



BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND THE VULNERABLE

**Edited by
ODUFUWA B. O.
BADIORA A. I.**

Fear of Crime and the Predictors of Victimization in the Built Environment

Badiora, A.I. & Ntamark, J.J.

Introduction

Crime, personal safety, and fear of crime are key issues that have continued to attract public concern. Fear of crime has emerged as a social phenomenon which, in extreme cases, impinges on the quality of life of urban residents (Jackson and Gray, 2010), as well as induce paranoia, anxiety, and other psychological issues on a personal level. Increased criminal activities have engendered increased fear of crime in developed and developing countries alike. Findings drawn from the International Crime and Victim Survey (ICVS) of the World Bank (2010) reveal that globally, irrespective of where a person lives, over a five year period, two out of three inhabitants of big towns and cities are victims of crime at least once, while one in every five persons has been a victim of crime at least once. Consequently, crime statistics, the perception of growing danger, and actual crime incidents in Africa have generated a culture of fear and widespread anxiety among the population in both developing and developed countries. In Lagos, Nigeria, Alemika and Chukwuma, (2005) note that 70 per cent of respondents in a city-wide survey were fearful of being victims of crime. In Nairobi, more than half of the citizens worry about crime “all the time” or “very often” (UN-Habitat, 2007), while a World Bank study in Zambia reported that fear of crime among teachers affected their work decisions (Moser & Holland, 1997).

The fear of crime first emerged as an area of criminological enquiry after it was ‘discovered’ in the 1960s America via household crime surveys (Hale, 1996). Earlier on, in the discovery of fear of crime as a

phenomenon shaping the life of cities, significant social differences in its experience were recognized. Today, the empirical and theoretical development around the issue of social identity and fear is the subject of a sizeable literature in its own right, as well as being a focus of some policies which aim to make cities safer and better places to live in. Over a period spanning more than fifty years, fear of crime has developed into a full-fledged sub-discipline of criminology, a phenomenon worthy of attention both in terms of furthering academic knowledge and developing criminal justice, as well as policy responses that reflect the impact and the serious nature of the issue (Lee, 2007). Indeed, as Walklate (2007, p.82) puts it, the fear of crime "... now has a life that is somewhat independent of the actual experience or risk from crime itself".

Much thinking about fear of crime has tended to be dichotomised. For instance, different groups of individuals are widely constructed as vulnerable to fear of crime (either threatening or threatened). Thus, fear of crime as a discipline can be said to have developed on a binary format whereby, as the old are prone to fear more than the young, certain ethnic groups have the tendency to show fear more than the others, women fear more than men, and so on. In other words, the 'actors' within fear of crime are cast in the role of weak and strong, powerless and powerful, good and bad. Within these perceived boundaries for examining fear of crime as a social phenomenon, it is unusual to encounter a study that identifies individuals or groups as simultaneously fearful and fearing, or that identifies the 'good' as feared and the 'bad' as fearful. These dualisms reflect a wider criminological notion that certain groups are vulnerable and others are victims of it. Another set of differentiations in the literature is around the vulnerable built environments. That is, places in which fear is situated. For example, we have identified public versus private spaces, safe versus dangerous places, low-income estates versus high income estates, central business districts versus suburbs, and the ways in which people navigate them. In fact, most discussions of fear in the built environment deal only with public spaces which are shared with outsiders. While many people strongly associate fear with specific places, reflecting wider ideologies of public space as dangerous and private space as safe, fear and safety in different spaces are interconnected. For example, experiences of danger in private space

affect feelings of security in public at an individual, neighborhood and societal level.

As the built environment social identities which have received most attention in the recent years, this chapter aims to appraise debates on vulnerability and fear of crime in the built environment with a view to shaping the focus of some policies which aim to make cities safer and better places to live in. The next section begins by conceptualizing key concepts of vulnerability and fear of crime as well as their relationships. This is followed by a brief explanation on the theory underpinning these discussions. This chapter then goes on to examine how individual, neighborhood, and urban characteristics influence fear of crime and its effects on peoples' routine activities and use of urban spaces. This chapter will examine literature on individual level characteristics, neighbourhood level characteristics, and city level characteristics it will also observe the ways in which they each may or may not have an effect on fear of crime.

