Hotspots are strong indicators of where the highest occurrence of a specific variable is on a map. With respect to understanding violent crime occurrences across the city of Chicago, step #1 in the workflow is the most effective. Hotspots are categorized into different confidence levels, and an area that has a hotspot with a high percentage confidence level denotes an area with a high occurrence of whatever variable is being studied. In this case, the variable being examined is violent crime. Another step in the workflow that I'd like to highlight is step #5, which is also effective and relevant. This step involves completing a space-time cube and an emerging hot spot analysis analyzing crime trends. I believe step #1 is the most effective in studying this topic because it analyzes violent crime, which is what the question is asking, and step #5 is more broadly focusing on crime trends.

There is an emphasis on the scaling of the application of the fishnet polygon grid. This is important because when comparing several hot spot maps, it is imperative that they all have the same scale of analysis. The study area, cell size and scale of analysis all need to be in accordance. This allows for an accurate comparison between maps, which is important when making conclusions about the data.

I remember reading research regarding the influence of familial environments on criminal behavior in individuals. I would be curious to know how individuals who have grown up in a stable household with a more nuclear family composition fare in terms of crime, and the extent to which individuals who do not have the same background engage in crime. Of course, this is more at the individual level but I believe we can

study this on the aggregate level. Perhaps by studying how many families in an area consist of a single parent household, or how many families report that their home life is not as great as it could be. My only hesitancy with this is vilifying single parent households, and incorrectly implying that just because there are not two parents in the picture, the house environment is deemed "unhealthy." There is also a lot of variety in why people are single parents, some people adopt or raise a child on their own and there was never another parent in the picture. Some people are divorced and much happier and healthier than they were when they were together, so they are each able to provide a more secure and stable home to their child. A lot of studies I've read on this topic categorize by single parent households vs two parent households, but I feel that taking a survey may be a better way to gauge an understanding of home environments. I mentioned this briefly earlier but people can turn in surveys on how they feel their home life is. They can rank it on a scale of how encouraging, nurturing, and positive it is among other things. However, it's important to note that surveys are not the perfect solution to collect data either, as there is a lot of bias that plays a role in this type of data collection. People may be inclined to say their home situation is perfect just so they feel good about themselves, and kids may do so due to obligation or fear. Still, I think this is something worth exploring. Compiling a report from each household may give us enough data to separate households into 3-5 satisfactory levels. This can be mapped and we can study any spatial patterns present. It is possible that this will give us a further understanding of how familial bonds influence involvement in crime, and which areas consist of families that are struggling to cultivate households that don't negatively influence their children.