of Hate | $f$ | Proportion |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Racial | 846 | .143 |
| Religious | 846 | .143 |
| Sexual orientation | 846 | .143 |
| Ethnicity/National origin | 846 | .143 |
| Disability | 846 | .143 |
| Gender | 846 | .143 |
| Gender identity | 846 | .143 |
| Total | 5,922 | $1.001^{*}$ |

*Greater than 1.0 due to rounding.

Table 4.6
Grouped Frequency Distribution for Time-Until-Failure Data for 120 Inmates

| Stated Limits (Days) | $f$ | Midpoint |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $17-19$ | 4 | 18 |
| $20-22$ | 1 | 21 |
| $23-25$ | 12 | 24 |
| $26-28$ | 16 | 27 |
| $29-31$ | 28 | 30 |
| $32-34$ | 28 | 33 |
| $35-37$ | 10 | 36 |
| $38-40$ | $n=120$ | 39 |
|  |  |  |

Table 4.7
Number of Years of Prison Time for Convicted Armed Robbery Defendants

| Judge 1 |  | Judge 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Years <br> Sentenced | $f$ | Years <br> Sentenced | $f$ |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| 6 | 1 | 20 | 10 |
| 7 | 3 |  |  |
| 8 | 4 |  |  |
| 9 | 3 |  |  |
| 10 | 1 |  |  |
| 11 | 3 |  |  |
| 12 | 2 |  |  |
| 13 | 1 |  |  |
| 14 | 1 |  |  |

Table 4.8
The Relationship Among Percentiles, Deciles, and Quartiles

| Percentile | Decile | Quartile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100th | 10th | 4th $\left(Q_{4}\right)$ |
| 99th |  |  |
| 98th |  |  |
| 90th | 9th |  |
| . |  |  |
| 80th | 8th |  |
| - |  |  |
| . |  |  |
| 75th |  | $3 \mathrm{rd}\left(Q_{3}\right)$ |
| - |  |  |
| . |  |  |
| 60th | 6th |  |
| - |  |  |
| . |  |  |
| 50th | 5th | 2nd ( $Q_{2}$ ) |
| - |  |  |
| - |  |  |
| . |  |  |
| 30th | 3rd |  |
| 29th |  |  |
| 28th |  |  |
| 25th |  | 1st ( $Q_{1}$ ) |
| - |  |  |
| . |  |  |
| 20th | 2nd |  |
| - |  |  |
| 3rd |  |  |
| 2nd |  |  |
| 1st |  |  |


| Table 4.9 | Number of Escapes <br> From 20 Correctional <br> Institutions in Two States |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Institution | State $A$ | State $B$ |

Rank-Ordered Number of Escapes
From 20 Correctional Institutions in Two States From Table 4.9

| Institution | State A | State B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 5 | 2 | 3 |
| 6 | 2 | 3 |
| 7 | 3 | 3 |
| 8 | 3 | 3 |
| 9 | 3 | 4 |
| 10 | 4 | 4 |
| 11 | 4 | 4 |
| 12 | 4 | 5 |
| 13 | 5 | 5 |
| 14 | 5 | 5 |
| 15 | 6 | 6 |
| 16 | 6 | 6 |
| 17 | 7 | 8 |
| 18 | 7 | 8 |
| 19 | 9 | 9 |
| 20 | 23 | 10 |

Frequency Counts, Percentages, and Cumulative Percentages for Escape Data From Two States

| State A \# of <br> Escapes | $f$ | $\%$ | Cum \% | State B \# of <br> Escapes | $f$ | $\%$ | Cum \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 10 |
| 1 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 2 | 3 | 15 | 30 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 40 |
| 3 | 3 | 15 | 45 | 4 | 3 | 15 | 55 |
| 4 | 3 | 15 | 60 | 5 | 3 | 15 | 70 |
| 5 | 2 | 10 | 70 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 80 |
| 6 | 2 | 10 | 80 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 90 |
| 7 | 2 | 10 | 90 | 9 | 1 | 5 | 95 |
| 9 | 1 | 5 | 95 | 10 | 1 | 5 | 100 |
| 23 | 1 | 5 | 100 |  |  |  |  |
|  | $n=20$ | 100 |  |  | $n=20$ | 100 |  |

Two Sample Distributions of One Variable: (a) Five Scores With Little
Figure 4.2 Dispersion About the Mean and (b) Five Scores With a Great Deal of Dispersion About the Mean

(a)

(b)

For the scores in Figure 4.2(a)

| Score | Mean | Deviation From Mean | Squared Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | 25 | $23-25=-2$ | 4 |
| 26 | 25 | $26-25=+1$ | 1 |
| 23 | 25 | $23-25=-2$ | 4 |
| 27 | 25 | $27-25=+2$ | 4 |
| 26 | 25 | $26-25=+1$ | 1 |

For the scores in Figure 4.2(b)

| Score | Mean | Deviation From Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 25 | $10-25=-15$ |
| 50 | 25 | $50-25=+25$ |
| 15 | 25 | $15-25=-10$ |
| 40 | 25 | $40-25=+15$ |
| 10 |  | $10-25=-15$ |

For the scores in Figure 4.2(a):

| Score | Mean | Deviation From Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | 25 | $23-25=-2$ |
| 26 | 25 | $26-25=+1$ |
| 23 | 25 | $23-25=-2$ |
| 27 | 25 | $27-25=+2$ |
| 26 | 25 | $26-25=+1$ |

For the scores in Figure 4.2(b):

| Score | Mean | Deviation From <br> Mean | Squared <br> Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 25 | $10-25=-15$ | 225 |
| 50 | 25 | $50-25=25$ | 625 |
| 15 | 25 | $15-25=-10$ | 100 |
| 40 | 25 | $40-25=15$ | 225 |
| 10 | 25 | $10-25=-15$ | 225 |



| Table 4.13 | Calculations for the <br> Variance and Standard <br> Deviation in Judge 1's <br> Sentencing $(n=20)$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $x$ | $x_{i}-\bar{x}$ | $\left(x_{i}-\bar{x}\right)^{2}$ |
| 5 | $5-9=-4$ | 16 |
| 7 | $7-9=-2$ | 4 |
| 7 | $7-9=-2$ | 4 |
| 7 | $7-9=-2$ | 4 |
| 7 | $7-9=-2$ | 4 |
| 7 | $7-9=-2$ | 4 |
| 8 | $8-9=-1$ | 1 |
| 8 | $8-9=-1$ | 1 |
| 8 | $8-9=-1$ | 1 |
| 8 | $8-9=-1$ | 1 |
| 9 | $9-9=0$ | 0 |
| 9 | $9-9=0$ | 0 |
| 9 | $9-9=0$ | 0 |
| 10 | $10-9=1$ | 1 |
| 11 | $11-9=2$ | 4 |
| 11 | $11-9=2$ | 4 |
| 11 | $11-9=2$ | 4 |
| 12 | $12-9=3$ | 9 |
| 12 | $12-9=3$ | 9 |
|  | $14-9=5$ | 25 |
|  |  | $\Sigma=96$ |
|  |  |  |


| Table 4.14 | Calculations for the Variance and Standard Deviation in Judge 2's Sentencing ( $n=20$ ) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $x$ | $x_{i}-\bar{x}$ | $\left(x_{i}-\bar{x}\right)^{2}$ |
| 1 | $1-9=-8$ | 64 |
| 2 | $2-9=-7$ | 49 |
| 2 | $2-9=-7$ | 49 |
| 3 | $3-9=-6$ | 36 |
| 3 | $3-9=-6$ | 36 |
| 3 | $3-9=-6$ | 36 |
| 4 | $4-9=-5$ | 25 |
| 4 | $4-9=-5$ | 25 |
| 5 | $5-9=-4$ | 16 |
| 8 | $8-9=-1$ | 1 |
| 9 | $9-9=0$ | 0 |
| 10 | $10-9=1$ | 1 |
| 11 | $11-9=2$ | 4 |
| 14 | $14-9=5$ | 25 |
| 15 | $15-9=6$ | 36 |
| 15 | $15-9=6$ | 36 |
| 16 | $16-9=7$ | 49 |
| 17 | $17-9=8$ | 64 |
| 18 | $18-9=9$ | 81 |
| 20 | $20-9=11$ | 121 |
|  |  | $\Sigma=754$ |

## Self-Control Scores for a

Table 4.15
Sample of 25 Incarcerated Youths

| $x$ | $x_{i}-\bar{\chi}$ | $\left(x_{i}-\bar{x}\right)^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 85 | $85-91=-6$ | 36 |
| 100 | $100-91=9$ | 81 |
| 87 | $87-91=-4$ | 16 |
| 93 | $93-91=2$ | 4 |
| 78 | $78-91=-13$ | 169 |
| 103 | $103-91=-12$ | 144 |
| 88 | $88-91=-3$ | 9 |
| 94 | $94-91=3$ | 9 |
| 94 | $94-91=3$ | 9 |
| 101 | $101-91=10$ | 100 |
| 94 | $94-91=3$ | 9 |
| 92 | $92-91=1$ | 1 |
| 83 | $83-91=-8$ | 64 |
| 70 | $70-91=-21$ | 441 |
| 110 | $110-91=19$ | 361 |
| 87 | $87-91=-4$ | 16 |
| 91 | $91-91=0$ | 0 |
| 79 | $79-91=-12$ | 144 |
| 84 | $84-91=-7$ | 49 |
| 88 | $88-91=-3$ | 9 |
| 90 | $90-91=-1$ | 1 |
| 104 | $104-91=13$ | 169 |
| 100 | $100-91=9$ | 81 |
| 98 | 98-91 = 7 | 49 |
| 82 | $82-91=-9$ | 81 |
|  |  | $\Sigma=2,052$ |


| Table 4.16 | Stated Class Limits, Midpoints, and Frequencies for Grouped Frequency Distribution of Time-Until-Rearrest Data $(n=120)$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stated Class Limits | Midpoints (m.) | $f$ |
| 17-19 | 18 | 4 |
| 20-22 | 21 | 1 |
| 23-25 | 24 | 12 |
| 26-28 | 27 | 16 |
| 29-31 | 30 | 28 |
| 32-34 | 33 | 28 |
| 35-37 | 36 | 21 |
| 38-40 | 39 | 10 |

Table 4.17
Calculations for Variance and Standard Deviation for Time-Until-Rearrest Data ( $n=120$ )

| Midpoint of Class Interval | $m_{i}-\bar{X}$ | $\left(m_{i}-\bar{X}\right)^{2}$ | $f_{i}$ | $f_{i}\left(m_{i}-\bar{X}\right)^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 | $18-31=-13$ | 169 | 4 | $4(169)=676$ |
| 21 | $21-31=-10$ | 100 | 1 | $1(100)=100$ |
| 24 | $24-31=-7$ | 49 | 12 | $12(49)=588$ |
| 27 | $27-31=-4$ | 16 | 16 | $16(16)=256$ |
| 30 | $30-31=-1$ | 1 | 28 | $28(1)=28$ |
| 33 | $33-31=2$ | 4 | 28 | $28(4)=112$ |
| 36 | $36-31=5$ | 25 | 21 | $21(25)=525$ |
| 39 | $39-31=8$ | 64 | 10 | $10(64)=640$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\Sigma=2,925$ |


| Table 4.18 | Data and Calculations for <br> Variance and Standard <br> Deviation: Judge Sentencing <br> Data From Table 4.1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Judge 1 |  | Judge 2 |  |
| x | $x^{2}$ | x | $\chi^{2}$ |
| 5 | 25 | 1 | 1 |
| 7 | 49 | 2 | 4 |
| 7 | 49 | 2 | 4 |
| 7 | 49 | 3 | 9 |
| 7 | 49 | 3 | 9 |
| 7 | 49 | 3 | 9 |
| 8 | 64 | 4 | 16 |
| 8 | 64 | 4 | 16 |
| 8 | 64 | 5 | 25 |
| 8 | 64 | 8 | 64 |
| 9 | 81 | 9 | 81 |
| 9 | 81 | 10 | 100 |
| 9 | 81 | 11 | 121 |
| 10 | 100 | 14 | 196 |
| 11 | 121 | 15 | 225 |
| 11 | 121 | 15 | 225 |
| 11 | 121 | 16 | 256 |
| 12 | 144 | 17 | 289 |
| 12 | 144 | 18 | 324 |
| 14 | 196 | 20 | 400 |
| $\Sigma=180$ | $\Sigma=1,716$ | $\Sigma=180$ | $\Sigma=2,374$ |


| Talculations for Variance and <br> Standard Deviation for Grouped <br> Time-Until-Rearrest Data |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $m f$ | $f_{i}$ | $m_{i}^{2 f_{i}}$ | $m_{i} f_{i}$ |
|  | 324 | 4 | 1,296 | 72 |
|  | 441 | 1 | 441 | 21 |
|  | 576 | 12 | 6,912 | 288 |
| 27 | 729 | 16 | 11,664 | 432 |
| 30 | 900 | 28 | 25,200 | 840 |
| 33 | 1,089 | 28 | 30,492 | 924 |
| 36 | 1,296 | 21 | 27,216 | 756 |
| 39 | 1,521 | 10 | 15,210 | 390 |
|  |  |  | $\Sigma=118,431$ | 3,723 |


|  |  | Current Offense Is: |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Property | Violent | Drug | Status |  |  |
| Previous offense was: | Property | 75 | 50 | 40 | 120 |  |
|  | Violent | 10 | 30 | 30 | 20 |  |
|  | Drug | 20 | 10 | 110 | 115 |  |
| Total | Status | 20 | 20 | 50 | 320 |  |


| Number of Thefts | $f$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $0-4$ | 76 |
| $5-9$ | 52 |
| $10-14$ | 38 |
| $15-19$ | 21 |
| $20-24$ | 10 |
| $25-29$ | 8 |


| Person | Years of <br> Education | Person | Years of <br> Education |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 11 | 11 | 9 |
| 2 | 8 | 12 | 9 |
| 3 | 12 | 13 | 5 |
| 4 | 9 | 14 | 9 |
| 5 | 9 | 15 | 7 |
| 6 | 9 | 16 | 6 |
| 7 | 10 | 17 | 10 |
| 8 | 10 | 18 | 12 |
| 9 | 10 | 19 | 9 |
| 10 | 11 | 20 | 5 |


| Year | Race | $f$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 | White | 852 |
|  | Black | 675 |
|  | Hispanic | 112 |
|  | Asian | 25 |
|  | Other | 59 |
| 1990 | White | 979 |
|  | Black | 756 |
|  | Hispanic | 262 |
|  | Asian | 86 |
|  | Other | 78 |
| 2000 | White | 1,211 |
|  | Black | 925 |
|  | Hispanic | 636 |
|  | Asian | 310 |
|  | Other | 120 |
| 2010 | White | 1,300 |
|  | Black | 1,017 |
|  | Hispanic | 750 |
|  | Asian | 400 |
|  | Other | 145 |


| State | Robbery <br> Arrest Rate | State | Robbery <br> Arrest Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Arizona | 29 | New York | 70 |
| Arkansas | 22 | North Carolina | 41 |
| Colorado | 17 | North Dakota | 7 |
| Georgia | 32 | Oregon | 30 |
| Idaho | 6 | Pennsylvania | 51 |
| Kentucky | 29 | South Carolina | 32 |
| Maine | 17 | Texas | 25 |
| Maryland | 56 | Utah | 13 |
| Missouri | 33 | Wyoming | 5 |

Source: Adapted from Puzzanchera and Kang © 2014 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.



| Table 5.1Adolescents' Delinquent <br> Conduct by Family Status |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0 | $1-4$ | 5 or <br> More | Total |
|  | 125 | 60 | 15 | 200 |
| Yes | 10 | 35 | 65 | 110 |
| Total | 135 | 95 | 80 | 310 |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Table 5.2 | Joint Frequency Distribution for Right- <br> and Left-Handedness and Delinquency |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Committed Delinquent Act <br> Last Year? |  |  |
|  | No | Yes | Total |


| Table 5.3 Joi | Joint Frequency Distribution for Impulsivity and Delinquency |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Youth Impulsive? | Committed Delinquent Act Last Year? |  | Total |
|  | No | Yes |  |
| No | 40 | 10 | 50 |
| Yes | 10 | 40 | 50 |
| Total | 50 | 50 | 100 |