Definition of Concepts

Vulnerability

The concept of vulnerability is relative and dynamic and has a wider applicability in a number of disciplines. Generally, the Business Dictionary (2018) explains vulnerability as the degree to which people, property, resources, systems, and cultural, economic, environmental, and social activities are susceptible to harm, degradation, or destruction on being exposed to hostile agents or factors. But more specifically, and in relation to fear of crime, vulnerability connotes a condition of being exposed to the possibility of being attacked, hurt, influenced or harmed, either physically or emotionally. It can also explain a situation where one is likely to meet with harm due to being predisposed to such harmful situation as a result of lacking protection from danger or resistance against such perceived or real physical or emotional attacks. According to the World Health Organization (WHO[2002]), vulnerability is the diminished capacity of an individual, population, organization or group to anticipate, cope with, resist and recover from the impact of a natural or man-made hazard or disasters. Although vulnerability is most often associated with poverty, it can also arise when people are isolated, insecure and defenceless in the face of risk, shock or stress. Suffice it to

say that due to the eclectic nature of the multi-faceted context within which the concept of vulnerability can be situated, vulnerable groups are defined usually within the context of the discipline under investigation. Thus, the concept of vulnerability is amplified within groups in a particular population.

Vulnerable groups refer to people who are disadvantaged in some way. This include such population as children, people living with schizophrenia, pregnant women, and homeless people, who are particularly vulnerable when a disaster strikes, and take a relatively high share of the disease burden associated with emergencies. Socially, a population can be deemed to be socially vulnerable due to having a high level of physical, psychological, and/or social risk and who may experience a higher risk of poverty and social exclusion than the general population. Within the context of health vulnerability, vulnerable populations also include the economically disadvantaged, racial and ethnic minorities, the uninsured, low-income children, the elderly, the homeless, those with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), and those with other chronic health conditions, including severe mental illness.

Clearly, there are several social groups marked as vulnerable to victimization in the fear of crime literature. Based on the 1994 British Crime Survey, there is a strong support for the view that some population groups, either because of their physical inability to defend themselves or social and economic position, usually feel less safe than others (Pantazis, 2000). Such groups include women, elderly people, and poor individuals (Hale, 1996), as well as individuals with physical disabilities (Stiles et al. 2003). Other studies have identified other vulnerable groups to victimization to include people with mental retardation/illness (Nettlebeck and Wilson, 2002) and victims of repeated victimizations (Perloff, 1983). People with disabilities may be particularly vulnerable to crimes involving interpersonal violence, such as physical or sexual assault, because as a population, regardless of age or gender, they are often the least able to recognize danger, the least able to protect themselves, and the least able to obtain assistance within the criminal justice system. Vulnerability is also heightened within the context of gender. Johnson (2007) notes that conventionally, gender and age have been used as proxies for vulnerability. According to him, females are found to worry more frequently than males partly because

(a) they feel less able to physically defend themselves, (b) they have lower perceived self-efficacy, (c) they have higher perceived negative impact, and (d) they see the likelihood of victimization as higher for themselves and for their social group (Johnson, 2007). Younger people are also found to worry more frequently than older people, although differential vulnerability does not explain such association.

Vulnerability can also be defined in term of geographical areas. Socially vulnerable areas have lower education rates (Larsen et al., 2015), higher unemployment rates (Sigurd et al., 2011) and higher crime rates (Sigurd & Madsen, 2011) compared to other areas. Moreover, in these areas, there is a greater likelihood of mothers not living with their family, having been convicted of crime, receiving unemployment benefits, having no education, and having poor living conditions (Frederickson et al., 2015). The risk posed by criminogenic features is located at one or more places on a landscape and their confluence at the same place contributes to a risk value which indicates the likelihood of crime. These spatial risk values, which measure the clustering of contributing factors at specific places, represent vulnerability to crime and can be used to forecast where crime will occur and (possibly) cluster over a period of time (Drawve 2014).

