

# **The Marriage and Gun Ownership**

## **Correlation in East Baton Rouge**

**An Analysis of the Data Collected in the Sociology 2211 Spring 2013**

**Survey of East Baton Rouge Parrish**

Gun owners in America tend to consider themselves more conservative than non-gun owners; religiously, economically, and politically. Similarly, married individuals are more likely to be conservative in many different aspects of their lives than single or unmarried individuals. This tendency by both groups to be more conservative sets the basis for the trend that married individuals are more likely to own a gun than their unmarried counterparts. There are many reasons that this trend exists: both gun owners and married individuals tend to share attributes commonly associated with conservatism, such as regular church attendance, Republican party affiliations, and high income. With conservative values serving as the foundation, gun ownership can be predicted by the marital status of an individual.

The relationship between gun ownership and marriage will be explored through five hypotheses developed from a survey of the East Baton Rouge community. The first hypothesis is that married people and gun owners are both more likely to be Republican. The next hypothesis is that married people and gun owners are more likely to attend church on a regular basis. The third hypothesis states that married people are more likely to own guns because they have a higher household income. The fourth hypothesis is that married people and gun owners are both predominately Caucasian. The last hypothesis states that married people are more likely to own guns as a means of protection, because they are more likely to have children. The overall theme of each of the five hypotheses is that married people are more likely to own guns because of their tendency to be conservative; fiscally, religiously, and politically. The theory being that the three factors; marriage, gun ownership, and conservatism, form a triangle of sorts. With married people being more likely than unmarried to hold conservative beliefs and gun owners more likely

Good

than non-gun owners, this paper will show that marriage status is a good indicator of gun ownership.

All of the aforementioned hypotheses were derived from data collected by students of the sociology department at Louisiana State University during the spring semester of 2013. This survey was conducted over the phone using randomly generated numbers to ensure that the information was representative of the East Baton Rouge Parish. Not all of the random numbers were usable, however; some were disconnected, and others were numbers to fax machines or business. To further guarantee randomization and to offset the number of women who answered the phone, surveyors requested to talk to the person who was over the age of eighteen and who had the last birthday. The people of the East Baton Rouge parish were asked 52 questions about their thoughts on many issues facing the area, such as, safety, politics, and the economy. Our class surveyed 375 residents, 64.3% of which were female, and 35.7% of which were male. The United States Census Bureau estimates that in 2012 the East Baton Rouge Parish was home to 444,526 residents, only 51.9% of which were female, meaning 48.1% of the population was male (East Baton Rouge). The data that we collected was then weighted in order to make it as representative of the population as possible. Some of the questions with multiple answers were combined in order to make analysis of the data easier.

Great  
methods  
section:  
descriptive  
and concise

The first hypothesis is that married people and gun owners are both more likely to be Republicans. This prediction was made because it shows the correlation between both groups and political conservatism, which is the basis for some of the other hypotheses. Republicans are not typically in favor of strict gun control laws, fighting to uphold the

rights granted to citizens by the Second Amendment. Obviously gun owners would not be in favor of strict gun control laws either, and it follows that they would likely be Republican. Republicans tend to idealize the nuclear family, by voting against legalizing gay-marriage, and they also tend to be wealthier than Democrats. Married couples, having two incomes are also wealthier and though they don't all oppose gay marriage, they are more likely to be in the party that would more positively affect their nuclear-family lifestyle. This is the reasoning that leads to the hypothesis that married people are more likely to own guns because they are more likely to be Republican.

Our data in Table 1 shows that married people are more likely to consider themselves Republican. In fact 33.3% of married individuals were also Republican while only 23.3% of unmarried individuals were Republican. When looking at the likelihood of married people to be Democrats, our Table 1 shows almost an exact flip in numbers, with 31.8% being not married, and 26.9% being married. The significance of the chi-square for this relationship is .105, meaning it is not statistically significant (Table 1A). The value of Cramer's V is .112 showing a moderate association (Table 1B). In our survey gun owners also were found to be more slightly more likely to be Republican, as seen in Table 2, at 35.8%. The p-value for this table is .002 and the Cramer's V is .193, meaning that it is significant with a moderate association (Table 2A-B). The analysis proves that there is a relationship between both being married and owning a gun, and being a Republican, although not necessarily a significant one. Gun owners are more likely to be Republicans, but the relationship between marriage and party is not significant. This proves only that gun ownership can be determined from political party.