## Table 5.4

## Rule 1: The Bounding Rule

The probability of an event (event $A$ ) must always be greater than or equal to zero or less than or equal to 1.0 .
$0 \leq P(A) \leq 1$
Rule 2: The Addition Rule
Rule 2a: The Restricted Addition Rule for Mutually Exclusive Events
If two events (events $A$ and $B$ ) are mutually exclusive, the probability of either event $A$ or event $B$ occurring is equal to the sum of their separate probabilities.

$$
P(A \text { or } B)=P(A)+P(B)
$$

## Rule 2b:The General Addition Rule

If two events (events $A$ and $B$ ) are not mutually exclusive, the probability of either event $A$ or event $B$ occurring is equal to the sum of their separate probabilities minus their joint probability.
$P(A$ or $B)=P(A)+P(B)-P(A$ and $B)$

## Rule 3: The Multiplication Rule

## Rule 3a: The Restricted Multiplication Rule for Independent Events

If two events (events $A$ and $B$ ) are independent, the probability of event $A$ and event $B$ occurring simultaneously is equal to the product of their separate probabilities.
$P(A$ and $B)=P(A) \times P(B)$

## Rule 3b: The General Multiplication Rule

If two events (events $A$ and $B$ ) are not independent, the probability of event $A$ and event $B$ occurring simultaneously is equal to the product of the unconditional probability of $A$ and the conditional probability of $B$ given $A$.
$P(A$ and $B)=P(A) \times P(B \mid A)$

| Table 5.5 | Probability Distribution of <br> the Number of Heads From <br> Flipping a Coin Two Times |
| :---: | :---: |
| Number of Heads |  |


| Table 5.6 | Observed Results From the <br> Flipping of a Coin Twice 10 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number of Heads $f$ $p$ |  |
| 0 | 5 |
| 1 | 3 |
| 2 | 2 |
| Total | 10 |


| Table 5.7 | Probability Distribution of Appearance at Trial Where $p$ (Success) $=.8$, $q($ Failure $)=.2$, and $n=5$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Successes | Calculation | $p$ |
| 0 | $\left(\frac{5!}{0!(5-0)!}\right) \cdot 8^{0} \cdot 2^{5}$ | . 0003 |
| 1 | $\left(\frac{5!}{1!(5-1)!}\right) \cdot 8^{1} \cdot 2^{4}$ | . 0064 |
| 2 | $\left(\frac{5!}{2!(5-2)!}\right) \cdot 8^{2} \cdot 2^{3}$ | . 0512 |
| 3 | $\left(\frac{5!}{3!(5-3)!}\right) \cdot 8^{3} \cdot 2^{2}$ | . 2048 |
| 4 | $\left(\frac{5!}{4!(5-4)!}\right) \cdot 8^{4} \cdot 2^{1}$ | . 4096 |
| 5 | $\left(\frac{5!}{5!(5-5)!}\right) \cdot 8^{5} \cdot 2^{0}$ | . 3277 |
|  |  | Total $=1.00$ |

Figure 5.3 Histogram of Probability Distribution From Table 5.7


| Table 5.8 |  | Decision Making in Hypothesis <br> Tests |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| True State of <br> Affairs | Fail to Reject | Reject |  |
| Null hypothesis <br> is true | Correct decision | Type I error |  |
| Null hypothesis <br> is false | Type II error | Correct <br> decision |  |


| Table 5.9 | Probability Distribution of Recovering a Stolen Car With LoJack Where $p$ (Success) =.4, $q($ Failure $)=.6$, and $n=10$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Successes | Calculation | P |
| 0 | $\left(\frac{10!}{0!(10-0)!}\right) \cdot 4^{0} \cdot 6^{10}$ | . 0060 |
| 1 | $\left(\frac{10!}{1!(10-1)!}\right) \cdot 4^{1} \cdot 6^{9}$ | . 0403 |
| 2 | $\left(\frac{10!}{2!(10-2)!}\right) \cdot 4^{2} \cdot 6^{8}$ | . 1209 |
| 3 | $\left(\frac{10!}{3!(10-3)!}\right) \cdot 4^{3} \cdot 6^{7}$ | . 2150 |
| 4 | $\left(\frac{10!}{4!(10-4)!}\right) \cdot 4^{4} \cdot 6^{6}$ | . 2508 |
| 5 | $\left(\frac{10!}{5!(10-5)!}\right) \cdot 4^{5} \cdot 6^{5}$ | . 2007 |
| 6 | $\left(\frac{10!}{6!(10-6)!}\right) \cdot 4^{6} \cdot 6^{4}$ | . 1115 |
| 7 | $\left(\frac{10!}{7!(10-7)!}\right) \cdot 4^{7} \cdot 6^{3}$ | . 0425 |
| 8 | $\left(\frac{10!}{8!(10-8)!}\right) \cdot 4^{8} \cdot 6^{2}$ | . 0106 |
| 9 | $\left(\frac{10!}{9!(10-9)!}\right) \cdot 4^{9} \cdot 6^{1}$ | . 0016 |
| 10 | $\left(\frac{10!}{10!(10-10)!}\right) \cdot 4^{10} \cdot 6^{0}$ | $\begin{gathered} .0001 \\ \text { Total }=1.00 \end{gathered}$ |

Figure 5.4 Histogram of Probability Distribution of Stolen Car Recoveries


Figure 5.5 Representation of a Standard Normal Distribution


Figure 5.6
Two Normal Distributions With Unequal Means $\left(\mu_{1} \neq \mu_{2}\right)$ but Equal Variances $\left(\sigma_{1}^{2}={ }_{2}{ }_{2}\right)$

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Figure 5.7 } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Two Normal Distributions With Equal Means } \\ \left(\mu_{1}=\mu_{2}\right) \text { but Unequal Variances }\left(\sigma_{1}{ }_{1}{ }^{2}{ }_{2}\right)\end{array}\end{array}$


Figure 5.8
Two Normal Distributions With Unequal Means ( $\mu_{1} \neq \mu_{2}$ ) and Unequal Variances $\left(\sigma_{1}^{2} \neq{ }_{2}\right.$ )



Figure 5.10
Area of the Normal Curve From the Mean to
Points $\pm 1, \pm 2$, and $\pm 3$ Standard Deviations Away


| Table 5.10 | Number of Prior <br> Arrests for Sample of <br> 10 Persons Arrested <br> During Past Year |
| :---: | :---: |
| Person |  |
| 1 | Number of Prior <br> Arrests |
| 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 2 |
| 4 | 0 |
| 5 | 8 |
| 7 | 0 |
| 8 | 13 |
| 9 | 4 |
| 10 | 10 |




Figure $\left.5.14 \begin{array}{l}\text { Area of the Normal Curve Corresponding } \\ \text { to the Top } 1 \% \text { of the Distribution }\end{array}\right]$


| Table 5.11 | Characteristics of Three Types of Distributions |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | Standard <br> Deviation | Distribution |
| Sample | $\bar{\chi}$ | $s$ | Empirical and known |
| Population | $\mu$ | $\sigma$ | Empirical but not known |
| Sampling distribution | $\mu$ | $\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}$ | Theoretical |



| Salary | $f$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\$ 25,000$ | 6 |
| $\$ 26,000$ | 8 |
| $\$ 27,500$ | 9 |
| $\$ 28,000$ | 10 |
| $\$ 30,000$ | 16 |
| $\$ 31,500$ | 19 |
| $\$ 32,000$ | 12 |
| $\$ 32,500$ | 15 |
| $\$ 34,000$ | 8 |
| $\$ 35,000$ | 7 |
| Total | 110 |


| Impulsivity | Deterred | Not <br> Deterred | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 75 | 15 |  |
| Impulsive | 5 | 25 | 30 |
| Total | 80 | 40 | 120 |


| Number of <br> Violent Acts | No Measures | Metal Detectors Only | Guards Only | Guards and Metal <br> Detectors | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 | 10 | 15 | 30 |  |
|  | 25 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 75 |
| 5 or more acts | 50 | 30 | 25 | 10 | 115 |
| Total | 80 | 60 | 55 | 55 | 250 |


|  | Favor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Background checks for private and gun show sales | 85 |
| Preventing people with mental illness from purchasing guns | 80 |
| Federal database to track gun sales | 67 |
| Ban on semi-automatic weapons | 58 |
| Ban on high-capacity ammunition clips | 54 |

## Table 6.1 Top Crime Worries of Americans

Crime Worries in United States
How often do you, yourself, worry about the following things-frequently, occasionally, rarely, or never? How about ...

|  | \% Frequently or <br> Occasionally Worry |
| :--- | :---: |
| Having the credit card information you have used at stores stolen by computer <br> hackers | 69 |
| Having your computer or smartphone hacked and the information stolen by <br> unauthorized persons | 62 |
| Having your home being burglarized when you are not there | 45 |
| Having your car stolen or broken into | 42 |
| Having a school-aged child physically harmed attending school | 31 |
| Getting mugged | 31 |
| Having your home being burglarized when you are there | 30 |
| Being the victim of terrorism | 28 |
| Being attacked while driving your car | 20 |
| Being a victim of a hate crime | 18 |
| Being sexually assaulted | 18 |
| Getting murdered | 18 |
| Being assaulted/killed by a coworker/employee where you work | 7 |
|  |  |

Source: Copyright ©2014 Gallup, Inc. All rights reserved. The content is used with permission; however, Gallup retains all rights of republication.

Figure 6.1
A Hypothetical Example of 95\% Confidence Intervals Computed From 20 Different Samples of the Same Size Drawn From the Same Population


## Table 6.2 Properties of the Sampling Distribution of $\bar{X}$

1. The mean of this sampling distribution of $\bar{X}$ is $\mu$.
2. The standard deviation of the sampling distribution of $\bar{X}$ is

$$
\sigma_{\bar{x}}=\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}
$$

where $\sigma$ is the standard deviation of the original population, $n$ is the sample size, and $\sigma_{\bar{x}}$ is used to denote the standard deviation of the sampling distribution. This entire term is called the standard error of the mean.
3. Because of the central limit theorem, when $n$ is large (safely, when $n \geq 30$ ), the sampling distribution is normally distributed regardless of the distribution of the population from which the sample was drawn.
4. As the sample size increases, the standard deviation of the sampling distribution (the standard error of the mean) decreases.

| Table 6.3 <br>  <br> Their Corresponding Critical Values of <br> T From the Sampling Distribution of $\boldsymbol{z}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Confidence Level <br> $(\%)$ | Significance <br> $(\alpha)$ | z Score |
| 90 | .10 | 1.65 |
| 95 | .05 | 1.96 |
| 99 | .01 | 2.58 |
| 99.9 | .001 | 3.27 |

Figure 6.2 The $z$ Distribution and the $t$ Distribution


## Table 6.4 Properties of the Sampling Distribution of $t$

1. The $t$ distribution is bell-shaped and symmetrical and centers around $t=0$.
2. The $t$ distribution is flatter and has fatter tails than the $z$ distribution.
3. There are many different $t$ distributions based on the sample size. More specifically, the distribution of $t$ that we use for our statistical test is based on a parameter called the degrees of freedom (df). The number of degrees of freedom is different for different kinds of statistical problems. For confidence intervals, there are $n-1$ degrees of freedom where $n$ is the sample size.
4. With sample sizes of 120 or more, the $t$ distribution becomes virtually identical to the $z$ distribution.

| Police Officers' Overload <br> Score in Our Sample |
| :---: |
| $\bar{X}=31$ |
| $s=3$ |
| $n=14$ |


| Female Police <br> Officers' Scores <br> on Work Overload <br> Test | Male Police <br> Officers' Scores <br> on Work Overload <br> Test |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\bar{X}=41.9$ | $\bar{X}=32.5$ |
| $s=7.8$ | $s=9.3$ |
| $n=15$ | $n=15$ |

## Figure 7.1 Formal Steps for Hypothesis Testing

Step 1: Formally state your null $\left(H_{0}\right)$ and research $\left(H_{1}\right)$ hypotheses.
Step 2: Select an appropriate test statistic and the sampling distribution of that test statistic.
Step 3: Select a level of significance (alpha $=\alpha$ ) and determine the critical value and rejection region of the test statistic based on the selected level of alpha.
Step 4: Conduct the test; calculate the obtained value of the test statistic and compare it with the critical value.
Step 5: Make a decision about your null hypothesis and interpret this decision in a meaningful way based on the research question, sample, and population.

|  | Population | Sample |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mean reading level | $\mu=7.5$ | $\bar{x}=9.3$ |
| Standard deviation | $\sigma=$ unknown | $s=2.2$ |
|  | $N=$ unknown | $n=100$ |

Figure 7.2 Two Populations With Different Mean Reading Levels



## Table 7.1

Alpha ( $\alpha$ ) Levels and Critical Values of $z$ for One- and Two-Tailed Hypothesis Tests

| Type of Hypothesis Test | Significance/A/pha Level | Critical Area in Each Tail | Critical z |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Two-tailed | .10 | .05 | 1.65 |
| One-tailed | .10 | .10 | 1.29 |
| Two-tailed | .05 | .025 | 1.96 |
| One-tailed | .05 | .05 | 1.65 |
| Two-tailed | .01 | .005 | 2.58 |
| One-tailed | .01 | .01 | 2.33 |
| Two-tailed | .001 | .0005 | 3.27 |
| One-tailed |  | .001 | 3.08 |

Figure 7.4 Critical $z$ and Critical Region for Two-Tailed Test and Alpha $=.05$


| Population Parameters for Armed <br> Robberies Before New Legislation | Sample Statistics for Armed <br> Robberies After New Legislation |
| :--- | :---: |
| $\mu=52.5$ months | $\bar{x}=53.2$ months |
| $\sigma=$ unknown | $s=6$ |
| $N=$ unknown | $n=110$ |

Figure 7.5 Critical zand Critical Region for Two-Tailed Test With Alpha $=.01$


## Figure 7.6

Three Populations of Convicted Armed Robbers With Different Mean Sentence Lengths (in Months)


Figure 7.7
Two Populations of Convicted Armed Robbers, One With Mean = 52.5 and One With Mean = 58.5


Figure 7.8
Two Populations of Convicted Armed Robbers, One With Mean = 48.0 and One With Mean = 52.5


Figure 7.9 Critical $z$ and Critical Region for Two-Tailed Test With Alpha $=.05$


Figure 7.10 Critical zand Critical Region for One-Tailed Test and Alpha $=.05$


Figure 7.11 Critical $t$ and Critical Region for Two-Tailed Test and Alpha $=.01$


| National Sample of Asset <br> Seizures in Dollars from ATF | Sample of 14 Asset Seizures <br> in Our State in Dollars |
| :--- | :---: |
| $\mu=\$ 75,200$ | $\bar{x}=\$ 71,500$ |
| $\sigma=$ unknown | $s=\$ 3,900$ |
| $N=$ unknown | $n=14$ |

Figure 7.12 Critical $t$ and Critical Region for Two-Tailed Test and Alpha $=.01$


Figure 7.13 Critical $t$ and Critical Region for Two-Tailed Test and Alpha $=.01$


Figure 7.14 Critical $z$ and Critical Region for One-Tailed and Alpha $=.05$


| Population | Sample |
| :--- | :--- |
| $P=12 \%$ | $\hat{p}=36 \%$ |
|  | $n=100$ |

Figure 7.15 Critical $z$ and Critical Region for a One-Tailed Test With Alpha $=.05$


| Facility Number | Hours Spent in Cells |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 16.3 |
| 2 | 21.1 |
| 3 | 14.9 |
| 4 | 13.5 |
| 5 | 22.2 |
| 6 | 15.3 |
| 7 | 18.1 |
| 8 | 19.0 |
| 9 | 14.2 |
| 10 | 9.3 |
| 11 | 10.1 |
| 12 | 21.1 |
| 13 | 22.3 |
| 14 | 15.4 |
| 15 | 13.2 |


| Table 8.1 | Distribution of Gender and Negative Emotionality and Joint Distribution of Gender and Negative Emotionality in Contingency Table |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender |  | $f$ |  |
| Female |  | 60 |  |
| Male |  | 60 |  |
| Negative Emotionality |  | $f$ |  |
| Low |  | 90 |  |
| High |  | 30 |  |
| Contingency Table of Observed Joint Frequency Distribution |  |  |  |
| Gender | Negative Emotionality |  |  |
|  | Low | High | Total |
| Female | 46 | 14 | 60 |
| Male | 44 | 16 | 60 |
| Total | 90 | 30 | 120 |


| Table 8.2 Labeling a $2 \times 2$ Contingency Table |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Rows | 1 | 2 | Row Marginals |
|  | $A^{*}$ | $B^{*}$ |  |
|  | $C^{*}$ | $D^{*}$ | $R_{2}$ |
|  | $C_{1}$ | $C_{2}$ | $N$ |
| Column marginals |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

*Cell frequencies.