Fear of Crime

Generally, fear of crime explains the fear of becoming a victim in a crime incident. Fear of crime can be described as a feeling of “fear” and “insecurity” derived from the feeling of a person who senses his/her personal security to be under threat. Over the years, studies have attempted to conceptualize fear of crime, culminating in the debate as to whether fear of crime should be conceptualized as an emotion or as a measure of risk (Ferraro, 1995; Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987). However, more recent studies have established that fear of crime refers to the emotional response to potential victimization, whereas “perceived risk” is better explained as the “likelihood of victimization risk” (Warr, 2000; Wyant, 2008).

More broadly, fear of crime is the emotional response of dreaded occurrences or anxiety to crime or any symbol that a person associates with crime (La Graange and Ferraro 1995). It encapsulates a personal

disposition to fear which is as a result of risk, vulnerability and victimization (Elchardus et al, 2002). Taken as a broader community problem and conduct disorders, fear of crime defines a set of empirically distinct but related construct that combine emotion, risks perception and vulnerability to victimization among the population. Fear of crime precipitates into fear which in turn influences the sense of personal security in the community. It relates to how vulnerable a person feels in relation to crime in his/her environment. Consequently, fear of crime constrains peoples' lifestyles, restricts the use of public spaces and public amenities. These restrictions dampen community's shared aspirations and expectations to conform to a set of traditionally understood rules.

Garofalo (1973) defines fear of crime as: "an emotional reaction characterized by a sense of danger and anxiety" (p. 840). He goes on to distinguish between the types of fear of crime. Fear of physical injury is an emotional automatic reaction to physical cues from one's environment. Fear of property crime involves a more complex thought process that could also be described as worry. Fear of crime is not limited to fear of personal victimization. The term "fear of crime" encompasses all types of crime which can include property crime. As stated earlier, the definition of fear of crime has generated a lot of debate. Warr (2000) argues that fear is a feeling of dread caused by the expectation of danger. He states that it is a reaction to a perceived environment. Further, he purports that the fear of crime is not a separate entity in and of itself. Rather, fear of crime is like any other type of fear such as the fear of a traffic accident or fear of a family member dying. Fear of crime, as Warr (2000) defines, cannot be defined as Garofalo (1973) does. According to Garofalo, fear is "an emotional reaction from one's environment" does not distinguish fear from any other emotion. Emotions like joy, sadness, and anger are all "emotional reactions from one's environment" (Garfalo, 1973, p. 840).

Garland (1996) describes fear as an inevitable consequence of living in a crime-prone world. According to Vanderveen (2006), feeling of insecurity is the sense of personal insecurity in the community or the emotional response to possible violent crime and physical harm. Ferraro (1995) suggests that fear is an emotional response of dread or anxiety to crime or symbols that a person associates with crime. Clare (2012) views

it as an emotional reaction characterized by a sense of danger and anxiety produced by the threat of physical harm elicited by perceived cues in the environment which relate to some aspects of crime.

In this chapter however, fear or feeling of insecurity relates to how vulnerable a person feels in his/her environment at a particular period of time. This chapter therefore, examines studies on individual level characteristics, neighbourhood level characteristics, and urban centre level characteristics, and observe the ways in which they each may or may not have an effect on fear of crime. Before examining vulnerability factors which have been found to have an effect on fear of crime, it is important to examine the theory underpinning this chapter. This is discussed in the next section.

Predictors of Victimization

Vulnerability factors found to have an effect on fear of crime include previous victimization, disadvantage, disorder, and individual characteristics such as age, gender, and ethnicity. These influences can vary among the individuals, the neighbourhood, and the city or built environment at large.

Individual Predictors

It is prevalent in the literature that the fear of crime is more prevailing among the elderly and, for many crimes, this assumption holds true, such as in mugging and burglary cases. When it comes to crime types like rape, and sexual assaults, it has been found that younger people tend to be more fearful (Evans, 1995). Elderly people have a high fear level in relation to many crimes because they feel vulnerable. This vulnerability stems from the physical and social limitations that elderly people have which renders them unable to defend themselves or to seek support and help. However, research shows that the elderly are among the groups which are least likely to be victimized (Scarborough, Like, Novak, Lucas, & Alarid, 2010).