The second hypothesis predicts that frequent church goers were more likely to be married and to own a gun. This hypothesis was made to demonstrate the relationship through religious, rather than political conservatism. Religious conservatives adhere strictly to the set of basic ideas or principles of their religion and could be considered devout. The reasoning behind this hypothesis was a predicted relationship between the two groups and conservatism of all forms. Traditional married couples are more likely to have been married in a church and therefore be a member of some place of worship, especially in Baton Rouge, a southern city in the Bible Belt. The relationship between gun owners and religious devoutness is less clear. The prediction that gun owners are more likely to attend church is based on the knowledge that political conservatives are also highly likely to be religiously conservative.

Table 3 shows a clear and strong relationship between marriage and church membership in East Baton Rouge. A large majority of married individuals said they were members of a local church or place of worship, at 83.4%, and only 16.6% were not. This data shows a continuing conservative trend in married individuals. The significance of the chi-square here is .000, which means the relationship is highly significant. The Cramer's V value is .246, which signifies a moderately strong association (Table 3A-B). The second hypothesis also assumes that because gun owners are more likely to be politically conservative they are more likely to be members of a church. Further analysis showed that there was a connection between gun owners and church membership, as can be seen in Table 4. 77.6% of gun owners are also members of a church or place of worship. The p-value of the chi-square for this relationship is .039, and the Cramer's V is .113, showing moderate association and statistical significance (Table 4A-B). There also seems to be some

relationship between being politically conservative and attending church, as depicted in Table 5. This table shows that 53.4% of church members considered themselves at least slightly politically conservative, while only 34.9% of non-church members were conservative. This relationship is significant as shown by the p-value of .000 and the Cramer's V value is .275 signifying moderately strong association (Table 5A-B). Married individuals and gun owners both were more likely to be members of a church, based on these results, and therefore the analysis supports the second hypothesis.

Hypothesis number three proposes that married individuals are more likely to own guns because they have higher household incomes. The reasons for this hypothesis are twofold: 1) those with higher incomes are more likely to own a gun because they have the fiscal means to own a gun, and 2) those with higher incomes have more net worth, that they may feel the need to protect. The analysis of this will focus solely on the first reason, because the survey contained no question which could accurately measure the second reason, however, it is still a valid assumption, and worth mentioning. Due to the dual income that marriage often provides, married individuals are more likely to have higher household incomes than single individuals. Similarly, gun owners simply would not be gun owners if they did not have the fiscal means to own a gun. In Louisiana registering a gun costs over \$125 and must be done every 5 years, and guns can cost anywhere from a couple hundred dollars to a couple thousand dollars (Concealed). Gun ownership can require a significant monetary commitment that would only be reasonable for those with higher household incomes.

Rationale behind hypothesis is clearly explained.

Residents with a low household income are less likely to own a gun than those who have a higher household income. Only 29.6% of the people who own a gun had a household income under \$50,000, while 70.4% had a household income of over \$50,000 according to Table 6. This relationship is a moderately strong one with Cramer's V at .221, and it is statistically significant with a p-value of .001 (Table 6A-B). Married residents are extremely likely to have a high household income. Table 7 shows that 60.5% of not married individuals fell below the \$50,000 mark, whereas only 16.9% of married individuals had household incomes that low, and 37.3% of married people had household incomes of above \$100,000. This relationship is most certainly significant with a p-value of .000 and a strong association based on the Cramer's V of .461 (Table 7A-B). The data collected from the survey strongly supports the hypothesis that married people are more likely to own guns because they have the fiscal means to do so.

The relationship between marriage, gun ownership, and race was predicted in the fourth hypothesis, which states that both marriage and gun ownership rates will be higher amongst Caucasian citizens. This hypothesis was developed under the assumption that race can be used as a predictor of party affiliation. Caucasian people, being more likely to be Republicans, are therefore more likely to be in favor of gun ownership. A well-established fact in sociology is that there are many more African American women heading households than Caucasian women. A possible reason is that because there is a higher rate of African American men in the prison system there are fewer marriageable options. In reality, every time the African American male incarceration rate increases 1%, the percent of African American women who will marry decreases an associated 2.4% (Blunt). Therefore, it is probable that Caucasian individuals are more likely to be married and to own guns.