## Table 8.3

Relationship Between Gender and Negative Emotionality: Comparing Percentages Across the IV Categories Within a DV Category

| Gender (IV) | Negative Emotionality (DV) |  | Row Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Low | High |  | Calculate percentages based on the marginals of the independent variable |
| Female | A | B | $\begin{gathered} 60 \\ 100 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | 46 | 14 |  |  |
|  | 77\% | - $23 \%$ |  |  |
| Male | C | D |  | Compare on a category of the dependent variable across categories of the independent variable |
|  | 44 <br> 73\% | 『 $\begin{gathered}16 \\ 27 \%\end{gathered}$ | 100\% |  |
| Column total | 90 | 30 | $n=120$ |  |



| Table 8.5 | Relationship Between Attitudes Toward School and Self-Reported Delinquency: Observed Frequencies With Percentages and Making Comparisons Across the IV Categories |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DV: Number of Self- <br> Reported Delinquent Acts |  | IV: Do You | School? | Total |
|  |  | Like | Dislike |  |
| 0 |  | $\begin{gathered} 140 \\ 45 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & 19 \% \end{aligned}$ | 165 |
| 1 |  | $\begin{gathered} 105 \\ 33 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & 37 \% \end{aligned}$ | 155 |
| 2+ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 22 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \\ & 44 \% \end{aligned}$ | 130 |
| Total |  | $\begin{aligned} & 315 \\ & 100 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 135 \\ & 100 \% \end{aligned}$ | 450 |


| Table 8.6 | Observed Cell Frequencies and Expected Cell Frequencies for Relationship Between Gender and Negative Emotionality |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Negative Emotionality |  |  |  |
| Gender | Low | High | Row Total |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \text { A } \\ 46 \\ f_{e}=45 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B } \\ 14 \\ f_{e}=15 \end{gathered}$ | 60 |
| Male | $\begin{gathered} C \\ 44 \\ f_{e}=45 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} D \\ 16 \\ f_{e}=15 \end{gathered}$ | 60 |
| Column total | 90 | 30 | $n=120$ |


| Table 8.7 | Row and Column Marginals for <br> Gender and Negative Emotions <br> Data Found in Table 8.6 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Negative Emotionality |  |  |  |
| Gender | Low | High | Total |
| Female | $?$ | $?$ | 60 |
| Male | $?$ | $?$ | 60 |
| Total | 90 | 30 | 120 |


| Table 8.8 | Determining Degrees of Freedom <br> in a $\mathbf{2} \times \mathbf{2}$ Table: Fixing the <br> Frequencies for the First Cell |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Negative Emotionality |  |  |  |



| Table 8.10 | Calculations for Chi-Square Statistic on Gender and Negative Emotions Data Using the Computational Formula |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| fo | $f_{0}{ }^{2}$ | $f_{\text {e }}$ | $\frac{f_{0}^{2}}{f_{e}}$ |
| 46 | 2,116 | 45 | $(2,116 / 45)=47.022$ |
| 14 | 196 | 15 | $(196 / 15)=13.067$ |
| 44 | 1,936 | 45 | $(1,936 / 45)=43.022$ |
| 16 | 256 | 15 | $(256 / 15)=17.067$ |
|  |  |  | $\Sigma=120.178$ |
|  |  |  | $\chi^{2}=120.178-120=.178$ |


| Table 8.11 <br> Joint Distribu Response Tim | Joint Distribution of Neighborhood Socioeconomic Status and Police Response Time to a 911 Call for Assistance |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Police Response Time |  |  |  |  |
| Neighborhood Socioeconomic Status | Less Than 3 Minutes | 3-7 Minutes | More Than 7 Minutes | Total |
| Low | A $11$ | B $17$ | C $35$ | 63 |
| Medium | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{D} \\ 16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E} \\ 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} F \\ 13 \end{gathered}$ | 53 |
| High | G <br> 48 | H $20$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I } \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | 75 |
| Total | 75 | 61 | 55 | 191 |

Relationship Between Neighborhood Socioeconomic Status and Police Response Time to a 911 Call for Assistance: Examining Percentages

| Police Response Time |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Neighborhood <br> Socioeconomic Status | Less Than 3 <br> Minutes | 3-7 Minutes | More Than 7 <br> Minutes | Total |
| Low | 11 | 17 | 35 | 63 |
| Medium | $17 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| High | 16 | 24 | 13 | 53 |
|  | $30 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Total | 48 | 20 | 7 | 75 |

Table 8.13
Observed and Expected Cell Frequencies Under the Null Hypothesis of Independence

| Police Response Time |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Neighborhood <br> Socioeconomic Status | Less Than 3 <br> Minutes | $3-7$ Minutes | More Than 7 <br> Minutes | Total |  |
| Low | 11 <br> $f_{e}=25$ | 17 <br> $f_{e}=20$ | 35 <br> $f_{e}=18$ | 63 |  |
| Medium | 16 | 24 |  |  |  |
|  | $f_{e}=21$ | $f_{e}=17$ | 13 |  |  |
| High | 48 | 20 | $f_{e}=15$ | 53 |  |
|  | $f_{e}=29$ | $f_{e}=24$ | $f_{e}=22$ | 75 |  |
| Total | 75 | 61 | 55 | 191 |  |


| Table 8.14 | Computational Formula: Calculation of the Chi-Square Statistic for the Null Hypothesis That Neighborhood Socioeconomic Status and Police Response Time Are Independent |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $f_{0}$ | $f_{0}{ }^{2}$ | $f_{\text {e }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & f_{o}^{2} \\ & f_{e} \end{aligned}$ |
| 11 | 121 | 25 | 4.84 |
| 17 | 289 | 20 | 14.45 |
| 35 | 1,225 | 18 | 68.06 |
| 16 | 256 | 21 | 12.19 |
| 24 | 576 | 17 | 33.88 |
| 13 | 169 | 15 | 11.27 |
| 48 | 2,304 | 29 | 79.45 |
| 20 | 400 | 24 | 16.67 |
| 7 | 49 | 22 | 2.23 |
|  |  |  | $\Sigma=243.04$ |
|  |  |  | $\chi^{2}{ }_{\text {obt }}=243.04-19$ |
|  |  |  | $\chi^{2}$ obt $=52.04$ |


| Table 8.15 | Joint Distribution of Gender of <br> Police Officer and Type of Work <br> Performed |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Desk Job | Patrol | Total |
| Low | 45 | 80 | 125 |
|  | $36 \%$ | $64 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Medium | 30 | 15 | 45 |
|  | $67 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Total | 75 | 95 | 170 |

Table 8.16 Joint Distribution for Type of Lawyer and Type of Sentence Received

| Type of Lawyer | Type of Sentence Received |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Probation | Fine Only | Fine and Jail Time | Total |
| Court-appointed | 5 | 10 | 40 | 55 |
|  | $9 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Public defender | 15 | 20 | 30 | 65 |
|  | $23 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Private | 25 | 10 | 5 | 40 |
|  | $63 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Total | 45 | 40 | 75 | 160 |


| Joint Distribution of Number of <br> Hours Worked per Week During the <br> School Year and Number of Times a <br> Youth Has Used Drugs or Alcohol |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Times Used Drugs/Alcohol |  |  |  |
| Number of Hours Worked <br> per Week | 0 | 1 or More | Total |
| Court-appointed | 15 | 60 | 75 |
| Public defender | $40 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Total | $57 \%$ | 20 | 60 |


| Person <br> Number | Levelon $V_{1}$ | Level on $V_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 | 2 |


| Table 8.18 | Grades in School and Self-Reported <br> Acts of Petty Theft |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Self-Reported Thefts |  |  |  |  |
| Grades in School | 0 | 1 to 5 | 6 or More | Total |
| Mostly Ds and Fs | 23 | 19 | 20 | 62 |
| Mostly Cs | 307 | 157 | 123 | 587 |
| Mostly Bs | 762 | 345 | 155 | 1,262 |
| Mostly As | 418 | 166 | 56 | 640 |
| Total | 1,510 | 687 | 354 | 2,551 |


| Type of <br> Institution | Satisfied With Job? |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No | Yes |  |
| Medium <br> security | 15 | 30 | 45 |
| Maximum <br> security | 100 | 40 | 140 |
| Total | 115 | 70 | 185 |


| Type of <br> Institution | Social Organization |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Socially <br> Disorganized | Total |  |
| Low crime <br> rate | 90 | 98 | 188 |
| High crime <br> rate | 10 | 52 | 62 |
| Total | 100 | 150 | 250 |


| Type of <br> Sentence <br> Received | Where Defendant Was Tried <br> Court |  |  | Suburban <br> Court |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 18 | 30 | 94 | 142 |
| Fine and <br> Court | Total |  |  |  |
| Lail | 22 | 37 | 36 | 95 |
| Less than <br> jail time of | 24 | 38 | 50 | 112 |
| 60 or <br> more days <br> of jail time | 16 | 20 | 40 | 76 |
| Total | 80 | 125 | 220 | 425 |


| Race | Number of property <br> Crimes |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $0-4$ | 5 or More |  |
| Non-White | 77 | 33 | 110 |
| White | 180 | 70 | 250 |
| Total | 257 | 103 | 360 |


| Number <br> of <br> Arrests |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Within 3 <br> Years | Stable <br> Employment | Sporadic <br> Employment | Unemployed | Total |
| None | 30 | 14 | 10 | 54 |
| One or <br> more | 15 | 16 | 30 | 61 |
| Total | 45 | 30 | 40 | 115 |


|  | 0-4 | 5-9 <br> Adult <br> Tattoo <br> Adult | 15 or <br> 10-14 <br> Adult <br> Offeneses | More <br> Adult <br> Offenses | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No <br> Otatoos | 78 | 56 | 34 | 15 | 183 |
| Has <br> tattoos | 15 | 22 | 37 | 63 | 137 |
| Total | 93 | 78 | 71 | 78 | 320 |


| Table 9.1 | Characteristics and Notations <br> for Two-Sample Problems |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Population 1 | Population 2 |
| Population mean | $m_{1}$ | $m_{2}$ |
| Population <br> standard deviation | $s_{1}$ | $s_{2}$ |
| Sample mean | $\bar{X}_{1}$ | $\bar{X}_{2}$ |
| Sample standard <br> deviation | $s_{1}$ | $s_{2}$ |
| Sample size | $n_{1}$ | $n_{2}$ |




## Figure 9.3 Hypothesis Test for Difference Between Two Means or Proportions




| Table 9.2 | Prison Expenditures per Inmate per Day by State and Region, 2011 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State |  | Daily Mean State Prison Operating Expenditures per Inmate (in Dollars) |
| West |  |  |
| Nevada |  | 56.59 |
| Idaho |  | 53.55 |
| Arizona |  | 67.96 |
| Montana |  | 82.81 |
| Colorado |  | 83.22 |
| California |  | 129.92 |
| Washington |  | 128.48 |
| Utah |  | 80.41 |
| Sample Stat $\begin{aligned} & \bar{X}_{1}=85.37 \\ & s_{1}=29.33 \\ & n_{1}=8 \end{aligned}$ | stics | he West |
| Northeast |  |  |
| New Hampshire |  | 93.37 |
| Pennsylvania |  | 116.00 |
| New York |  | 164.59 |
| New Jersey |  | 150.32 |
| Vermont |  | 135.62 |
| Connecticut |  | 137.70 |
| Maine |  | 127.13 |
| Rhode Island |  | 134.61 |
| Sample Statistics for the Northeast$\begin{aligned} & \bar{X}_{2}=132.42 \\ & s_{2}=21.45 \\ & n_{2}=8 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |

[^2]
## Table 9.3 Steps Taken When Conducting a Hypothesis Test

Step 1: Formally state your null $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$ and research $\left(\mathrm{H}_{1}\right)$ hypotheses.
Step 2: Select an appropriate test statistic and the sampling distribution of that test statistic.
Step 3: Select a level of significance (alpha $=\alpha$ ) and determine the critical value and rejection region of the test statistic based on the selected level of alpha and degrees of freedom.

Step 4: Conduct the test: Calculate the obtained value of the test statistic and compare it with the critical value.
Step 5: Make a decision about your null hypothesis and interpret this decision in a meaningful way based on the research question, sample, and population.

Figure 9.5 Critical $t$ and Critical Region for Alpha $=.05(d f=14)$ and a Two-Tailed Test


| Less Than 1 Year | More Than 1 Year |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\bar{X}_{1}=22.4$ | $\bar{X}_{2}=16.2$ |
| $s_{1}^{2}=4.3$ | $s_{2}^{2}=4.1$ |
| $n_{1}=49$ | $n_{2}=53$ |

Figure 9.6 Critical $t$ and Critical Region for Alpha $=.01(d f=120)$ and a One-Tailed Test


| Boot Camp Group | Prison Group |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\bar{X}_{1}=15.2$ offenses | $\bar{X}_{2}=15.9$ offenses |
| $s_{1}^{2}=4.7$ | $s_{2}^{2}=5.1$ |
| $n_{1}=32$ | $n_{2}=29$ |

Figure 9.7 Critical $t$ and Critical Regions for Alpha $=.05(d f=60)$ and a Two-Tailed Test


| Short-Term Detention | Long-Term Detention |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\bar{X}_{1}=6.4$ | $\bar{X}_{2}=8.1$ |
| $s_{1}=2.2$ | $s_{2}=3.9$ |
| $n_{1}=14$ | $n_{2}=42$ |

Figure 9.8 Critical $t$ and Critical Region for alpha $=.01(d f=40)$ and a Two-Tailed Test


| Male Defendants | Female Defendants |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\bar{X}_{1}=12.02$ | $\bar{X}_{2}=3.32$ |
| $s_{1}=72.68$ | $s_{2}=11.31$ |
| $n_{1}=50$ | $n_{2}=25$ |

Figure 9.9 Critical $t$ and Critical Region for Alpha $=.05(d f=60)$ and a One-Tailed Test


Table 9.4
Number of Arrests for Violent Offenses in Neighborhoods Before (First Score) and After (Second Score) Implementation of Problem-Oriented Policing

| Pair Number | First Score ${ }_{1}$ | Second Score $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ | $x_{2}-x_{1}$ | $\left(x_{2}-x_{1}\right)^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 25 | 21 | -4.00 | 16 |
| 2 | 29 | 25 | -4.00 | 16 |
| 3 | 32 | 32 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 4 | 42 | 39 | -3.00 | 9 |
| 5 | 21 | 25 | 4.00 | 16 |
| 6 | 29 | 25 | -4.00 | 16 |
| 7 | 33 | 29 | -4.00 | 16 |
| 8 | 35 | 36 | 1.00 | 1 |
| 9 | 32 | 29 | -3.00 | 9 |
| 10 | 36 | 35 | - 1.00 | 1 |
| 11 | 39 | 40 | 1.00 | 1 |
| 12 | 25 | 21 | -4.00 | 16 |
| 13 | 27 | 25 | -2.00 | 4 |
| 14 | 41 | 35 | -6.00 | 36 |
| 15 | 36 | 35 | - 1.00 | 1 |
| 16 | 21 | 23 | 2.00 | 4 |
| 17 | 38 | 31 | -7.00 | 49 |
| 18 | 25 | 21 | -4.00 | 16 |
| 19 | 29 | 25 | -4.00 | 16 |
| 20 | 25 | 20 | -5.00 | 25 |
|  |  |  | $\Sigma=-48$ | $\Sigma=268$ |
|  |  |  | $\bar{X}_{D}=-2.40$ |  |

Figure 9.10 Critical $t$ and Critical Regions for Alpha $=.01(d f=19)$ and a Two-Tailed Test


