

https://dspace.org/

The relationship between crime and life satisfaction : evidence from the Gauteng Province

Cordeiro, Martinique

2018

https://hdl.handle.net/10539/27158

Cordeiro, Martinique (2018) The relationship between crime and life satisfaction: evidence from the Gauteng Province, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, <http://hdl.handle.net/10539/27158>

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Responses to Examiners' comments

1. Internal examiners comments

1.1. Comments 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23 and 24

These comments pertain to typos, incorrect punctuation utilized, missing words etcetera. I addressed all of these comments by following the guidance of the examiner to identify the errors and then corrected them accordingly. I also performed a search of the whole document to ensure that all related typos and errors were corrected throughout. There were also other typos and punctuation issues that were not specified in the comments, but where highlighted in the paper. Those have been addressed as well.

1.2 Comment 2

I went back to Sulemana's paper to determine the dataset that he used and specified it accordingly in my paper.

1.3 Comment 4

I included my hypothesis on what I would expect to observe about the relationship between crime and life satisfaction over time.

1.4 Comment 5

I corrected this statement to indicate that most, opposed to all, South Africans reported being satisfied with life for a fleeting moment in 1994.

1.5 Comment 12

The examiner asked if the GCRO QoL survey specified the types of crime in regards to crime victimization from the past 12 months. But the survey just asked in general if the respondent had been a victim of crime in the past 12 months, not specifying the type of crime. Therefore I specified that it was a general question.

1.6 Comment 13

The examiner wanted me to comment on what kind of unobserved variables might affect both the crime and life satisfaction variables- I've provided two examples. The examiner also wanted me to comment on what not controlling for these two sources of endogeneity might do to my results in

terms of direction and size of effects, therefore I specified this in the paper by indicating that the value will be systematically lower or higher than actual values due to the omitted variable bias, and that the size effect of crime of life satisfaction may be bigger or smaller than is observed in reality.

1.7 Comment 15

The examiner felt that an unemployment value of 66% and 52% was too high so I went back to my data to determine how I specified this variable. From there I realized that this included unemployed and economically inactive people, therefore I indicated that this also includes people who categorize themselves in the 'other' category- i.e. not economically active individuals.

1.8 Comment 17

The examiner wanted me to explain why the safety/security finding was opposite to the other subjective wellbeing measures i.e. why higher crime rates in 2015 meant that the respondent was less likely to report being very dissatisfied with safety and security etc. An explanation that I was able to provide was that this finding can be interpreted as a relative measure. For instance, if respondents felt more satisfied with the safety/security provided in their neighbourhood relative to in 2011, then despite the higher crime rate in 2015; they felt less likely to be targets of crime in this period due to safety/security measures in their neighbourhoods.

1.9 Comment 19

The examiner wanted me to note a potential criticism for using subjective dependent and independent variables. I have included this paragraph to indicate this criticism

1.10 Comment 22

The examiner wanted me to say more about why marginal effects have declined over time. This is something that we had previously found difficult to explain, but we had said that this is possibly because South Africans are exposed to crime so frequently that it stops affecting their life satisfaction as much. Respondents could also have moved to neighbourhoods in which they feel safer in their homes over time. It is also possible that measures of crime and crime victimization from the past year are not good longer-term measures of crime victimization.

2. External examiner's comments

2.1 Comment 2a.

The examiner commented that the last paragraph on page 5, although correct given the realities of apartheid, somehow locks crime to be a 'black' phenomenon. They ask if there are any records of the crime levels within the "white' neighbourhoods at that time. I have attempted to find such records about crime levels in white neighbourhoods in this period, but have come up empty handed. Records about crime during this period were highly biased and unreliable and tried to paint crime indeed as a black phenomenon (or tried to really portray non-white citizens as the instigators of crime). Unfortunately, I have not come across other information or more in-depth information about explicit crime levels in white areas during this time. Therefore, I have made a comment that although crime information does seem to indicate that crime levels within white neighbourhoods during apartheid was significantly lower than in non-white areas, as policing efforts were focused on protecting white citizens and their suburbs during this period, a lack of research into specific crime levels in white areas during this time does not allow me to make detailed comments and comparisons. This provides a potential gap in the paper and area for potential future research.

2.2 Comment 2c.

The examiner said I had to correct the 5-point Likert scale under the methodology section as it contradicted what I said on page 14. Originally under the methodology section I had j: 1=very satisfied and 5=very dissatisfied. Although this is correct, it contradicts what we did as we later had 1= least satisfied and 5= most satisfied in our data section. This is because we decided to recode our data so that most satisfied was associated with a score of 5 and least satisfied was associated with a score of 1. It made sense to us to do it this way. However, in order to avoid confusion I have changed the Likert scale under methodology to be consistent with what we did in our paper.

2.3 Comments 2e: Key limitations

Comment i) I have addressed this comment by including a pie chart to indicate provincial comparisons of total crime in South Africa. This also provides further motivation for using Gauteng as total crimes are highest in the Gauteng province.

I think that comments ii) and iii) can be treated as improvements in further studies. The examiner did comment that they recommend that this research report be passed subject to corrections of very minor typos as indicated in the marked dissertation. I have, as mentioned previously, corrected these already. They have also said that some of the issues raised in their comments could be treated as

improvements in further studies and I believe that comments ii) and iii) are potential comments that fall into this category as they require a fair amount of research. These sections were intended to merely supplement the paper and provide some context and background, whilst they are not the main focus or argument around which the paper is written. Hence I do believe they can be explored in more depth in further studies. Although I have indicated that these are limitations and areas for improvements in further studies in my conclusion.

In regards to comment iv) the examiner wanted me to discuss the other covariates more adequately. However, we decided to present the covariates in the manner that we did (i.e. specifically with a short decision which was supplemented with a colour-coded table indicating relationship and statistical significance) in order to make the paper more concise. Presenting too much detail on the discussion of other covariates would make the research paper unnecessarily too long and possibly make the reader miss the key results intended; specifically referring to the link between subjective well-being and crime.

M.Cordeiro

Signature of student

Martinique Cordeiro-15 August 2018



PRUDENCE MAGEJO – 14 AUGUST 2018

Signature of Supervisor