There is a relationship between marriage and race in keeping with Table 10, which shows that 58.3% of all married individuals in East Baton Rouge are Caucasian. Only 34.2% of the married population is African American. The significance of the chi-square for this relationship is .001, and the Cramer's V is .190, representing a moderate association (Table 10A-B). This supports the hypothesis that African Americans marry far less frequently than Caucasians. Table 9 illustrates that as predicted, 65.7% of Caucasian residents have a gun in their homes. That is almost double the amount of African Americans who own guns, which is at 38.6%. Other races are the least likely to own a gun with only 36.8%. The p-value for this relationship shows statistical significance at .000 (Table 9A). There is also moderately strong association with a Cramer's V of .275 (Table 9B) Caucasians, according to Table 8, are far more likely than African Americans to be Republican, with 49.5% of Caucasians and only 2.9% of African Americans being Republican. This hypothesis has a strong association with the value of Cramer's V at .549 and is statistically significant with a p-value of .000 (Table 8A-B). This suggests that Caucasians are more likely to be gun owners because of the anti-gun control views held by most Republicans. Since most of the married individuals are Caucasian and most of the gun owners are Caucasian, the conclusion can be drawn that most gun owners are married.

Great mix of statistical references and interpretation .

The fifth hypothesis predicts that married people are more likely to own guns as a means of protection for their families. This hypothesis assumes that married people are more likely to have children for which they are responsible. Although, many would argue that the fundamental purpose of marriage is for procreation, this hypothesis, goes one step further and predicts that married individuals without children will be less likely to own



guns than those with children. The reason behind this hypothesis is that parents with children will feel the need to have extra protection because children are mostly incapable of protecting themselves.

The strong correlation between marriage and having children is clear in Table 11. 80.2% of married individuals have children and only 19.8% are childless. There is a much smaller difference between unmarried individuals, with 53% being without children and 47% having children. The p-value is .000 and the Cramer's V is .346 indicating a strong association and statistical significance (Table 11A-B). This data proves that married individuals are more likely to have children than not, but if children is an assumed part of marriage, then it says little about gun ownership. Table 12, however, proves that there is a connection between having children and owning a gun. 64.1% of people who are married with children have a gun, whereas only 51.4% of people who are married but have no children own a gun. There is significance and a strong association for the relationship between married people who have children and guns. The significance of the chi-square is .000 and the Cramer's V is .355 (Table 12A-B). However, the relationship between married residents who have no children but still own a gun is not statistically significant and the association is weak. The p-value for this relationship is at .660 and the Cramer's V is .040. This analysis shows that married individuals who have children are more likely to own a gun than married individuals who do not have children. However, this finding may require further research due to the lack of significance in the category of married people without children. Nonetheless, overall, the above findings do support the final hypothesis that married people are more likely to have guns, especially if they have children.

The data and analysis presented in this paper from the 2013 Spring survey demonstrate an obvious trend in marriage and gun ownership. This relationship is centralized around the religiously, fiscally, and politically conservative viewpoints held by married individuals and gun owners. Furthermore, the relationship is proven through the data found in Table 13. Gun owners constitute 61.4% of the married individuals in East Baton Rouge while only 42.4% of not married individuals own a gun. The value of  $p$ , .000, indicates statistical significance and the value of Cramer's  $V$ , .191, indicates a moderate association (Table 13A-B). Therefore, the general hypothesis that married people are more likely to own guns is supported by the data. There are many possible reasons for this relationship, which could include; church membership, household income, race, political party, or children. Both groups; married individuals and gun owners, tend to have higher incomes, tend to be Republican, tend to have children, tend to be church members, and tend to be Caucasian. The correlation of marriage and gun ownership in East Baton Rouge is not necessarily to be used to generalize the entire country. East Baton Rouge Parrish and other parts of Louisiana have higher percentages of almost all of the variables found to support the marriage and gun owner relationship. Nationally only 59% of citizens are members of a church, whereas 76.8% of the people we surveyed were church members (Trends). 40% of Americans consider themselves Republicans, but 45.1% of East Baton Rouge residents are republicans (Trends). Gun owners make up 47.5% of the East Baton Rouge population, but nationally only 43% of citizens own guns (Trends). These high levels may be signs of a regional, rather than national trend in marriage and gun ownership correlations, and could be the basis of further investigation. Another unexpected finding that might be a source of future research is the fact that there was no statistical significance

in the relationship between marriage and political party. This find was surprising due to the Republican emphasis on family values. The five hypothesis discussed in this paper found support and corroborating evidence from the analysis of the data collected during the 2013 Spring Telephone Survey by Sociology 2211 students at LSU. There appears an undeniable relationship between marriage and gun ownership, as well as an underlying theme of conservatism in the East Baton Rouge Parrish that provides the basis for the correlation.