Standard Deviations of the Sampling Distribution for the Number of
Table 9.5 Neighborhood Arrests for Violent Offenses Before (First Score) and After (Second Score) Problem-Oriented Policing Implementation

| Pair | $x_{D}-\bar{X}_{D}$ | $\left(x_{D}-\bar{X}_{D}\right)^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | -4-(-2.4) = -1.60 | 2.56 |
| 2 | $-4-(-2.4)=-1.60$ | 2.56 |
| 3 | $0-(-2.4)=2.40$ | 5.76 |
| 4 | $-3-(-2.4)=-0.60$ | 0.36 |
| 5 | $4-(-2.4)=6.40$ | 40.96 |
| 6 | $-4-(-2.4)=-1.60$ | 2.56 |
| 7 | $-4-(-2.4)=-1.60$ | 2.56 |
| 8 | $1-(-2.4)=3.40$ | 11.56 |
| 9 | $-3-(-2.4)=-0.60$ | 0.36 |
| 10 | $-1-(-2.4)=1.40$ | 1.96 |
| 11 | $1-(-2.4)=3.40$ | 11.56 |
| 12 | $-4-(-2.4)=-1.60$ | 2.56 |
| 13 | $-2-(-2.4)=0.40$ | 0.16 |
| 14 | $-6-(-2.4)=-3.60$ | 12.96 |
| 15 | $-1-(-2.4)=1.40$ | 1.96 |
| 16 | $2-(-2.4)=4.40$ | 19.36 |
| 17 | $-7-(-2.4)=-4.60$ | 21.16 |
| 18 | $-4-(-2.4)=-1.60$ | 2.56 |
| 19 | $-4-(-2.4)=-1.60$ | 2.56 |
| 20 | $-5-(-2.4)=-2.60$ | 6.76 |
| $n=20$ |  | $\Sigma\left(X_{D}-\bar{X}_{D 2}\right)=152.80$ |

Number of Delinquent Siblings for 15 Delinquent Youths and a Matched
Table 9.6 Group of 15 Non-Delinquent Youths and the Calculations Necessary for a Matched-Group $t$ Test

| Pair | Non-Delinquent Score $x_{1}$ | Delinquent Score $x_{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} x_{\mathrm{D}} \\ x_{2}-x_{1} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} x_{D}^{2} \\ \left(x_{2}-x_{1}\right)^{2} \end{gathered}$ | $x_{D}-\bar{X}_{D}$ | $\left(x_{D}-\bar{X}_{D}\right)^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | $2-1.40=0.60$ | 0.36 |
| 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | $2-1.40=0.60$ | 0.36 |
| 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $1-1.40=-0.40$ | 0.16 |
| 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 9 | $3-1.40=1.60$ | 2.56 |
| 5 | 2 | 1 | -1 | 1 | $-1-1.40=-2.40$ | 5.76 |
| 6 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 9 | $3-1.40=1.60$ | 2.56 |
| 7 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | $0-1.40=-1.40$ | 1.96 |
| 8 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 9 | $3-1.40=1.60$ | 2.56 |
| 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | $1-1.40=-0.40$ | 0.16 |
| 10 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | $2-1.40=0.60$ | 0.36 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0-1.40=-1.40$ | 1.96 |
| 12 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | $1-1.40=-0.40$ | 0.16 |
| 13 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | $2-1.40=0.60$ | 0.36 |
| 14 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | $2-1.40=0.60$ | 0.36 |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0-1.40=-1.40$ | 1.96 |
| $n=15$ |  |  | $\bar{x}_{D}=21$ | $\begin{aligned} & =21 \\ & 5=1.40 \\ & =51 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \Sigma\left(x_{D}-\bar{X}_{D}\right)^{2}=21.60 \\ & s_{D}=\sqrt{\frac{21.60}{15-1}}=1.24 \end{aligned}$ |

Figure 9.11 Critical $t$ and Critical Regions for alpha $=.05(d f=14)$ and a One-Tailed Test


Decision Chart for Using the Appropriate Statistical Test for Two-Sample Mean Problems


Figure 9.13 Critical $z$ and Critical Regions for Alpha $=.01$ and a Two-Tailed Test


| Would Not Approve <br> of Driving Drunk | Would Approve of <br> Driving Drunk |
| :--- | :--- |
| $n_{1}=40$ | $n_{2}=25$ |
| $x_{1}=2.1$ | $x_{2}=8.2$ |
| $s_{1}=1.8$ | $s_{2}=1.9$ |


| Judge | Untrained | Trained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 3 | 2 | 4 |
| 4 | 7 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 | 2 |
| 6 | 4 | 5 |
| 7 | 6 | 1 |
| 8 | 2 | 1 |
| 9 | 7 | 0 |
| 10 | 5 | 6 |
| 11 | 3 | 4 |
| 12 | 4 | 2 |
| 13 | 5 | 5 |
| 14 | 6 | 3 |
| 15 | 2 | 1 |


| Person | Before | After |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 5 | 7 |
| 2 | 9 | 5 |
| 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | 7 | 7 |
| 5 | 8 | 11 |
| 6 | 11 | 13 |
| 7 | 8 | 4 |
| 8 | 8 | 10 |
| 9 | 5 | 7 |
| 10 | 2 | 1 |
| 11 | 9 | 3 |

Figure 10.1
Distribution of the Number of New Offenses for Three Groups of Intimate Partner Assault Suspects
(a)

(b)


| Table 10.1 | Number of New Offenses for Suspects Arrested, <br> Counseled, or Separated by Police in Response <br> to a 911 Call for Intimate Partner Assault |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Arrested | Counseled | Separated |$|$| 8 |
| :--- |
| 0 |


| Total Variability |  | Within-Group Variability |  | Between-Groups Variability |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left(x_{i}-\bar{X}_{\text {grand }}\right)$ | $=$ | $\left(x_{i}-\bar{X}_{k}\right)$ | + | $\left(\bar{X}_{k}-\bar{X}_{\text {grand }}\right)$ |
| $(0-5)$ | $=$ | $(0-1)$ | + | $(1-5)$ |
| -5 | $=$ | -1 | + | -4 |
| -5 | $=$ | -5 |  |  |


| Total Variability |  | Within-Group Variability |  | Between-Groups Variability |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left(x_{i}-\bar{X}_{\text {grand }}\right)$ | $=$ | $\left(x_{i}-\bar{X}_{k}\right)$ | + | $\left(\bar{X}_{k}-\bar{X}_{\text {grand }}\right)$ |
| $(6-5)$ | $=$ | $(6-5)$ | + | $(5-5)$ |
| 1 | $=$ | 1 | + | 0 |
| 1 | $=$ | 1 |  |  |


| Total Variability |  | Within-Group Variability |  | Between-Groups Variability |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left(x_{i}-\bar{X}_{\text {grand }}\right)$ | $=$ | $\left(x_{i}-\bar{X}_{k}\right)$ | + | $\left(\bar{X}_{k}-\bar{X}_{\text {grand }}\right)$ |
| $(8-5)$ | $=$ | $(8-9)$ | + | $(9-5)$ |
| 3 | $=$ | -1 | + | 4 |
| 3 | $=$ | 3 |  |  |


| Total Sum of Squares |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\left(X_{i}-\bar{X}_{\text {grand }}\right)$ | $\left(X_{i}-\bar{X}_{\text {grand }}\right)^{2}$ |
| $(0-5)=-5$ | 25 |
| $(2-5)=-3$ | 9 |
| $(1-5)=-4$ | 16 |
| $(1-5)=-4$ | 16 |
| $(1-5)=-4$ | 16 |
| $(6-5)=1$ | 1 |
| $(4-5)=-1$ | 1 |
| $(4-5)=-1$ | 1 |
| $(6-5)=1$ | 1 |
| $(5-5)=0$ | 0 |
| $(8-5)=3$ | 9 |
| $(10-5)=5$ | 25 |
| $(9-5)=4$ | 16 |
| $(10-5)=5$ | 25 |
| $(8-5)=3$ | 9 |
|  | $\Sigma=170$ |
| Within-Group Sum of Squares |  |
| $\left(X_{i}-\bar{X}_{k}\right)$ | $\left(X_{i}-\bar{X}_{k}\right)^{2}$ |
| $(0-1)=-1$ | 1 |
| $(2-1)=-1$ | 1 |
| $(1-1)=0$ | 0 |
| $(1-1)=0$ | 0 |
| $(1-1)=0$ | 0 |
| $(6-5)=1$ | 1 |
| $(4-5)=-1$ | 1 |


| $(4-5)=-1$ | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $(6-5)=1$ | 1 |
| $(5-5)=0$ | 0 |
| $(8-9)=-1$ | 1 |
| $(10-9)=1$ | 1 |
| $(9-9)=0$ | 0 |
| $(10-9)=1$ | 1 |
| $(8-9)=-1$ | 1 |
|  | $\left.\bar{X}_{k}-\bar{X}_{\text {grand }}\right)^{2}$ |
|  | Between-Groups Sum of Squares |
| $\left(\bar{X}_{k}-\bar{X}_{\text {grand }}\right)$ | 16 |
| $(1-5)=-4$ | 16 |
| $(1-5)=-4$ | 16 |
| $(1-5)=-4$ | 16 |
| $(1-5)=-4$ | 16 |
| $(1-5)=-4$ | 0 |
| $(5-5)=0$ | 0 |
| $(5-5)=0$ | 0 |
| $(5-5)=0$ | 0 |
| $(5-5)=0$ | 0 |
| $(5-5)=0$ | 16 |
| $(9-5)=4$ | 16 |
| $(9-5)=4$ | 16 |
| $(9-5)=4$ | 16 |
| $(9-5)=4$ | 160 |
| $(9-5)=4$ |  |
|  |  |


| Table 10.3 | Summary F Table for Police Response to <br> Domestic Violence Data |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source Sum of Squares df Variance F |  |  |  |  |
| Between groups | 160 | 2 | 80.00 | 96.39 |
| Within group | 10 | 12 | 0.83 |  |
| Total | 170 | 14 |  |  |


| Table 10.4 | Size of Probation Officer Caseload <br> and Number of Crimes and <br> Violations Committed on Release |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Caseload Supervision Size |$|$| Low | Moderate | Heavy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | 10 | 11 |
| 12 | 14 | 8 |
| 13 | 8 | 7 |
| 5 | 9 | 10 |
| 8 | 13 | 9 |
| 11 | 12 | 7 |
| 10 | 8 | 8 |
| 14 | 8 | 3 |
| 9 | $\bar{X}_{\text {moderate }}=10.0$ | $\bar{X}_{\text {neavy }}=7.5$ |
| $\bar{X}_{\text {low }}=9.5$ |  | 3 |

Table 10.5 Calculations for Caseload Size and Probation Success

| Total Sum of Squares |  | Within-Group Sum of Squares |  | Between-Groups Sum of Squares |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left(X_{i}-\bar{X}_{\text {grand }}\right)$ | $\left(X_{i}-\bar{X}_{\text {grand }}\right)^{2}$ | $\left(X_{i}-\bar{X}_{k}\right)$ | $\left(X_{i}-\bar{X}_{k}\right)^{2}$ | $\left(\bar{X}_{k}-\bar{X}_{\text {grand }}\right)$ | $\left(\bar{X}_{k}-\bar{X}_{\text {grand }}\right)^{2}$ |
| $7-9=-2$ | 4 | $7-9.5=-2.5$ | 6.25 | $9.5-9=0.5$ | 0.25 |
| $12-9=3$ | 9 | $12-9.5=2.5$ | 6.25 | $9.5-9=0.5$ | 0.25 |
| $13-9=4$ | 16 | $13-9.5=3.5$ | 12.25 | $9.5-9=0.5$ | 0.25 |
| $5-9=-4$ | 16 | $5-9.5=-4.5$ | 20.25 | $9.5-9=0.5$ | 0.25 |
| $8-9=-1$ | 1 | $8-9.5=-1.5$ | 2.25 | $9.5-9=0.5$ | 0.25 |
| $11-9=2$ | 4 | $11-9.5=1.5$ | 2.25 | $9.5-9=0.5$ | 0.25 |
| $10-9=1$ | 1 | $10-9.5=0.5$ | 0.25 | $9.5-9=0.5$ | 0.25 |
| $14-9=5$ | 25 | $14-9.5=4.5$ | 20.25 | $9.5-9=0.5$ | 0.25 |
| $9-9=0$ | 0 | $9-9.5=-0.5$ | 0.25 | $9.5-9=0.5$ | 0.25 |
| $6-9=-3$ | 9 | $6-9.5=-3.5$ | 12.25 | $9.5-9=0.5$ | 0.25 |
| $10-9=1$ | 1 | $10-10=0$ | 0.00 | $10-9=1$ | 1.00 |
| $14-9=5$ | 25 | $14-10=4$ | 16.00 | $10-9=1$ | 1.00 |
| $8-9=-1$ | 1 | $8-10=-2$ | 4.00 | $10-9=1$ | 1.00 |
| $7-9=-2$ | 4 | $7-10=-3$ | 9.00 | $10-9=1$ | 1.00 |
| $9-9=0$ | 0 | $9-10=-1$ | 1.00 | $10-9=1$ | 1.00 |
| $11-9=2$ | 4 | $11-10=1$ | 1.00 | $10-9=1$ | 1.00 |
| $13-9=4$ | 16 | $13-10=3$ | 9.00 | $10-9=1$ | 1.00 |
| $12-9=3$ | 9 | $12-10=2$ | 4.00 | $10-9=1$ | 1.00 |
| $8-9=-1$ | 1 | $8-10=-2$ | 4.00 | $10-9=1$ | 1.00 |
| $8-9=-1$ | 1 | $8-10=-2$ | 4.00 | $10-9=1$ | 1.00 |
| $11-9=2$ | 4 | $11-7.5=3.5$ | 12.25 | $7.5-9=-1.5$ | 2.25 |
| $8-9=-1$ | 1 | $8-7.5=0.5$ | 0.25 | $7.5-9=-1.5$ | 2.25 |
| $7-9=-2$ | 4 | $7-7.5=-0.5$ | 0.25 | $7.5-9=-1.5$ | 2.25 |
| $10-9=1$ | 1 | $10-7.5=2.5$ | 6.25 | $7.5-9=-1.5$ | 2.25 |
| $9-9=0$ | 0 | $9-7.5=1.5$ | 2.25 | $7.5-9=-1.5$ | 2.25 |
| $9-9=0$ | 0 | $9-7.5=1.5$ | 2.25 | $7.5-9=-1.5$ | 2.25 |
| $7-9=-2$ | 4 | $7-7.5=-0.5$ | 0.25 | $7.5-9=-1.5$ | 2.25 |
| $8-9=-1$ | 1 | $8-7.5=0.5$ | 0.25 | $7.5-9=-1.5$ | 2.25 |
| $3-9=-6$ | 36 | $3-7.5=-4.5$ | 20.25 | $7.5-9=-1.5$ | 2.25 |
| $3-9=-6$ | 36 | $3-7.5=-4.5$ | 20.25 | $7.5-9=-1.5$ | 2.25 |
|  | $\Sigma=234$ |  | $\Sigma=199$ |  | $\Sigma=35$ |


$\left.$| Table 10.6 |
| :--- | | Summary F Table for the Relationship Between |
| :--- |
| Caseload Size and Success on Probation | \right\rvert\,


| Level of Stress |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| High | Medium | Low |
| $x$ | $x$ | $x$ |
| 4 | 2 | 3 |
| 6 | 4 | 1 |
| 12 | 5 | 2 |
| 10 | 3 | 0 |
| 5 | 3 | 2 |
| 9 | 2 | 2 |
| 8 | 5 | 4 |
| 11 | 4 | 1 |
| 10 |  | 0 |
| 8 |  | 1 |


| Get Tough <br> States | Moral Appeal <br> States | Control States |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $n_{1}=15$ | $n_{2}=15$ | $n_{3}=15$ |
| $\bar{X}_{1}=125.2$ | $\bar{X}_{2}=119.7$ | $\bar{X}_{3}=145.3$ |


|  | Sum of <br> Squares | df | SS/df | F |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Between groups | 475.3 |  |  |  |
| Within group | 204.5 |  |  |  |
| Total | 679.8 |  |  |  |


|  | Very <br> High <br> Fear | High <br> Fear | Medium <br> Fear | Low <br> Fear | Very <br> Low <br> Fear <br> Spot |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Spot | Spot | Spot | Spot |  |  |


| Sum of <br> Squares | df | SS/df | F |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between groups | 12.5 |  |  |  |
| Within group | 616.2 |  |  |  |
| Total | 628.7 |  |  |  |


| How Many Friends Each Female Has |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A Lot | Some | A Few |
| 5 | 7 | 2 |
| 8 | 5 | 3 |
| 9 | 4 | 0 |
| 4 | 9 | 3 |
| 7 | 6 | 1 |
| 10 | 4 | 3 |
| 6 | 7 | 2 |


| Observation | $x$ Score | $y$ Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 |
| 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 8 | 8 |
| 6 | 10 | 10 |
| 7 | 7 | 1 |
| 8 | 6 | 7 |
| 9 | 9 | 9 |
| 10 |  |  |


| Observation | $x$ Score | $y$ Score |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 2 | 4 | 7 |
| 3 | 9 | 2 |
| 4 | 7 | 4 |
| 5 | 8 | 3 |
| 6 | 1 | 10 |
| 7 | 6 | 6 |
| 8 | 10 | 5 |
| 9 | 3 | 8 |
| 10 |  | 1 |