Clemente and Kleiman (1977) in their study of fear of crime in the United States find out that younger individuals are more likely to be victims of crime than are older people. They also conclude that the elderly are more fearful of crime but report that this finding is not

substantial, at least in their study. Accordingly, Keane (1992) conducts a study on concrete and formless fear. Concrete fear is fear associated with a specific crime like theft or assault. Keane asks how likely the respondents feel they are to become the victims of specific crimes in urban environment. Formless fear, on the other hand, is a general worry of crime in general. Questions measuring formless fear ask how safe one would feel walking alone in the neighbourhood after dark. The study finds out that younger individuals are more fearful of concrete fear like theft and assault. Alternatively, the elderly are more fearful of formless fear. They are more fearful of neighbourhood crime, particularly at night.

Badiora, Fadoyin and Omisore (2013) in their study of spatial pattern of crime and residents' fear and feeling of insecurity in Ile-Ife, Nigeria, find out that fear of crime increases as age increases. Scarborough et al. (2010) also find out that fear of crime increases as age increases. While Cockburn (2008) highlights elderly people as the most fearful in societies, while Cops and Pleysier (2011) acknowledge heighten fear among young people though, they report that the relationship between age and fear of crime is not positive in baseline models. The relationship becomes positive when they include attitudes and neighbourhood characteristics. They hypothesize that this finding that the environment is important when examining the relationship between age and fear of crime. Contrary to most literature, Pain (1997) finds out that elderly women are significantly less fearful than younger women. She also finds out that women whose age ranges between eighteen and thirty are more likely to be inhibited by these fears of crime than elderly women. Pain (1997) links this finding to the rationale that the elderly have less exposure to possible dangers than younger individuals which in turn makes them less fearful of crime. Overall, available literature has shown that the elderly are generally more fearful of crime even though they may not be the most at risk. The rationale behind this finding is that the elderly feel they are more vulnerable to crime. It is not necessarily that they believe they are at a higher risk; rather, they are less likely to be able to defend themselves (Clemente & Kleiman, 1977).

The answer to ethnic vulnerability to fear of crime, according to research findings, is not definitive. According to a research by Clemente and Kleiman (1977), Africans are the most fearful of crime. They are also the group most likely to be victimized by personal crimes. Clemente and

Kleiman (1977) find this in their study on fear of crime in the United States and the likelihood of victimization among ethnicity, age, and gender. They explain that this increased fear is due to the need Africans, particularly males, feel to protect themselves by owning guns and other weapons. Scarborough, et.al. (2010) find a significant positive relationship between blacks and fear of crime. However, they report that when neighbourhood characteristics and attitudes are included, the relationship between ethnicity and fear of crime switches direction and significance. They argue that this finding is due to the fact that tribe or ethnicity does not make individuals more fearful of crime by itself, rather, an interaction between ethnicity and environmental characteristics influences fear of crime. They also find out that there is no relationship between those of Hispanic origin and fear of crime. They further explain this finding by stating that African-Americans are overrepresented in disorganized communities compared to Hispanics and Whites. Therefore, the finding that the environment plays an important role between ethnicity and fear of crime is sensible (Scarborough et al., 2010).

Alternatively, Ortega and Myles (1987) find out that the relationship between ethnicity and fear of crime is insignificant. However, they did find a significant relationship between ethnicity and factors that relate to fear of crime; perceived victimization, and crime level. They discover that blacks are more likely to live in high-crime neighbourhoods, and that they perceive their risk of victimization to be lower than their white counterparts. Ortega and Myles (1987) report that this is largely due to the fact that black males are less likely to express fear. They rationalize this finding by stating that black males are either the primary individuals committing the crimes or they do not feel vulnerable because they can and do protect themselves. A third explanation for this finding is that black males may in reality be more fearful and perceive their risk of victimization to be higher. However, fear on the streets is seen as a weakness which can lead to dire consequences. Therefore, even though they are the most likely to be victimized, they are the least likely to be fearful or to express fear. Consistent with literature, it is not clear which racial/ethnic group is the most fearful of crime. As we have seen in Scarborough et al (2010), other factors such as previous victimization, neighbourhood characteristics, disorder, and city level characteristics can interact with individual characteristics such as ethnicity.