*An excellent paper:*

*-Well-articulated hypotheses, properly tested and analyzed*

*-Demonstrated command of relevant statistics - cited where appropriate but not substituted for insightful interpretation and discussion.*

*-Discussed findings in direct relation to the variables in the hypotheses, pointed out possible limitations, and issued directions for future study.*

## Works Cited

- Blunt, Christina. "Black Feminist Thought: Nearly Twenty Years on." *The Society Pages*. N.p., 19 May 2010. Web. 03 May 2013. <<http://thesocietypages.org/sociologylens/2010/05/19/black-feminist-thought-nearly-twenty-years-on/>>.
- "Concealed Handgun Permit Unit." *Louisiana State Police*. Public Safety Services, n.d. Web. 03 May 2013. <<http://www.lsp.org/handguns.html>>.
- "East Baton Rouge Parish QuickFacts from the US Census Bureau." *United States Census Bureau*. U.S. Department of Commerce, 11 Mar. 2103. Web. 03 May 2013. <<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/22/22033.html>>.
- "Trends A-Z." *Gallup Pole*. N.p., n.d. Web. 03 May 2013. <<http://www.gallup.com/poll/trends.aspx>>.

**Table 1:**

			Married dummy		Total
			Not Married	Married	
Party Identification (simple)	Republican	Count	41	62	103
		% within Married dummy	23.3%	33.3%	28.5%
	Independent	Count	79	74	153
		% within Married dummy	44.9%	39.8%	42.3%
	Democrat	Count	56	50	106
		% within Married dummy	31.8%	26.9%	29.3%
Total	Count	176	186	362	
	% within Married dummy	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

**Table 1A:**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.512 <sup>a</sup>	2	.105
Likelihood Ratio	4.539	2	.103
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.503	1	.061
N of Valid Cases	362		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 50.08.

**Table 1B:**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.112	.105
	Cramer's V	.112	.105
N of Valid Cases		362	

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

**Table 2:**

**Party Identification (simple) \* Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers? Crosstabulation**

			Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?		Total
			Yes	No	
Party Identification (simple)	Republican	Count	62	29	91
		% within Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?	35.8%	18.6%	27.7%
	Independent	Count	64	74	138
		% within Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?	37.0%	47.4%	41.9%
	Democrat	Count	47	53	100
		% within Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?	27.2%	34.0%	30.4%
Total	Count	173	156	329	
	% within Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

**Table 2A:**

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.206 <sup>a</sup>	2	.002
Likelihood Ratio	12.451	2	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.162	1	.004
N of Valid Cases	329		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 43.15.

**Table 2B:**

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.193	.002
	Cramer's V	.193	.002
N of Valid Cases		329	

- a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.
- b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

**Table 3:**

Church member? (0=No & no relig) * Married dummy Crosstabulation					
			Married dummy		Total
			Not Married	Married	
Church member? (0=No & no relig)	Not	Count	69	31	100
		% within Married dummy	38.5%	16.6%	27.3%
Church Member	Church	Count	110	156	266
		% within Married dummy	61.5%	83.4%	72.7%
Total		Count	179	187	366
		% within Married dummy	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 3A:**

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.231 <sup>a</sup>	1	.000		
Continuity Correction <sup>b</sup>	21.138	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	22.629	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	22.170	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	366				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 48.91.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Table 3B:**

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.246	.000
	Cramer's V	.246	.000
N of Valid Cases		366	

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.



**Table 4:**

Church member? (0=No & no relig) \* Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?

**Crosstabulation**

			Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?		Total
			Yes	No	
Church member? (0=No & no relig)	Not	Count % within Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?	39 22.4%	52 32.5%	91 27.2%
	Church Member	Count % within Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?	135 77.6%	108 67.5%	243 72.8%
Total		Count % within Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?	174 100.0%	160 100.0%	334 100.0%

**Table 4A:**

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.278 <sup>a</sup>	1	.039		
Continuity Correction <sup>b</sup>	3.784	1	.052		
Likelihood Ratio	4.283	1	.039		
Fisher's Exact Test				.049	.026
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.265	1	.039		
N of Valid Cases	334				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 43.59.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Table 4B:**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.113	.039
	Cramer's V	.113	.039
N of Valid Cases		334	

- a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.
- b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

**Table 5:**

**We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Would you call yourself: \* Church member? (0=No & no relig) Crosstabulation**