Figure 11.1 Positive Relationship Between $x$ and $y$


Figure 11.2 Negative Relationship Between $x$ and $y$


| Observation | $x$ Score | $y$ Score |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 6 | 4 |
| 2 | 9 | 4 |
| 3 | 2 | 4 |
| 4 | 7 | 4 |
| 5 | 3 | 4 |
| 6 | 4 | 4 |
| 7 | 8 | 4 |
| 8 | 5 | 4 |
| 9 | 10 | 4 |
| 10 |  |  |

Figure 11.3 No Relationship Between $x$ and $y$


Figure 11.4 Perfect Positive Relationship Between $x$ and $y$


Figure 11.5 Perfect Negative Relationship Between $x$ and $y$


Figure 11.6 No Relationship Between $x$ and $y$


Figure 11.7 Predicting $y$ Scores $(\hat{y})$ from $x$ Scores With Perfect Positive Correlation


Figure 11.8 Predicting $y$ Scores $(\hat{y})$ from $x$ Scores With No Correlation


| Table 11.1 | Murder Rate per 100,000 and Percentage of Individuals in State Living Below the Poverty Level for 20 States, 2013 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Murder Rate (y) | Poverty Rate (x) |
| Alaska | 3.2 | 9.0 |
| Arizona | 5.5 | 16.5 |
| California | 5.4 | 14.2 |
| Delaware | 4.6 | 10.8 |
| Florida | 5.5 | 14.9 |
| Indiana | 5.3 | 14.4 |
| Louisiana | 12.3 | 17.3 |
| Maine | 2.0 | 12.3 |
| Maryland | 7.7 | 9.1 |
| Massachusetts | 2.7 | 10.3 |
| Michigan | 6.3 | 16.2 |
| Missouri | 6.6 | 14.6 |
| Nebraska | 2.5 | 12.3 |
| New Jersey | 3.7 | 9.4 |
| New Mexico | 10.0 | 18.0 |
| New York | 4.0 | 14.2 |
| Pennsylvania | 5.4 | 12.5 |
| South Carolina | 6.7 | 17.1 |
| Texas | 5.4 | 17.2 |
| Wyoming | 2.0 | 9.8 |

Source: Adapted from the Uniform Crime Reports and Population by Age and Sex from the FBI (2014) and the U.S. Bureau of the Census (2014), respectively.

Figure 11.9 Scatterplot of Poverty Rate (x) and Murder Rate $(y)$ for 20 States


Scatterplot of Poverty Rate ( $x$ ) and Murder Rate ( $y$ ) for 20 States With Regression Line


## Table 11.2

Robbery Rate per 100,000 and Percentage of Individuals in State Living in Rural Areas for 20 States, 2013

| State | Robbery Rate (y) | \% Rural (x) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Alaska | 94.0 | 30.4 |
| Arizona | 123.9 | 9.5 |
| California | 173.7 | 5.1 |
| Delaware | 189.7 | 17.4 |
| Florida | 166.8 | 9.1 |
| Indiana | 129.4 | 27.4 |
| Louisiana | 142.3 | 27.0 |
| Maine | 30.3 | 57.4 |
| Maryland | 210.7 | 12.8 |
| Massachusetts | 114.1 | 8.4 |


| State | Robbery Rate (y) | \% Rural (x) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Michigan | 126.5 | 25.5 |
| Missouri | 127.1 | 28.6 |
| Nebraska | 74.7 | 28.4 |
| New Jersey | 133.7 | 5.4 |
| New Mexico | 98.7 | 22.1 |
| New York | 144.5 | 12.3 |
| Pennsylvania | 142.4 | 22.2 |
| South Carolina | 126.0 | 34.3 |
| Texas | 153.6 | 14.5 |
| Wyoming | 14.3 | 30.5 |

Source: Adapted from the Uniform Crime Reports and Population by Age and Sex from the FBI (2014) and the U.S. Bureau of the Census (2014), respectively.

Scatterplot of Percentage Rural ( $x$ ) and Robbery Rate ( $y$ ) for 20 States With Regression Line


## Table 11.3

Burglary Rate per 100,000 and Divorce Rate per 1,000 in State Living in Rural Areas for 20 States, 2013

| State | Burglary Rate $(y)$ | Divorce Rate $(x)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Alaska | 514.2 | 7.8 |
| Arizona | 817.3 | 5.4 |
| California | 622.1 | 5.8 |
| Delaware | 784.0 | 5.4 |
| Florida | 981.2 | 7.5 |
| Indiana | 815.9 | 7.9 |
| Louisiana | 1036.4 | 7.1 |
| Maine | 510.4 | 7.2 |
| Maryland | 647.5 | 5.8 |
| Massachusetts | 524.1 | 5.5 |


| State | Burglary Rate (y) | Divorce Rate $(x)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Michigan | 768.1 | 5.4 |
| Missouri | 733.5 | 6.5 |
| Nebraska | 499.4 | 6.7 |
| New Jersey | 424.2 | 5.1 |
| New Mexico | 1117.3 | 5.1 |
| New York | 321.6 | 6.4 |
| Pennsylvania | 439.2 | 5.3 |
| South Carolina | 991.7 | 7.4 |
| Texas | 967.4 | 7.1 |
| Wyoming | 399.8 | 8.2 |

Source: Adapted from the Uniform Crime Reports and Population by Age and Sex from the FBI (2014) and the U.S. Bureau of the Census (2014), respectively.

Scatterplot of Divorce ( $x$ ) and Burglary Rate ( $y$ ) for 20 States With Regression Line


Figure 11.13 Interpretation of Pearson's $r$ Values

| -1 | -.7 | -.5 | -.3 | 0 | -.3 | +.5 | +.7 | +1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Perfect Negative |
| :--- |
| Moderate to Strong Negative |
| Moderate Negative |
| Weak to Moderate Negative |
| No Relationship |
| Weak to Moderate Positive |
| Moderate Positive |
| Moderate to Strong Positive |

Table 11.4
Calculation of Pearson Correlation Coefficient, $r$, for Correlation Between State Murder Rate and Poverty Rate (Table 11.1)

| State | Poverty Rate ( x ) | Murder Rate (y) | $\chi^{2}$ | $y^{2}$ | xy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alaska | 9.0 | 3.2 | 81.0 | 10.2 | 28.8 |
| Arizona | 16.5 | 5.5 | 272.3 | 30.3 | 90.8 |
| California | 14.2 | 5.4 | 201.6 | 29.2 | 76.7 |
| Delaware | 10.8 | 4.6 | 116.6 | 21.2 | 49.7 |
| Florida | 14.9 | 5.5 | 222.0 | 30.3 | 82.0 |
| Indiana | 14.4 | 5.3 | 207.4 | 28.1 | 76.3 |
| Louisiana | 17.3 | 12.3 | 299.3 | 151.3 | 212.8 |
| Maine | 12.3 | 2.0 | 151.3 | 4.0 | 24.6 |
| Maryland | 9.1 | 7.7 | 82.8 | 59.3 | 70.1 |
| Massachusetts | 10.3 | 2.7 | 106.1 | 7.3 | 27.8 |
| Michigan | 16.2 | 6.3 | 262.4 | 39.7 | 102.1 |
| Missouri | 14.6 | 6.6 | 213.2 | 43.6 | 96.4 |
| Nebraska | 12.3 | 2.5 | 151.3 | 6.3 | 30.8 |
| New Jersey | 9.4 | 3.7 | 88.4 | 13.7 | 34.8 |
| New Mexico | 18.0 | 10.0 | 324.0 | 100.0 | 180.0 |
| New York | 14.2 | 4.0 | 201.6 | 16.0 | 56.8 |
| Pennsylvania | 12.5 | 5.4 | 156.3 | 29.2 | 67.5 |
| South Carolina | 17.1 | 6.7 | 292.4 | 44.9 | 114.6 |
| Texas | 17.2 | 5.4 | 295.8 | 29.2 | 92.9 |
| Wyoming | 9.8 | 2.0 | 96.0 | 4.0 | 19.6 |
| $n=20$ | $\Sigma x=270.1$ | $\Sigma y=106.8$ | $\Sigma x^{2}=3,821.8$ | $\Sigma y^{2}=697.8$ | $\Sigma x y=1,535.1$ |

Table 11.5
Calculation of Pearson Correlation Coefficient, $r$, for Correlation Between Percentage of Population Living in Rural Areas in a State and Rate of Robbery for 20 States (Table 11.2)

| State | Rural Area (\%) $(x)$ | Robbery Rate (y) | $x^{2}$ | $y^{2}$ | $x y$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alaska | 30.4 | 94.0 | 924.2 | 8836.0 | 2857.6 |
| Arizona | 9.5 | 123.9 | 90.3 | 15351.2 | 1177.1 |
| California | 5.1 | 173.7 | 26.0 | 30171.7 | 885.9 |
| Delaware | 17.4 | 189.7 | 302.8 | 35986.1 | 3300.8 |
| Florida | 9.1 | 166.8 | 82.8 | 27822.2 | 1517.9 |
| Indiana | 27.4 | 129.4 | 750.8 | 16744.4 | 3545.6 |
| Louisiana | 27.0 | 142.3 | 729.0 | 20249.3 | 3842.1 |
| Maine | 57.4 | 30.3 | 3294.8 | 918.1 | 1739.2 |
| Maryland | 12.8 | 210.7 | 163.8 | 44394.5 | 2697.0 |
| Massachusetts | 8.4 | 114.1 | 70.6 | 13018.8 | 958.4 |
| Michigan | 25.5 | 126.5 | 650.3 | 16002.3 | 3225.8 |
| Missouri | 28.6 | 127.1 | 818.0 | 16154.4 | 3635.1 |
| Nebraska | 28.4 | 74.7 | 806.6 | 5580.1 | 2121.5 |
| New Jersey | 5.4 | 133.7 | 29.2 | 17875.7 | 722.0 |
| New Mexico | 22.1 | 98.7 | 488.4 | 9741.7 | 2181.3 |
| New York | 12.3 | 144.5 | 151.3 | 20880.3 | 1777.4 |
| Pennsylvania | 22.2 | 142.4 | 492.8 | 20277.8 | 3161.3 |
| South Carolina | 34.3 | 126.0 | 1176.5 | 15876.0 | 4321.8 |
| Texas | 14.5 | 153.6 | 210.3 | 23593.0 | 2227.2 |
| Wyoming | 30.5 | 14.3 | 930.3 | 204.5 | 436.2 |
| $n=20$ | $\Sigma x=428.3$ | $\Sigma y=2,516.4$ | $\Sigma x^{2}=12,188.8$ | $\Sigma y^{2}=359,678.1$ | $\Sigma x y=46,331.2$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Table 11.6

Calculation of Pearson Correlation Coefficient, $r$, for Correlation Between Divorce Rate in a State and Rate of Burglary for 20 States (Table 11.3)

| State | Divorce Rate $(x)$ | Burglary Rate $(y)$ | $x^{2}$ | $y^{2}$ | $x y$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alaska | 7.8 | 514.2 | 60.8 | 264401.6 | 4010.8 |
| Arizona | 5.4 | 817.3 | 29.2 | 667979.3 | 4413.4 |
| California | 5.8 | 622.1 | 33.6 | 387008.4 | 3608.2 |
| Delaware | 5.4 | 784.0 | 29.2 | 614656.0 | 4233.6 |
| Florida | 7.5 | 981.2 | 56.3 | 962753.4 | 7359.0 |
| Indiana | 7.9 | 815.9 | 62.4 | 665692.8 | 6445.6 |
| Louisiana | 7.1 | 1036.4 | 50.4 | 1074125 | 7358.4 |
| Maine | 7.2 | 510.4 | 51.8 | 260508.2 | 3674.9 |
| Maryland | 5.8 | 647.5 | 33.6 | 419256.3 | 3755.5 |
| Massachusetts | 5.5 | 524.1 | 30.3 | 274680.8 | 2882.6 |
| Michigan | 5.4 | 768.1 | 29.2 | 589977.6 | 4147.7 |
| Missouri | 6.5 | 733.5 | 42.3 | 538022.3 | 4767.8 |
| Nebraska | 6.7 | 499.4 | 44.9 | 249400.4 | 3346.0 |
| New Jersey | 5.1 | 424.2 | 26.0 | 179945.6 | 2163.4 |
| New Mexico | 5.1 | 1117.3 | 26.0 | 1248359 | 5698.2 |
| New York | 6.4 | 321.6 | 41.0 | 103426.6 | 2058.2 |
| Pennsylvania | 5.3 | 439.2 | 28.1 | 192896.6 | 2327.8 |
| South Carolina | 7.4 | 991.7 | 54.8 | 983468.9 | 7338.6 |
| Texas | 7.1 | 967.4 | 50.4 | 935862.8 | 6868.5 |
| Wyoming | 8.2 | 399.8 | 67.2 | 159840.0 | 3278.4 |
| $n=20$ | $\Sigma x=128.6$ | $\Sigma y=13,915.3$ | $\Sigma x^{2}=847.5$ | $\Sigma y^{2}=10,772,261.6$ | $5 x y=89,736.6$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 11.7 Hypothetical Data for 20 Students

| Student | Age ( x ) | Self-Reported Delinquency (y) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 12 | 0 |
| 2 | 12 | 2 |
| 3 | 12 | 1 |
| 4 | 12 | 3 |
| 5 | 13 | 4 |
| 6 | 13 | 2 |
| 7 | 13 | 1 |
| 8 | 14 | 2 |
| 9 | 14 | 5 |
| 10 | 14 | 4 |
| 11 | 15 | 3 |
| 12 | 15 | 4 |
| 13 | 15 | 6 |
| 14 | 15 | 8 |
| 15 | 16 | 9 |
| 16 | 16 | 7 |
| 17 | 16 | 6 |
| 18 | 17 | 8 |
| 19 | 17 | 10 |
| 20 | 17 | 7 |

Figure 11.14 Age ( $x$ ) and Number of Self-Reported Delinquent Acts ( $y$ )


| Table 11.8 | Conditional Means (means of $\boldsymbol{y}$ for <br> fixed values of $\boldsymbol{x}$ ) for the Data on <br> Age and Self-Reported Delinquency |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Age | $y$ Scores | Conditional $\bar{Y}$ |$|$| 12 | $0,1,2,3$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 13 | $4,2,1$ |
| 14 | $2,5,4$ |
| 15 | $9,4,6,8$ |
| 16 | $8,10,7$ |
| 17 |  |



Figure 11.16 Distance Between Conditional Means of y and Estimated Regression Line


Table 11.9
Calculations for Determining the Slope ( $b$ ) for the Data on Age and SelfReported Delinquency

| ID Number | Age (x) | Self-Reported Delinquency (y) | $x^{2}$ | xy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 12 | 0 | 144 | 0 |
| 2 | 12 | 2 | 144 | 24 |
| 3 | 12 | 1 | 144 | 12 |
| 4 | 12 | 3 | 144 | 36 |
| 5 | 13 | 4 | 169 | 52 |
| 6 | 13 | 2 | 169 | 26 |
| 7 | 13 | 1 | 169 | 13 |
| 8 | 14 | 2 | 196 | 28 |
| 9 | 14 | 5 | 196 | 70 |
| 10 | 14 | 4 | 196 | 56 |
| 11 | 15 | 3 | 225 | 45 |
| 12 | 15 | 4 | 225 | 60 |
| 13 | 15 | 6 | 225 | 90 |
| 14 | 15 | 8 | 225 | 120 |
| 15 | 16 | 9 | 256 | 144 |
| 16 | 16 | 7 | 256 | 112 |
| 17 | 16 | 6 | 256 | 96 |
| 18 | 17 | 8 | 289 | 136 |
| 19 | 17 | 10 | 289 | 170 |
| 20 | 17 | 7 | 289 | 119 |
| $n=20$ | $\Sigma x=288$ | $\Sigma y=92$ | $\Sigma x^{2}=4,206$ | $\Sigma x y=1,409$ |