Unlike the findings regarding ethnicity and fear of crime, the findings on gender are more consistent. Previous research has generally found that women are the most fearful of crime. Vulnerability in crime studies has traditionally been associated with femininity and femaleness as well as with such notions as weakness, susceptibility to harm, violability and dependency (Gilson, 2016). In this sense, vulnerability is thought to connote an inherent weakness and unavoidable openness to sexual victimization for women (Gilson, 2016). Hence, Vulnerability is a highly feminized concept as evident in most crime literature. Females are found to worry more frequently than their male counterparts partly because (a) they feel less able to physically defend themselves, (b) they have lower perceived self-efficacy, (c) they have higher perceived negative impact, and (d) they see the likelihood of victimization as higher for themselves and for their social group. Several explanations have also been put forth to explain the above assertions. These include a focus on vulnerability (e.g., individuals who felt vulnerable to crime even if they were not vulnerable), and a focus on differences in groups (e.g., women were more afraid of crime than men, even though they were less likely to be victims). Thus, it should be considered that predictors of fear of crime should be more germane to understanding trends and patterns of fear of crime than mere categorization. Such fear of crime predictors include individual level predictors (i.e., sex, ethnicity, age, social class), contextual predictors (neighbourhood disorder, incivilities, and social cohesion), along with the consequences of fear of crime (psychological and behavioural).

Despite the argument put forth above, empirical studies have repeatedly found that women are more fearful of crime than men. The works of Lee (2007); Okorodudu (2010), and Sheared (2011) establish the fact that women are more fearful than men. Badiora, Popoola, and Fadoyin (2014) examine gender differences in crime perception, feeling of safety, and the use of precautionary measures among the residents of Nigerian Traditional Yoruba City. Systematic sampling method was used to obtain data for this study. It was revealed that women were more fearful than men walking alone in the dark as the odds of a woman feeling unsafe walking alone after dark were approximately 4(3.61) times higher than that of a man. In separate studies, Crowell and Burgess (1996) notes that women are ten times more likely to be sexually assaulted than men,

while Allens (2006) reports that in 2004 and 2005, 4% more women had a higher level of fear about burglary than men. In the same vein, Ramsay (1989) also claims that while 71% of women are fearful of being mugged in Coventry, only 47% of men share this anxiety. Ramos and Andrade-Palos (1993) also find gender to be the clearest predictor for fear of victimisation.

Ferraro (1995) introduces a concept known as the shadow of sexual assault to explain female fear. Women are undoubtedly fearful of being raped or sexually assaulted, but Ferraro believes that they are more fearful of other offences as a consequence of fear of being raped or sexually assaulted. For example, women may be more fearful of being burgled whilst at home than men, because the incident may also include a sexual attack. Rape is a high profile offence which attracts extensive media coverage. Ferraro believes that this can have a shadowing effect on women's perceptions of other types of crime. Women do not simply become aware of this fear one day, nor are they born with it; women are socialised into thinking that they are vulnerable to attack if they, for example, go out alone at night. Parents, peers, and the media emphasise and reinforce this fear, and women are expected to succumb to it. Ferraro (1995) concludes that when hoping to reduce fear of crime among women, reducing the fear of rape must be a priority. However, few exceptions to this trend have been identified. For instance, younger men are more fearful of car-related theft (Williams, 2004).

Many studies have examined whether or not past experiences with crime and criminals have any effect on the level of fear that a person holds. In studying the effects of crime on college students, Dull and Wint (1997) find out that those students who had been victims of crime had less fear of personal crime, but more fear of property crime, than those not victimised. The Angus Reid Report (1997) establishes that while 19% of non-victims express a great or fair amount of fear of being victims of crime, 30% of victims express this fear. Certain crimes generate more fear for victims than others. Being a victim of a robbery, for example, generates a high level of fear because it contains elements that cause a greater amount of fear to be instilled in its victims. Robbery usually involves a stranger, weapons, physical assaults, and the loss of a fair amount of money (Skogan & Klecka, 1997). Burglary, because of its invasion of privacy and substantial amount of loss, generates a high level

of fear. The victims who express the most fear of walking alone in their neighborhood after dark are victims of sexual assaults. Next to this were victims of robbery, break and enter assaults, vandalism, motor vehicle theft, household theft, and personal theft (CCJS, March 1995). Victimization can have differing impacts on fear, depending on the type of crime. Spratt and Doob also show that the highest level of fear for victims and non-victims were found in cases of break and enter with the victims at home (Spratt & Doob, 1997). In addition, these authors reported that the higher the fear of crime (amongst victim and non-victim respondents) tended to be, the more punitive they were towards offenders. Furthermore, as fear of crime increases, the more the police and courts are evaluated in negative terms.