			Church member? (0=No & no relig)		Total
			Not	Church Member	
We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Would you call yourself:	Extremely Liberal	Count	6	2	8
		% within Church member? (0=No & no relig)	7.2%	0.8%	2.5%
	Liberal	Count	12	17	29
		% within Church member? (0=No & no relig)	14.5%	7.2%	9.1%
	Slightly Liberal	Count	10	16	26
		% within Church member? (0=No & no relig)	12.0%	6.8%	8.2%
	Moderate, middle of the road	Count	26	75	101
		% within Church member? (0=No & no relig)	31.3%	31.8%	31.7%
	Slightly Conservative	Count	15	42	57
		% within Church member? (0=No & no relig)	18.1%	17.8%	17.9%
Conservative	Count	9	69	78	
	% within Church member? (0=No & no relig)	10.8%	29.2%	24.5%	
Extremely Conservative	Count	5	15	20	
	% within Church member? (0=No & no relig)	6.0%	6.4%	6.3%	
<b>Total</b>	Count	83	236	319	

% within Church member? (0=No & no relig)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
---	--------	--------	--------

**Table 5A:**

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.131 <sup>a</sup>	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	23.560	6	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.832	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	319		

a. 1 cells (7.1%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.08.

**Table 5B:**

**Symmetric Measures**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.275	.000
	Cramer's V	.275	.000
N of Valid Cases		319	

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

**Table 6:**

**Household Income (3 category) \* Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers? Crosstabulation**

			Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?		Total
			Yes	No	
Household Income (3 category)	Under \$50,000	Count % within Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?	42 29.6%	68 51.1%	110 40.0%
	\$50,000 to \$100,000	Count % within Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?	59 41.5%	40 30.1%	99 36.0%
	Over \$100,000	Count % within Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?	41 28.9%	25 18.8%	66 24.0%
Total		Count % within Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?	142 100.0%	133 100.0%	275 100.0%

**Table 6A:****Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.391 <sup>a</sup>	2	.001
Likelihood Ratio	13.496	2	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.140	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	275		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 31.92.

**Table 6B:****Symmetric Measures**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.221	.001
	Cramer's V	.221	.001
N of Valid Cases		275	

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

**Table 7:****Household Income (3 category) \* Married dummy Crosstabulation**

			Married dummy		Total
			Not Married	Married	
Household Income (3 category)	Under \$50,000	Count	92	24	116
		% within Married dummy	60.5%	16.9%	39.5%
	\$50,000 to \$100,000	Count	43	65	108
		% within Married dummy	28.3%	45.8%	36.7%
	Over \$100,000	Count	17	53	70
		% within Married dummy	11.2%	37.3%	23.8%
Total	Count	152	142	294	
	% within Married dummy	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

**Table 7A:****Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	62.590 <sup>a</sup>	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	66.137	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	58.553	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	294		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 33.81.

**Table 7B:****Symmetric Measures**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.461	.000
	Cramer's V	.461	.000
N of Valid Cases		294	

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

**Table 8:**

**Party Identification (simple) \* Race (3 category) Crosstabulation**

			Race (3 category)			Total
			White	Black	All Others	
Party Identification (simple)	Republican	Count	91	4	8	103
		% within Race (3 category)	49.5%	2.9%	20.0%	28.5%
	Independent	Count	74	63	16	153
		% within Race (3 category)	40.2%	45.7%	40.0%	42.3%
	Democrat	Count	19	71	16	106
		% within Race (3 category)	10.3%	51.4%	40.0%	29.3%
Total	Count	184	138	40	362	
	% within Race (3 category)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

**Table 8A:**

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	109.118 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	127.714	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	68.308	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	362		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.38.

**Table 8B:**

**Symmetric Measures**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.549	.000
	Cramer's V	.388	.000
N of Valid Cases		362	

- a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.
- b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.



**Table 9:**

**Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers? \* Race (3 category) Crosstabulation**

			Race (3 category)			Total
			White	Black	All Others	
Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?	Yes	Count	109	51	14	174
		% within Race (3 category)	65.7%	38.6%	36.8%	51.8%
	No	Count	57	81	24	162
		% within Race (3 category)	34.3%	61.4%	63.2%	48.2%
Total	Count	166	132	38	336	
	% within Race (3 category)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

**Table 9A:**

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.343 <sup>a</sup>	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	25.679	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.209	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	336		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.32.