Fitting the Regression Line to the Data for Percentage Rural ( $x$ ) and Robbery Rate ( $y$ ) for 20 States Using the Regression Equation $y=179.5+-2.51(x)$


Fitting the Regression Line to the Data for Divorce Rate ( $x$ ) and Burglary Rate (y) for 20 States Using the Regression Equation $y=614.24+-12.68(x)$




| Self-Control $(x)$ | Self-Reported Delinquency $(y)$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| 45 | 5 |
| 63 | 10 |
| 38 | 2 |
| 77 | 23 |
| 82 | 19 |
| 59 | 7 |
| 61 | 17 |
| 88 | 24 |
| 52 | 14 |
| 67 | 20 |


| Police Response Time <br> in Minutes (x) | Community Rate of <br> Crime per 1,000 (y) |
| :--- | :---: |
| 14 | 82.9 |
| 3 | 23.6 |
| 5 | 42.5 |
| 6 | 39.7 |
| 5 | 63.2 |
| 8 | 51.3 |
| 7 | 58.7 |
| 4 | 44.5 |
| 10 | 61.2 |
| 12 | 73.5 |


| Community <br> Number | Percentage on <br> Welfare $(x)$ | Hours of Daily <br> Police Patrol ( $y$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 40 | 20 |
| 2 | 37 | 15 |
| 3 | 32 | 20 |
| 4 | 29 | 20 |
| 5 | 25 | 15 |
| 6 | 24 | 20 |
| 7 | 15 | 15 |
| 8 | 12 | 20 |
| 9 | 4 | 10 |
| 10 | 2 | 20 |
| 11 |  | 40 |
| 12 |  | 50 |




Data From a Hypothetical Study Examining the Relationship Between
Figure 12.2 Attending a Boot Camp Prison and the Likelihood of Committing Crimes After Prison (Recidivating)

All Prisoners, $n=350$

| Attended <br> Boot Camp | Did Not Attend <br> Boot Camp |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Recidivated | 75 | 105 |
| Did Not | $47 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| Recidivate | 85 | 85 |
|  | $53 \%$ | $45 \%$ |

Female Prisoners, $n=150$
Male Prisoners, $n=200$

Recidivated

Did Not
Recidivate

| Female Prisoners, $n=150$ |  | Male Prisoners, $n=200$ <br> Attended <br> Boot Camp |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Did Not Attend |  |  |  |
| 40 | 20 | Attended <br> Boot Camp | Did Not Attend |
| $40 \%$ | $40 \%$ | 30 | 90 |
| 60 | 30 | $60 \%$ | $60 \%$ |
| $60 \%$ | $60 \%$ | 20 | 60 |

Table 12.1
Calculations Necessary to Compute the Partial Slope Coefficient
Between Delinquency and Both Age and Family Closeness ( $n=23$ )

| Delinquency y | Age $\mathrm{x}_{1}$ | Family Closeness $x_{2}$ | $y^{2}$ | $\chi_{1}^{2}$ | $x_{2}^{2}$ | $x_{1} y$ | $x_{2} y$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80 | 17 | 10 | 6,400 | 289 | 100 | 1,360 | 800 |
| 60 | 15 | 20 | 3,600 | 225 | 400 | 900 | 1,200 |
| 50 | 14 | 25 | 2,500 | 196 | 625 | 700 | 1,250 |
| 70 | 17 | 15 | 4,900 | 289 | 225 | 1,190 | 1,050 |
| 10 | 13 | 35 | 100 | 169 | 1,225 | 130 | 350 |
| 15 | 13 | 30 | 225 | 169 | 900 | 195 | 450 |
| 20 | 14 | 28 | 400 | 196 | 784 | 280 | 560 |
| 5 | 13 | 40 | 25 | 169 | 1,600 | 65 | 200 |
| 70 | 13 | 15 | 4,900 | 169 | 225 | 910 | 1,050 |
| 55 | 14 | 20 | 3,025 | 196 | 400 | 770 | 1,100 |
| 40 | 15 | 25 | 1,600 | 225 | 625 | 600 | 1,000 |
| 35 | 16 | 20 | 1,225 | 256 | 400 | 560 | 700 |
| 10 | 17 | 30 | 100 | 289 | 900 | 170 | 300 |
| 15 | 16 | 25 | 225 | 256 | 625 | 240 | 375 |
| 10 | 14 | 20 | 100 | 196 | 400 | 140 | 200 |
| 15 | 16 | 25 | 225 | 256 | 625 | 240 | 375 |
| 0 | 14 | 25 | 0 | 196 | 625 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 13 | 35 | 0 | 169 | 1,225 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | 14 | 20 | 400 | 196 | 400 | 280 | 400 |
| 0 | 13 | 20 | 0 | 169 | 400 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | 14 | 30 | 400 | 196 | 900 | 280 | 600 |
| 45 | 16 | 30 | 2,025 | 256 | 900 | 720 | 1,350 |
| 50 | 17 | 25 | 2,500 | 289 | 625 | 850 | 1,250 |
| $\Sigma=695$ | $\Sigma=338$ | $\Sigma=568$ | $\Sigma=34,875$ | $\Sigma=5,016$ | $\Sigma=15,134$ | $\Sigma=10,580$ | $\Sigma=14,560$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \bar{Y}=30.22 \\ & s_{y}=25.11 \\ & r_{y x_{1}}=.445 \\ & r_{y x_{2}}=-.664 \\ & r_{x_{1} x_{2}}=-.366 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{X}_{x_{1}}=14.70 \\ & s_{x_{1}}=1.49 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{X}_{x_{2}}=24.70 \\ & s_{x_{2}}=7.09 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |



Multiple Regression Output From SPSS Predicting Delinquency by Age and Family Closeness

## Regression

Variables Entered/removed ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Model | Variables Entered | Variable Removed | Method |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Family Attachments, <br> Age $^{\mathrm{b}}$ |  | Enter |

a. Dependent variable: Delinquency
b. All requested variables entered.

a. Predicators: (Constant),Family Attachments, Age

F Statistics and corresponding sig/alpha for the Null Hypothesis that $\mathrm{R}^{2}=0$

| Model |  | Sum of Square | df | Mean Square | F | Sig |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | Regression | 6777.010 | 2 | 3388.505 | 9.549 | $.001^{\mathrm{b}}$ |
|  | Residual | 7096.903 | 20 | 354.845 |  |  |
|  | Total | 13873.913 | 22 |  |  |  |

a. Dependent Variable: Delinquency
b. Predicators: (Constant),Family Attachments, Age


Hypothetical Inmate-to-Inmate Assault Rates per 100 Inmate Population, Prison Density Index (overcrowding), and Mean Age of Inmates for a Random Sample of 30 Prisons

| Case | Prison | Assault Rate y | Density Index $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ | Mean Age $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Prison A | 10.2 | 1.5 | 25.8 |
| 2 | Prison B | 8.2 | 1.0 | 32.1 |
| 3 | Prison C | 11.3 | 1.6 | 26.2 |
| 4 | Prison D | 9.2 | 1.2 | 29.6 |
| 5 | Prison E | 5.3 | 1.0 | 34.5 |
| 6 | Prison F | 8.5 | 1.1 | 27.5 |
| 7 | Prison G | 8.6 | 1.3 | 30.2 |
| 8 | Prison H | 7.5 | 0.9 | 33.2 |
| 9 | Prison I | 15.3 | 1.9 | 27.2 |
| 10 | Prison J | 10.5 | 1.5 | 26.3 |
| 11 | Prison K | 12.5 | 1.5 | 28.3 |
| 12 | Prison L | 5.4 | 1.1 | 32.3 |
| 13 | Prison M | 10.5 | 1.4 | 23.5 |
| 14 | Prison N | 15.4 | 1.4 | 24.5 |
| 15 | Prison O | 12.8 | 1.2 | 24.5 |
| 16 | Prison P | 13.5 | 1.3 | 27.5 |
| 17 | Prison Q | 17.5 | 1.8 | 25.8 |
| 18 | Prison R | 11.5 | 1.6 | 32.6 |
| 19 | Prison S | 19.0 | 1.4 | 21.2 |
| 20 | Prison T | 14.2 | 1.2 | 26.5 |
| 21 | Prison U | 11.4 | 1.6 | 32.0 |
| 22 | Prison V | 9.8 | 1.1 | 29.9 |
| 23 | Prison W | 6.6 | 0.9 | 36.2 |
| 24 | Prison X | 8.9 | 1.0 | 35.0 |
| 25 | Prison Y | 10.6 | 1.1 | 29.8 |
| 26 | Prison Z | 12.5 | 1.2 | 25.6 |
| 27 | Prison AA | 7.4 | 1.1 | 33.5 |
| 28 | Prison BB | 3.3 | 1.2 | 38.2 |
| 29 | Prison CC | 17.5 | 1.7 | 25.2 |
| 30 | Prison DD | 13.2 | 0.9 | 33.1 |
|  |  | $\Sigma_{y}=328.10$ | $\Sigma x_{1}=38.7$ | $\Sigma x_{2}=877.80$ |
|  |  | $\bar{Y}=10.94$ | $\bar{X}_{x_{1}}=1.29$ | $\bar{X}_{x_{2}}=29.26$ |
|  |  | $s_{y}=3.78$ | $s_{x_{1}}=.27$ | $s_{x_{2}}=4.19$ |
|  |  | $\Sigma y^{2}=4002.07$ | $\Sigma x_{1}^{2}=52.11$ | $\Sigma x_{2}^{2}=26,193.2$ |
|  | $\Sigma y x_{1}=441.7$ | $\Sigma y x_{2}=9,251.0$ | $\Sigma x_{1} x_{2}=1,114.2$ |  |
|  | $r_{y x_{1}}=.61$ | $r_{y x_{2}}=-.76$ | $r_{x_{1} x_{2}}=-.55$ |  |

Figure 12.5
Multiple Regression Output From SPSS Predicting Inmate-to-Inmate Assaults in Prison by Mean Age in the Prison and Overcrowding

## Regression

Variables Entered/Removed ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Model | Variables <br> Entered | Variables <br> Removed | Method |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Mean Age of <br> inmates, <br> Overcrowding <br> index |  | Enter |

a. Dependent Variable: Inmate to Inmate Assault Rate
b. All requested variables entered.

a. Predictors, (Constant),Mean Age of Inmates Overcrowding Index

F Statistic and corresponding sig/alpha for the Null Hypothesis that $R^{2}=0$

| Model |  | Sum of Squares | ANOVA $^{\text {a }}$ | df | Mean Square | F |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | Regression | 261.556 | 2 | 130.778 | 23.201 | $.000^{\mathrm{b}}$ |
|  | Residual | 152.193 | 27 | 5.637 |  |  |
|  | Total | 413.750 | 29 |  |  |  |

a. Dependent Variable: Inmate to Inmate Assault Rate
b. Predictors: (Constant), Mean Age of Inmates, Overcrowding Index


Data and Calculations Necessary to Compute the Partial Slope Coefficient
Table 12.3
Among Murder Rates, Poverty Rate, and South Region ( $0=$ Non-South, 1 = South) for $n=20$ States

| Case | State | Murder Rate y | Percentage Poor $\chi_{1}$ | Southern Region $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Alaska | 3.2 | 9.0 | 0 |
| 2 | Arizona | 5.5 | 16.5 | 0 |
| 3 | California | 5.4 | 14.2 | 0 |
| 4 | Delaware | 4.6 | 10.8 | 1 |
| 5 | Florida | 5.5 | 14.9 | 1 |
| 6 | Indiana | 5.3 | 14.4 | 0 |
| 7 | Louisiana | 12.3 | 17.3 | 1 |
| 8 | Maine | 2.0 | 12.3 | 0 |
| 9 | Maryland | 7.7 | 9.1 | 1 |
| 10 | Massachusetts | 2.7 | 10.3 | 0 |
| 11 | Michigan | 6.3 | 16.2 | 0 |
| 12 | Missouri | 6.6 | 14.6 | 0 |
| 13 | Nebraska | 2.5 | 12.3 | 0 |
| 14 | New Jersey | 3.7 | 9.4 | 0 |
| 15 | New Mexico | 10.0 | 18.0 | 0 |
| 16 | New York | 4.0 | 14.2 | 0 |
| 17 | Pennsylvania | 5.4 | 12.5 | 0 |
| 18 | South Carolina | 6.7 | 17.1 | 1 |
| 19 | Texas | 5.4 | 17.2 | 1 |
| 20 | Wyoming | 2.0 | 9.8 | 0 |
|  |  | $\Sigma_{y}=106.8$ | $\Sigma x_{1}=270.1$ | $\Sigma x_{2}=6$ |
|  |  | $\bar{Y}=5.34$ | $\bar{X}_{x_{1}}=13.5$ | $\bar{X}_{x_{2}}=.30$ |
|  |  | $s_{y}=2.59$ | $s_{x_{1}}=3.03$ | $s_{x_{2}}=.47$ |
|  |  | $\Sigma y^{2}=697.4$ | $\Sigma x_{1}^{2}=3821.8$ | $\Sigma x_{2}^{2}=6$ |
|  | $\Sigma y x_{1}=1534.8$ | $\Sigma y x_{2}=42.2$ | $\Sigma x_{1} x_{2}=86.4$ |  |
|  | $r_{y x_{1}}=.62$ | $r_{y \times 2}=.44$ | $\begin{aligned} & r_{y_{1} x_{2}}=.56 \\ & r_{x_{1} x_{2}}=.20 \end{aligned}$ |  |

Variables Entered/Removed ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Model | Variables <br> Entered | Variables <br> Removed | Method |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | State in South, <br> Percent <br> Individuals below <br> poverty |  | Enter |

a. Dependent Variable: Murder Rate per 100K
b. All requested variables entered.

| Model Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Model R Square Adjusted R <br> Square <br> 1 $.700^{\mathrm{a}}$ .490 Std. Error of the <br> Estimate |  |  |  |  |  |

a. Predictors: (Constant), State in South, Percent Individuals below poverty

ANOVA ${ }^{a}$

| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Regression | 62.298 | 2 | 31.149 | 8.170 | $.003^{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| Residual | 64.810 | 17 | 3.812 |  |  |
| Total | 127.108 | 19 |  |  |  |

a. Dependent Variable: Murder Rate per 100K
b. Predictors: (Constant), State in South, Percent Individuals below poverty

Coefficients ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients |  | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | B | Std.Error |  |  |  |
| 1 (Constant) | -1.617 | 2.049 |  | -. 789 | . 441 |
| Percent Individuals below poverty | . 475 | . 151 | . 556 | 3.145 | . 006 |
| State in South | 1.812 | . 972 | . 329 | 1.864 | . 080 |