Ferraro (1995) feels that (perceived) risk plays a significant role in evoking fear, and highlights that in studies which include risk or perceived risk, perceived risk is influential in explaining fear of crime; suggesting that any scientific approach to the subject of fear of crime should give explicit attention to the risk interpretation process (Ferraro, 1995). Terms such as fear, worry, and anxiety are often used interchangeably in literature minimizing the subtle differences between them. Ferraro (1995) defines risk as anything which involves exposure to the chance of loss or injury. Perceived risk, defined by DuBow et al (1979) as people's assessments of crime rates and the probability of victimization, represents an element of fear of crime which has evaded many studies (Liska et al, 1988). In a study involving London taxi drivers by Mourato et al (2004, cited in Vanderveen, 2006) it emerged that a third of the drivers cited fear of crime as the most pressing issue affecting their jobs (58% were most concerned by traffic congestion). This is supported by Crawford (1998) that crime is one of the principal anxieties shared by the public, second only to unemployment. Jackson (2006: 261) recommends that future research should examine emotion and the psychology of risk. It has emerged that an individual's perceived risk may be significantly lower than their level of fear. Despite this, many studies fail to differentiate between the concepts. Equally, a person may judge their own risk to be high but may not necessarily be afraid (Ferraro, 1995).

Social class variables are not as prominent as the ones listed above, but their effects are still worth noting. Factors such as low income levels

(Evans, 1995; Silverman & Kennedy, 1983), and low educational levels (Evans, 1995) tend to increase levels of fear and feeling of safety. Ramsays (1989) offers an insight into social class as a predictor of fear. Although members of the less-skilled/unskilled socio-economic groups interviewed had similar rates of victimization to the professional/managerial groups interviewed, the former groups were significantly more fearful of being insulted and mugged (Ramsay, 1989). An explanation for this could be that the less skilled/unskilled individuals felt more vulnerable as they were more frequently exposed to dangerous environments and deviant people (neighborhoods, work locations). Nevertheless, both groups shared high levels of fear, well above the actual rates of victimization, particularly for more serious offences. The BCS (2001) also suggests that those who are less affluent, live in social housing and those employed in unskilled occupations are more likely to be concerned about crime (Hancock, cited in Muncie and Wilson, 2004). Furthermore, BCS (2004 & 2005) findings reveal that fewer individuals with good educational qualifications worry about violent crimes than those with no qualifications.

Keane (1992) finds out that those with a higher income and education were significantly more fearful of property crimes than those with lower incomes and education. Rountree (1998) asserts that wealthier individuals were less fearful and their odds of being victimized decreased as their income increased. Those with lower incomes and less education were more fearful of their neighborhoods than their richer counterparts. This finding could be because those who are better off live in safer neighborhoods. Therefore, those that live in poorer neighborhoods may perceive disorder at a higher level than those that do not (Rountree, 1998). In relation to marital status, less research is found compared to other demographic characteristics. Some have found that marital status is a significant predictor of fear of crime (Keane, 1992). Keane reveals that the only marital status that has a significant relationship with fear of crime is being single. Single individuals are more fearful of assault than those that are married. Other studies have found that marital status is not a significant predictor of fear of crime (Gainey et al., 2010).

Neighborhood Level Predictors

The prominent of all neighborhood characteristics is disorder. In his book on disorder and decline, Skogan (1990) differentiates between two types of disorder: visible social disorder and physical decay. Visible social disorder is the behavioural evidence of disorganization in a community. Common social disorder can include: public drinking, corner gangs, street harassment, drugs, noisy neighbours, commercial sex or prostitution, and the visibility of the homeless and the mentally ill. Physical decay, on the other hand, is a daily aspect of an environment. Skogan (1990) states that these aspects can be both legal and illegal. Among the most common forms of physical decay are: vandalism, dilapidation and abandonment, and trash strewn about the neighborhood.