**Table 9B:**

**Symmetric Measures**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.275	.000
	Cramer's V	.275	.000
N of Valid Cases		336	

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

**Table 10:**

			Married dummy		Total
			Not Married	Married	
Race (3 category)	White	Count	77	109	186
		% within Married dummy	41.8%	58.3%	50.1%
	Black	Count	75	64	139
		% within Married dummy	40.8%	34.2%	37.5%
	All Others	Count	32	14	46
		% within Married dummy	17.4%	7.5%	12.4%
Total	Count	184	187	371	
	% within Married dummy	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

**Table 10A:**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.396 <sup>a</sup>	2	.001
Likelihood Ratio	13.615	2	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.293	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	371		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.81.

**Table 10B:**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.190	.001
	Cramer's V	.190	.001
N of Valid Cases		371	

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

**Table 11:**

**Children dummy \* Married dummy Crosstabulation**

			Married dummy		Total
			Not Married	Married	
Children dummy	No Children	Count	97	37	134
		% within Married dummy	53.0%	19.8%	36.2%
	Children	Count	86	150	236
		% within Married dummy	47.0%	80.2%	63.8%
Total	Count	183	187	370	
	% within Married dummy	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

**Table 11A:**

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	44.184 <sup>a</sup>	1	.000		
Continuity Correction <sup>b</sup>	42.757	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	45.376	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	44.064	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	370				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 66.28.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Table 11B:**

**Symmetric Measures**

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.346	.000
	Cramer's V	.346	.000
N of Valid Cases		370	

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

**Table 12:**

**Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers? \* Married dummy \* Children dummy Crosstabulation**

Children dummy			Married dummy		Total	
			Not Married	Married		
No Children	Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?	Yes	Count	48	18	66
			% within Married dummy	55.8%	51.4%	54.5%
		No	Count	38	17	55
			% within Married dummy	44.2%	48.6%	45.5%
	Total		Count	86	35	121
			% within Married dummy	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Children	Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?	Yes	Count	23	84	107
			% within Married dummy	27.7%	64.1%	50.0%
		No	Count	60	47	107
			% within Married dummy	72.3%	35.9%	50.0%
	Total		Count	83	131	214
			% within Married dummy	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?	Yes	Count	71	102	173
			% within Married dummy	42.0%	61.4%	51.6%
		No	Count	98	64	162
			% within Married dummy	58.0%	38.6%	48.4%
	Total		Count	169	166	335
			% within Married dummy	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 12A:**

		Chi-Square Tests				
Children dummy		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
No Children	Pearson Chi-Square	.193 <sup>c</sup>	1	.660		
	Continuity Correction <sup>b</sup>	.057	1	.812		
	Likelihood Ratio	.193	1	.661		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.691	.405
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.191	1	.662		
	N of Valid Cases	121				
Children	Pearson Chi-Square	26.944 <sup>d</sup>	1	.000		
	Continuity Correction <sup>b</sup>	25.508	1	.000		
	Likelihood Ratio	27.683	1	.000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	26.818	1	.000		
	N of Valid Cases	214				
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	12.665 <sup>a</sup>	1	.000		
	Continuity Correction <sup>b</sup>	11.899	1	.001		
	Likelihood Ratio	12.747	1	.000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	12.627	1	.000		
	N of Valid Cases	335				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 80.27.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.91.

d. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 41.50.

**Table 12B:**

<b>Symmetric Measures</b>			Value	Approx. Sig.
Children dummy				
No Children	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.040	.660
		Cramer's V	.040	.660
	N of Valid Cases		121	
Children	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.355	.000
		Cramer's V	.355	.000
	N of Valid Cases		214	
Total	Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.194	.000
		Cramer's V	.194	.000
	N of Valid Cases		335	

- a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.
- b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

**Table 13:**

<b>Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers? * Married dummy Crosstabulation</b>					
			Married dummy		Total
			Not Married	Married	
Do you happen to have in your home any guns or revolvers?	Yes	Count	72	102	174
		% within Married dummy	42.4%	61.4%	51.8%
	No	Count	98	64	162
		% within Married dummy	57.6%	38.6%	48.2%
Total	Count		170	166	336
	% within Married dummy		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 13A:**

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.262 <sup>a</sup>	1	.000		
Continuity Correction <sup>b</sup>	11.510	1	.001		
Likelihood Ratio	12.340	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.226	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	336				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 80.04.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

**Table 13B:**

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	-.191	.000
	Cramer's V	.191	.000
N of Valid Cases		336	

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.