[^3]Figure 12.7
Multiple Regression Output for Problem 1: Predicting the Violent Crime Rate for States

| Variables Entered/Removed $^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Model | Variables <br> Entered | Variables <br> Removed | Method |
| 1 | Divorce <br> Mean Age |  | Enter |


| Model Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Model | $R$ | $R$ Rquare | Adjusted R <br> Square | Std. Error of the <br> Estimate |  |
| 1 | $.795^{a}$ | .632 | .609 | 1.9525 |  |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Divorce, Mean Age

| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 Regression | 324.538 | 2 | 162.26 | 27.531 | $.000^{\circ}$ |
| Residual | 188.604 | 20 | 5.893 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

a. Dependent Variable: Violent Crime Rate per 100,000
b. Predictors: (Constant), Divorce, Mean Age

$$
\text { Coefficients }{ }^{8}
$$

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients |  | Standardized Coefficients <br> Beta | t | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | B | Std. <br> Error |  |  |  |
| 1 (Constant) | 19.642 | 2.736 |  | . 600 | . 552 |
| Divorce | . 871 | . 119 | . 594 | 4.268 | . 000 |
| Mean Age | -. 146 | . 158 | -. 133 | -3.110 | . 001 |


| Jail | \# of Escapes | Morale Score | Staff-toInmate Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 12.00 | 3.00 | . 22 |
| 2 | 10.00 | 7.00 | . 41 |
| 3 | 3.00 | 14.00 | . 66 |
| 4 | 7.00 | 8.00 | . 45 |
| 5 | 9.00 | 9.00 | . 32 |
| 6 | 13.00 | 5.00 | . 33 |
| 7 | 17.00 | 2.00 | . 10 |
| 8 | 12.00 | 5.00 | . 30 |
| 9 | 15.00 | 4.00 | . 20 |
| 10 | 9.00 | 5.00 | . 50 |
| 11 | 3.00 | 7.00 | . 60 |
| 12 | 5.00 | 3.00 | . 40 |
| 13 | 11.00 | 2.00 | . 20 |
| 14 | 14.00 | 5.00 | . 50 |
| 15 | 7.00 | 8.00 | . 40 |
| 16 | 10.00 | 5.00 | . 20 |
| 17 | 14.00 | 3.00 | . 30 |
| 18 | 15.00 | 2.00 | . 40 |
| 19 | 17.00 | 2.00 | . 10 |
| 20 | 6.00 | 8.00 | . 20 |
| 21 | 9.00 | 4.00 | . 20 |
| 22 | 3.00 | 10.00 | . 50 |
| 23 | 2.00 | 11.00 | . 60 |
| 24 | 4.00 | 7.00 | . 30 |
| 25 | 13.00 | 2.00 | . 30 |
| 26 | 11.00 | 8.00 | . 50 |
| 27 | 14.00 | 4.00 | . 30 |
| 28 | 9.00 | 4.00 | . 30 |
| 29 | 5.00 | 11.00 | . 40 |
| 30 | 4.00 | 14.00 | . 50 |


| $\Sigma_{y}=283$ | $\Sigma_{x_{1}}=182$ | $\Sigma_{x_{2}}=10.7$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $s_{y}=4.49$ | $s_{x_{1}}=3.47$ | $s_{x_{2}}=.15$ |
| $\bar{y}=9.43$ | $\bar{x}_{1}=6.07$ | $\bar{x}_{2}=.36$ |
| $\Sigma y^{2}=3255$ | $\Sigma x_{x_{1}}^{2}=1454$ | $\Sigma x_{x_{1}}^{2}=4.44$ |
|  | $r_{y x_{1}}=-.77$ |  |
|  | $r_{y x_{2}}=-.63$ |  |
|  | $r_{x_{1 \times} x_{2}}=.67$ |  |
| $r_{y x_{1}, x_{2}}=-.59$ | $r_{y x_{2}, x_{1}}=-.245$ |  |

Figure 12.8 Multiple Regression Output for Problem 3: Jurors' Religious Characteristics and Their Verdicts and Sentencing Decisions

| Model | Variables Entered | Variables Removed | Method |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 1 | ENV, REL |  |


|  | Model Summary |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Model | $R$ | R Square | Adjusted R <br> Square |
| 1 | $.811^{a}$ | .659 | 602 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), ENV, REL

| ANOVA $^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |  |
| 1 Regression | 481.341 | 2 | 240.670 | 11.565 | $.001^{\text {b }}$ |  |
| Residual | 249.058 | 12 | 20.754 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Coefficients ${ }^{2}$


| + | Addition | $>$ | Is greater than |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| - | Subtraction | $\geq$ | Is greater than or equal to |
| $\times$ | Multiplication | $\approx$ | Is approximately equal to |
| $/$ or $\div$ | Division | $x^{2}$ | The number $x$ squared |
| $=$ | Equals | $\sqrt{ } x$ | The square root of the <br> number $x$ |
| $\neq$ | Is not equal to | In $x$ | The natural log of the <br> number $x$ |
| $\pm$ | Plus or minus | $\log x$ | The common log of the <br> number $x$ |
| $<$ | Is less than | $\|x\|$ | The absolute value of the <br> number $x$ |
| $\leq$ | Is less than or <br> equal to |  |  |


| Uppercase | Lowercase |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | $\alpha$ | Alpha |
| B | $\beta$ | Beta |
| 「 | $\gamma$ | Gamma |
| $\Delta$ | $\delta$ | Delta |
| E | $\varepsilon$ | Epsilon |
| $\Lambda$ | $\mu$ | Lambda |
| M | $\rho$ | Mu |
| P | $\tau$ | Rho |
| $\Sigma$ | $\phi$ | Sigma |
| T | $\chi$ | Tau |
| $\Phi$ | Phi |  |
| X | Chi |  |


|  |  |  M | Nơo이융 ద్ల్లస్గంగస్ఠ |  | 낭상우웅ㅅN <br>  |  |  | 앵Nㅇㅇㅇㅇㄱㅜ <br>  | 뇨NㅇN이 <br>  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br>  |  | 오운엉́ㅇ <br>  |  <br>  | 댕ㅇㅇ우ㅇㅜㅜ <br> 寸 fơN N్N | Min NiNo oino |  숭№m |  BNininco |  | 융ㅇNN్ల 웃융ㅇㅇㅇ |
| OిOMN: |  | ల్లి야양눈 <br>  | Niobion | BioNo No |  |  | M్ల్రీస్లఱ్ల్ల －ơm in | N్లNㅓㅓㅇㅜNN ©omion | RONONN웅 © |
|  <br>  |  | かNiNN Nomoㅜㅇ |  |  <br>  |  |  |  |  | 「～웅ㅇNN Ninco |
| 꿍NNN양ㅇㅇ <br>  | NMon |  |  |  がウㅜㅜ유우 |  |  <br>  | 우N～～N <br> べかっすく |  | 毋ioㅇㅇㅇㅇㅜ すべ |
| 잉NㅇNㅇN <br>  | No NiNo あむ心毎権 | దoneninion <br>  | Nôobざ <br>  | ゅかった寸 © O O | No <br>  | 운웅우웅 | প్ల్రీ ஜobicoodid |  | NiNمmo <br>  |
| セNNJポ <br>  |  | NNNNㅇ NoNiOn in N | niñNㅜㅇ <br>  | 읏등 N్ల్లి |  |  <br>  | 융웅유욱 <br>  |  <br> ロロッローか |  |
|  |  <br>  |  <br>  |  |  <br>  |  |  |  Nิ웅후운 |  <br>  | 웅융NNNNN |
| 뭉N웅ㅇㅇㅇ <br> かするどN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  생ㅅㅇㅇ우눙 | దino గ్గ수N్ల్ర |  |
| －్ల్గ్య్ర్లN <br>  | Nowo |  | nonNon ద్ద్ల్లు | NォOํN人Nণ |  |  | かロํํ순 o్ల융్ㅇㅎㅓ | o్ర |  |
|  |  | さNセ゚Nす 욱ㅇ№̛ になNoN |  <br>  | 以ーが品守 <br>  |  | 士心ㅁㅇㅇㅇㅇㅇ 엉 ふのON |  <br>  |  |  |
| 웅흥웅ㅇㅇ © $\quad \infty$ | OONON <br>  | পoncooiq <br>  | ฯ～ㅛㅇㅇㅇํ No |  |  | Ooo N-in Co |  | © it inco 시우웅్ల |  |
|  すめo |  |  | ヘロット゚ <br>  |  |  <br>  |  | ৪iower N్ల్우우웅 |  <br>  |  チ |

## Table B. 2 Area Under the Standard Normal Curve (z Distribution)*

| $z$ | .00 | .01 | .02 | .03 | .04 | .05 | .06 | .07 | .08 | .09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.0 | .0000 | .0040 | .0080 | .0120 | .0160 | .0199 | .0239 | .0279 | .0319 | .0359 |
| 0.1 | .0398 | .0438 | .0478 | .0517 | .0557 | .0596 | .0636 | .0675 | .0714 | .0753 |
| 0.2 | .0793 | .0832 | .0871 | .0910 | .0948 | .0987 | .1026 | .1064 | .1103 | .1141 |
| 0.3 | .1179 | .1217 | .1255 | .1293 | .1331 | .1368 | .1406 | .1443 | .1480 | .1517 |
| 0.4 | .1554 | .1591 | .1628 | .1664 | .1700 | .1736 | .1772 | .1808 | .1844 | .1879 |
| 0.5 | .1915 | .1950 | .1985 | .2019 | .2054 | .2088 | .2123 | .2157 | .2190 | .2224 |
| 0.6 | .2257 | .2291 | .2324 | .2357 | .2389 | .2422 | .2454 | .2486 | .2517 | .2549 |
| 0.7 | .2580 | .2611 | .2642 | .2673 | .2704 | .2734 | .2764 | .2794 | .2823 | .2852 |
| 0.8 | .2881 | .2910 | .2939 | .2967 | .2995 | .3023 | .3051 | .3078 | .3106 | .3133 |
| 0.9 | .3159 | .3186 | .3212 | .3238 | .3264 | .3289 | .3315 | .3340 | .3365 | .3389 |
| 1.0 | .3413 | .3438 | .3461 | .3485 | .3508 | .3531 | .3554 | .3577 | .3599 | .3621 |
| 1.1 | .3643 | .3665 | .3686 | .3708 | .3729 | .3749 | .3770 | .3790 | .3810 | .3830 |
| 1.2 | .3849 | .3869 | .3888 | .3907 | .3925 | .3944 | .3962 | .3980 | .3997 | .4015 |
| 1.3 | .4032 | .4049 | .4066 | .4082 | .4099 | .4115 | .4131 | .4147 | .4162 | .4177 |
| 1.4 | .4192 | .4207 | .4222 | .4236 | .4251 | .4265 | .4279 | .4292 | .4306 | .4319 |
| 1.5 | .4332 | .4345 | .4357 | .4370 | .4382 | .4394 | .4406 | .4418 | .4429 | .4441 |
| 1.6 | .4452 | .4463 | .4474 | .4484 | .4495 | .4505 | .4515 | .4525 | .4535 | .4545 |
| 1.7 | .4554 | .4564 | .4573 | .4582 | .4591 | .4599 | .4608 | .4616 | .4625 | .4633 |
| 1.8 | .4641 | .4649 | .4656 | .4664 | .4671 | .4678 | .4686 | .4693 | .4699 | .4706 |
| 1.9 | .4713 | .4719 | .4726 | .4732 | .4738 | .4744 | .4750 | .4756 | .4761 | .4767 |
| 2.0 | .4772 | .4778 | .4783 | .4788 | .4793 | .4798 | .4803 | .4808 | .4812 | .4817 |
| 2.1 | .4821 | .4826 | .4830 | .4834 | .4838 | .4842 | .4846 | .4850 | .4854 | .4857 |
| 2.2 | .4861 | .4864 | .4868 | .4871 | .4875 | .4878 | .4881 | .4884 | .4887 | .4890 |
| 2.3 | .4893 | .4896 | .4898 | .4901 | .4904 | .4906 | .4909 | .4911 | .4913 | .4916 |
| 2.4 | .4918 | .4920 | .4922 | .4925 | .4927 | .4929 | .4931 | .4932 | .4934 | .4936 |
| 2.5 | .4938 | .4940 | .4941 | .4943 | .4945 | .4946 | .4948 | .4949 | .4951 | .4952 |
| 2.6 | .4953 | .4955 | .4956 | .4957 | .4959 | .4960 | .4961 | .4962 | .4963 | .4964 |
| 2.7 | .4965 | .4966 | .4967 | .4968 | .4969 | .4970 | .4971 | .4972 | .4973 | .4974 |
| 2.8 | .4974 | .4975 | .4976 | .4977 | .4977 | .4978 | .4979 | .4979 | .4980 | .4981 |
| 2.9 | .4981 | .4982 | .4982 | .4983 | .4984 | .4984 | .4985 | .4985 | .4986 | .4986 |
| 3.0 | .4987 | .4987 | .4987 | .4988 | .4988 | .4989 | .4989 | .4989 | .4990 | .4990 |

Source: Adapted with permission from Frederick Mosteller and Robert E. K. Rourke, 1973. Sturdy Statistics. Table A-1. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. *Proportion of the area under the normal curve corresponding to the distance between the mean ( 0 ) and a point that is $z$ standard deviation units away from the mean.

## Table B. 3 The $t$ Distribution

|  | Level of Significance for a One-Tailed Test |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | . 10 | . 05 | . 025 | . 01 | . 005 | . 0005 |
|  |  |  | Significan | Two-Tailed |  |  |
|  | . 20 | . 10 | . 05 | . 02 | . 01 | . 001 |
| 1 | 3.078 | 6.314 | 12.706 | 31.821 | 63.657 | 636.619 |
| 2 | 1.886 | 2.920 | 4.303 | 6.965 | 9.925 | 31.598 |
| 3 | 1.638 | 2.353 | 3.182 | 4.541 | 5.841 | 12.941 |
| 4 | 1.533 | 2.132 | 2.776 | 3.747 | 4.604 | 8.610 |
| 5 | 1.476 | 2.015 | 2.571 | 3.365 | 4.032 | 6.859 |
| 6 | 1.440 | 1.943 | 2.447 | 3.143 | 3.707 | 5.959 |
| 7 | 1.415 | 1.895 | 2.365 | 2.998 | 3.499 | 5.405 |
| 8 | 1.397 | 1.860 | 2.306 | 2.896 | 3.355 | 5.041 |
| 9 | 1.383 | 1.833 | 2.262 | 2.821 | 3.250 | 4.781 |
| 10 | 1.372 | 1.812 | 2.228 | 2.764 | 3.169 | 4.587 |
| 11 | 1.363 | 1.796 | 2.201 | 2.718 | 3.106 | 4.437 |
| 12 | 1.356 | 1.782 | 2.179 | 2.681 | 3.055 | 4.318 |
| 13 | 1.350 | 1.771 | 2.160 | 2.650 | 3.012 | 4.221 |
| 14 | 1.345 | 1.761 | 2.145 | 2.624 | 2.977 | 4.140 |
| 15 | 1.341 | 1.753 | 2.131 | 2.602 | 2.947 | 4.073 |
| 16 | 1.337 | 1.746 | 2.120 | 2.583 | 2.921 | 4.015 |
| 17 | 1.333 | 1.740 | 2.110 | 2.567 | 2.898 | 3.965 |
| 18 | 1.330 | 1.734 | 2.101 | 2.552 | 2.878 | 3.922 |
| 19 | 1.328 | 1.729 | 2.093 | 2.539 | 2.861 | 3.883 |
| 20 | 1.325 | 1.725 | 2.086 | 2.528 | 2.845 | 3.850 |
| 21 | 1.323 | 1.721 | 2.080 | 2.518 | 2.831 | 3.819 |
| 22 | 1.321 | 1.717 | 2.074 | 2.508 | 2.819 | 3.792 |
| 23 | 1.319 | 1.714 | 2.069 | 2.500 | 2.807 | 3.767 |
| 24 | 1.318 | 1.711 | 2.064 | 2.492 | 2.797 | 3.745 |
| 25 | 1.316 | 1.708 | 2.060 | 2.485 | 2.787 | 3.725 |
| 26 | 1.315 | 1.706 | 2.056 | 2.479 | 2.779 | 3.707 |
| 27 | 1.314 | 1.703 | 2.052 | 2.473 | 2.771 | 3.690 |
| 28 | 1.313 | 1.701 | 2.048 | 2.467 | 2.763 | 3.674 |
| 29 | 1.311 | 1.699 | 2.045 | 2.462 | 2.756 | 3.659 |
| 30 | 1.310 | 1.697 | 2.042 | 2.457 | 2.750 | 3.646 |
| 40 | 1.303 | 1.684 | 2.021 | 2.423 | 2.704 | 3.551 |
| 60 | 1.206 | 1.671 | 2.000 | 2.390 | 2.660 | 3.460 |
| 120 | 1.289 | 1.658 | 1.980 | 2.358 | 2.617 | 3.373 |
| $\infty$ | 1.282 | 1.645 | 1.960 | 2.326 | 2.576 | 3.291 |

Source: Table B. 3 is adapted with permission from Table III of R. A. Fisher and F. Yates, Statistical Tables for Biological, Agricultural and Medical Research (6th ed.). Published by Longman Group UK Ltd., 1974.

Table B. 4 Critical Values of the Chi-Square Statistic at the .05 and .01 Significance Levels

| Area to the Right of the Critical Value |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Level of Significance |  |
| df | .05 | .01 |
| 1 | 3.841 | 6.635 |
| 2 | 5.991 | 9.210 |
| 3 | 7.815 | 11.345 |
| 4 | 9.488 | 13.277 |
| 5 | 11.070 | 15.086 |
|  |  |  |
| 6 | 12.592 | 16.812 |
| 7 | 14.067 | 18.475 |
| 8 | 15.507 | 20.090 |
| 9 | 16.919 | 21.666 |
| 10 | 18.307 | 23.209 |
| 11 | 19.675 | 24.725 |
| 12 | 21.026 | 26.217 |
| 13 | 22.362 | 27.688 |
| 14 | 23.685 | 29.141 |
| 15 | 24.996 | 30.578 |
| 16 | 26.296 | 32.000 |
| 17 | 27.587 | 33.409 |
| 18 | 28.869 | 34.805 |
| 19 | 30.144 | 36.191 |
| 20 | 31.410 | 37.566 |


| Area to the Right of the Critical Value |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Level of Significance |  |
| df | .05 | .01 |
| 21 | 32.671 | 38.932 |
| 22 | 33.924 | 40.289 |
| 23 | 33.924 | 40.289 |
| 24 | 36.415 | 42.980 |
| 25 | 37.652 | 44.314 |
|  | 38.885 | 45.642 |
| 26 | 40.113 | 46.963 |
| 27 | 41.337 | 48.278 |
| 28 | 42.557 | 49.588 |
| 29 | 43.773 | 50.892 |
| 30 | 55.758 | 63.691 |
| 40 | 67.505 | 76.154 |
| 50 | 79.082 | 88.379 |
| 60 | 90.531 | 100.425 |
| 70 | 101.879 | 112.329 |
| 80 | 113.145 | 124.116 |
| 90 | 124.342 | 135.807 |

Source: Adapted from Donald Owen, Handbook of Statistical Tables, © 1962 by Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc. Reprinted by permission of Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Table B.5a The FDistribution ( $\alpha=.01$ in the right tail)

| $\frac{d r}{d r}\left(b_{0 \text { own }}\right.$ | Numerator Degrees of Freedom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 1 | 4052.2 | 4999.5 | 5403.4 | 5624.6 | 5763.6 | 5859.0 | 5928.4 | 5981.1 | 6022.5 |
| 2 | 98.503 | 99.000 | 99.166 | 99.249 | 99.299 | 99.333 | 99.356 | 99.374 | 99.388 |
| 3 | 34.116 | 30.817 | 29.457 | 28.710 | 28.237 | 27.911 | 27.672 | 27.489 | 27.345 |
| 4 | 21.198 | 18.000 | 16.694 | 15.977 | 15.522 | 15.207 | 14.976 | 14.799 | 14.659 |
| 5 | 16.258 | 13.274 | 12.060 | 11.392 | 10.967 | 10.672 | 10.456 | 10.289 | 10.158 |
| 6 | 13.745 | 10.925 | 9.7795 | 9.1483 | 8.7459 | 8.4661 | 8.2600 | 8.1017 | 7.9761 |
| 7 | 12.246 | 9.5466 | 8.4513 | 7.8466 | 7.4604 | 7.1914 | 6.9928 | 6.8400 | 6.7188 |
| 8 | 11.259 | 8.6491 | 7.5910 | 7.0061 | 6.6318 | 6.3707 | 6.1776 | 6.0289 | 5.9106 |
| 9 | 10.561 | 8.0215 | 6.9919 | 6.4221 | 6.0569 | 5.8018 | 5.6129 | 5.4671 | 5.3511 |
| 10 | 10.044 | 7.5594 | 6.5523 | 5.9943 | 5.6363 | 5.3858 | 5.2001 | 5.0567 | 4.9424 |
| 11 | 9.6460 | 7.2057 | 6.2167 | 5.6683 | 5.3160 | 5.0692 | 4.8861 | 4.7445 | 4.6315 |
| 12 | 9.3302 | 6.9266 | 5.9525 | 5.4120 | 5.0643 | 4.8206 | 4.6395 | 4.4994 | 4.3875 |
| हो 13 | 9.0738 | 6.7010 | 5.7394 | 5.2053 | 4.8616 | 4.6204 | 4.4410 | 4.3021 | 4.1911 |
| 14 | 8.8616 | 6.5149 | 5.5639 | 5.0354 | 4.6950 | 4.4558 | 4.2779 | 4.1399 | 4.0297 |
| 15 | 8.6831 | 6.3589 | 5.4170 | 4.8932 | 4.5556 | 4.3183 | 4.1415 | 4.0045 | 3.8948 |
| 16 | 8.5310 | 6.2262 | 5.2922 | 4.7726 | 4.4374 | 4.2016 | 4.0259 | 3.8896 | 3.7804 |
| 17 | 8.3997 | 6.1121 | 5.1850 | 4.6690 | 4.3359 | 4.1015 | 3.9267 | 3.7910 | 3.6822 |
| 18 | 8.2854 | 6.0129 | 5.0919 | 4.5790 | 4.2479 | 4.0146 | 3.8406 | 3.7054 | 3.5971 |
| 19 | 8.1849 | 5.9259 | 5.0103 | 4.5003 | 4.1708 | 3.9386 | 3.7653 | 3.6305 | 3.5225 |
| 20 | 8.0960 | 5.8489 | 4.9382 | 4.4307 | 4.1027 | 3.8714 | 3.6987 | 3.5644 | 3.4567 |
| 21 | 8.0166 | 5.7804 | 4.8740 | 4.3688 | 4.0421 | 3.8117 | 3.6396 | 3.5056 | 3.3981 |
| ¢ 22 | 7.9454 | 5.7190 | 4.8166 | 4.3134 | 3.9880 | 3.7583 | 3.5867 | 3.4530 | 3.3458 |
| 23 | 7.8811 | 5.6637 | 4.7649 | 4.2636 | 3.9392 | 3.7102 | 3.5390 | 3.4057 | 3.2986 |
| 24 | 7.8229 | 5.6136 | 4.7181 | 4.2184 | 3.8951 | 3.6667 | 3.4959 | 3.3629 | 3.2560 |
| 25 | 7.7698 | 5.5680 | 4.6755 | 4.1774 | 3.8550 | 3.6272 | 3.4568 | 3.3239 | 3.2172 |
| 26 | 7.7213 | 5.5263 | 4.6366 | 4.1400 | 3.8183 | 3.5911 | 3.4210 | 3.2884 | 3.1818 |
| 27 | 7.6767 | 5.4881 | 4.6009 | 4.1056 | 3.7848 | 3.5580 | 3.3882 | 3.2558 | 3.1494 |
| 28 | 7.6356 | 5.4529 | 4.5681 | 4.0740 | 3.7539 | 3.5276 | 3.3581 | 3.2259 | 3.1195 |
| 29 | 7.5977 | 5.4204 | 4.5378 | 4.0449 | 3.7254 | 3.4995 | 3.3303 | 3.1982 | 3.0920 |
| 30 | 7.5625 | 5.3903 | 4.5097 | 4.0179 | 3.6990 | 3.4735 | 3.3045 | 3.1726 | 3.0665 |
| 40 | 7.3141 | 5.1785 | 4.3126 | 3.8283 | 3.5138 | 3.2910 | 3.1238 | 2.9930 | 2.8876 |
| 60 | 7.0771 | 4.9774 | 4.1259 | 3.6490 | 3.3389 | 3.1187 | 2.9530 | 2.8233 | 2.7185 |
| 120 | 6.8509 | 4.7865 | 3.9491 | 3.4795 | 3.1735 | 2.9559 | 2.7918 | 2.6629 | 2.5586 |
| $\infty$ | 6.6349 | 4.6052 | 3.7816 | 3.3192 | 30173 | 2.8020 | 2.6393 | 2.5113 | 2.4073 |

Table B.5b The F Distribution ( $\alpha=.01$ in the right tail)

|  | Numerator Degrees of Freedom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10 | 12 | 15 | 20 | 24 | 30 | 40 | 60 | 120 | $\infty$ |
| 1 | 241.88 | 243.91 | 245.95 | 248.01 | 249.05 | 250.10 | 251.14 | 252.20 | 253.25 | 254.31 |
| 2 | 19.396 | 19.413 | 19.429 | 19.446 | 19.454 | 19.462 | 19.471 | 19.479 | 19.487 | 19.496 |
| 3 | 8.7855 | 8.7446 | 8.7029 | 8.6602 | 8.6385 | 8.6166 | 8.5944 | 8.5720 | 8.5494 | 8.5264 |
| 4 | 5.9644 | 5.9117 | 5.8578 | 5.8025 | 5.7744 | 5.7459 | 5.7170 | 5.6877 | 5.6581 | 5.6281 |
| 5 | 4.7351 | 4.6777 | 4.6188 | 4.5581 | 4.5272 | 4.4957 | 4.4638 | 4.4314 | 4.3985 | 4.3650 |
| 6 | 4.0600 | 3.9999 | 3.9381 | 3.8742 | 3.8415 | 3.8082 | 3.7743 | 3.7398 | 3.7047 | 3.6689 |
| 7 | 3.6365 | 3.5747 | 3.5107 | 3.4445 | 3.4105 | 3.1758 | 3.3404 | 3.3043 | 3.2674 | 3.2298 |
| 8 | 3.3472 | 3.2839 | 3.2184 | 3.1503 | 3.1152 | 3.0794 | 3.0428 | 3.0053 | 2.9669 | 2.9276 |
| 9 | 3.1373 | 3.0729 | 3.0061 | 2.9365 | 2.9005 | 2.8617 | 2.8259 | 2.7872 | 2.7475 | 2.7067 |
| 10 | 2.9782 | 2.9110 | 2.8450 | 2.7740 | 2.7372 | 2.6996 | 2.6609 | 2.6211 | 2.5801 | 2.5379 |
| 11 | 2.8536 | 2.7876 | 2.7186 | 2.6464 | 2.6090 | 2.5705 | 2.5309 | 2.4901 | 2.4480 | 2.4045 |
| 12 | 2.7534 | 2.6866 | 2.6169 | 2.5436 | 2.5055 | 2.4663 | 2.4259 | 2.3842 | 2.3410 | 2.2962 |
| E 13 | 2.6710 | 2.6037 | 2.5331 | 2.4589 | 2.4202 | 2.1801 | 2.3392 | 2.2966 | 2.2524 | 2.2064 |
| 14 | 2.6022 | 2.5342 | 2.4630 | 2.3879 | 2.3487 | 2.1082 | 2.2664 | 2.2229 | 2.1778 | 2.1307 |
| 15 | 2.5437 | 2.4753 | 2.4034 | 2.3275 | 2.2878 | 2.2468 | 2.2043 | 2.1601 | 2.1141 | 2.0658 |
| 16 | 2.4935 | 2.4247 | 2.3522 | 2.2756 | 2.2354 | 2.1938 | 2.1507 | 2.1058 | 2.0589 | 2.0096 |
| 17 | 2.4499 | 2.3807 | 2.3077 | 2.2304 | 2.1898 | 2.1477 | 2.1040 | 2.0584 | 2.0107 | 1.9604 |
| $\stackrel{\circ}{\square} 18$ | 2.4117 | 2.3421 | 2.2686 | 2.1906 | 2.1497 | 2.1071 | 2.0629 | 2.0166 | 1.9681 | 1.9168 |
| 19 | 2.3779 | 2.3080 | 2.2341 | 2.1555 | 2.1141 | 2.0712 | 2.0264 | 1.9795 | 1.9302 | 1.8780 |
| 20 | 2.3479 | 2.2776 | 2.2033 | 2.1242 | 2.0825 | 2.0391 | 1.9938 | 1.9464 | 1.8963 | 1.8432 |
| 21 | 2.3210 | 2.2504 | 2.1757 | 2.0960 | 2.0540 | 2.0102 | 1.9645 | 1.9165 | 1.8657 | 1.8117 |
| - 22 | 2.2967 | 2.2258 | 2.1508 | 2.0707 | 2.0283 | 1.9842 | 1.9380 | 1.8894 | 1.8380 | 1.7831 |
| 23 | 2.2747 | 2.2036 | 2.1282 | 2.0476 | 2.0050 | 1.9605 | 1.9139 | 1.8648 | 1.8128 | 1.7570 |
| 24 | 2.2547 | 2.1834 | 2.1077 | 2.0267 | 1.9838 | 1.9390 | 1.8920 | 1.8424 | 1.7896 | 1.7330 |
| 25 | 2.2365 | 2.1649 | 2.0889 | 2.0075 | 1.9643 | 1.9192 | 1.8718 | 1.8217 | 1.7684 | 1.7110 |
| 26 | 2.2197 | 2.1479 | 2.0716 | 1.9898 | 1.9464 | 1.9010 | 1.8533 | 1.8027 | 1.7488 | 1.6906 |
| 27 | 2.2043 | 2.1323 | 20558 | 1.9736 | 1.9299 | 1.8842 | 1.8361 | 1.7851 | 1.7306 | 1.6717 |
| 28 | 2.1900 | 2.1179 | 2.0411 | 1.9586 | 1.9147 | 1.8687 | 1.8203 | 1.7689 | 1.7138 | 1.6541 |
| 29 | 2.1768 | 2.1045 | 2.0275 | 1.9446 | 1.9005 | 1.8543 | 1.8055 | 1.7537 | 1.6981 | 1.6376 |
| 30 | 2.1646 | 2.0921 | 2.0148 | 1.9317 | 1.8874 | 1.8409 | 1.7918 | 1.7396 | 1.6835 | 1.6223 |
| 40 | 2.0772 | 2.0035 | 1.9245 | 1.8389 | 1.7929 | 1.7444 | 1.6928 | 1.6373 | 1.5766 | 1.5089 |
| 60 | 1.9926 | 1.9174 | 1.8364 | 1.7480 | 1.7001 | 1.6491 | 1.5943 | 1.5343 | 1.4673 | 1.3893 |
| 120 | 1.9105 | 1.8337 | 1.7505 | 1.6587 | I. 6084 | 1.5543 | 1.4952 | 1.4290 | 1.3519 | 1.2539 |
| $\infty$ | 1.8307 | 1.7522 | 1.6664 | 1.5705 | 1.5173 | 1.4591 | 1.3940 | 1.3180 | 1.2214 | 1.0000 |

Table B. 6 The Studentized Range Statistic, q

Table B. $6 \quad$ (Continued)


|  | $f$ | Proportion | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than \$10 | 16 | .029 | 2.9 |
| $\$ 10-\$ 49$ | 39 | .072 | 7.2 |
| $\$ 50-\$ 99$ | 48 | .088 | 8.8 |
| $\$ 100-\$ 249$ | 86 | .159 | 15.9 |
| $\$ 250-\$ 999$ | 102 | .188 | 18.8 |
| $\$ 1,000$ or more | 251 | .463 | 46.3 |
|  | $n=542$ |  |  |


| Value | $f$ | $p$ | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Never | 30 | .2000 | 20.00 |
| A few times | 75 | .5000 | 50.00 |
| More than a few times | 35 | .2333 | 23.33 |
| A lot | 10 | .0667 | 6.67 |


| Value | $f$ |  | $c$ | $c$ | $p$ | $c p$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Value | $f$ | $p$ | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 16 | .64 | 64 |
| Female | 9 | .36 | 36 |

Distribution of Test Scores for Recruit Class


## Gender Distribution of Recruit Class



## Cumulative Frequency Line Graph for Test Score Data



Time Plot of NCVS Property Crime Victimization Rates per 1,000 Households


| $m_{i}$ | $m_{i}-\bar{X}$ | $\left(m_{i}-\bar{X}\right)^{2}$ | $f$ | $f\left(m_{i}-\bar{X}\right)^{2}$ |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | $2-8.6=-6.6$ | 43.56 | 76 | $3,310.56$ |
| 7 | $7-8.6=-1.6$ | 2.56 | 52 | 133.12 |
| 12 | $12-8.6=-3.4$ | 11.56 | 38 | 439.28 |
| 17 | $17-8.6=8.4$ | 70.56 | 21 | $1,481.76$ |
| 22 | $22-8.6=13.4$ | 179.56 | 10 | $1,795.60$ |
| 27 | $27-8.6=18.4$ | 338.56 | 8 | $2,708.48$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\Sigma=9,868.80$ |




[^0]:    Source: Adapted from Core Alcohol and Drug Survey: Long Form © 2015 from the Core Institute.

[^1]:    *Does not sum to $100 \%$ because of rounding.

[^2]:    Source: Adapted from The Cost of Prisons: What Incarceration Costs Taxpayers © 2012 from the Vera Institute of Justice.

[^3]:    a. Dependent Variable: Murder Rate per 100K