Badiora, Fadoyin and Omisore (2013) establish that the pattern of fear observed in Ile-Ife is a reverse of the pattern of residential crime magnitude and average crime experienced among the four residential areas identified. That is, the area with the highest disorder also have highest crime and highest fear level. Adigun (2012) reveal that the feeling of insecurity is at the lowest ebb in the high density residential areas of Ibadan where the highest crime rate was recorded, while the low density areas had a greater level of fear of events associated with crime. Afon (2001) asserts that all categories of crime investigated occurred in high density areas of Ilorin. Nonetheless, some crimes are peculiar to certain densities. This was attributed to varying socio-economic attributes as well as the space and environmental characteristics of the residential areas in Ilorin. Badiora, Fadoyin and Omisore (2013) establish that the feeling of insecurity was exceptionally high in the area affected by communal crisis in Ile-Ife. In addition, fear was on the decrease as distance increases from the high income residential areas to the traditional town center of Ile-Ife. Adigun (2012) reveals that the feeling of insecurity is at the lowest ebb in the high density residential areas of Ibadan where the highest crime rate was recorded while the low density areas had a greater level of fear of events associated with crime

In an article in the *Atlantic Monthly*, Wilson and Kelling (1982) share their theory on disorder and crime. They state that if a window is broken, left unattended, and never fixed, it will give the perception that no one cares. This perception, then, invites decay and crime. Criminals, transients, and the like will move in and take over because it is clear that

the social forces that control and police the neighborhood are no longer present or no longer care. They further hypothesize that disorder leads to fear which leads to physical and social withdrawal. The withdrawal then leads to increased predatory behaviour which in turn leads to increased crime. The cycle ends with a spiral of decline in the community. They argue that using order maintenance along with other means of crime control such as incarceration, police presence, and environmental design can reduce the level of disorder and crime in communities (Kelling & Bratton, 1998). In their broken windows metaphor to crime and decay, they stated that disorder leads to fear. This theory does not state that disorder is the culprit in criminal activity. Disorder is not the issue in itself. Rather, disorder produces a feeling and/or a mood that can evoke fear. Furthermore, disorder can give the illusion or the idea that violence and inappropriate behaviour are both permitted and or ignored in these areas.

Skogan (1990) finds out in his research on disorder that residents of neighborhoods that had social and physical signs of disorder were fearful of going out into the community. He interviewed residents of 40 communities. In each community, around 325 citizens took part in the study. The questions asked were about the levels of disorder in the community. These questions included questions regarding social and physical signs of disorder. He found that physical and social forms of disorder correlate strongly with each other. He also found that they were most prominent in areas characterized as poor, unstable, and most commonly referred to as minority areas. He stated that they were also tied to the amount of cohesion the neighborhood possessed. Skogan (1990) describes the neighborhoods as having many abandoned buildings with rubble strewn over the streets and parking lots, vacant lots, cheap stores, and an abundance of bars. The residents were frightened by the gangs of juveniles that hung out on street corners. Often, they would harass citizens as they walked by. They were also frightened by the homeless and transients. The old abandoned buildings were believed to harbour drug addicts and were seen as encouraging criminal activities. The general conception is that white middle-class individuals are the citizens that are most concerned with disorder. The neighborhood that people reside affects how they perceive and react to disorder. Therefore, where disorder is most prominent, in low income areas of cities, the individuals might not take as much notice of it or see it as a problem.

Skogan (1990) however, finds the opposite to be true. He finds out that racial minorities reported the most significant disorder problems. He also finds out that, contrary to most research outcomes, the elderly residents reported less physical disorder in areas they lived in compared with younger residents that lived in the same area. The level of disorder reported by residents directly impacts their fear of crime. Hence, those that reported higher levels of disorder in their neighborhood should experience higher levels of fear of crime. In this case it seems that the younger individuals are the ones with the highest level of fear of crime.

Interestingly, Kohm (2009) finds out the same occurrence when he conducted surveys of a neighborhood known as "Spence" in Winnipeg, Canada. This neighborhood is in close proximity to the downtown area of Winnipeg. It is a lower income neighborhood that is more dependent on government transfer payments. It comprises residents with lower levels of education and those less likely to own their homes, and has great ethnic diversity. Kohm administered two face-to-face yearly neighborhood surveys to 394 residents of Spence. The residents were asked questions about the neighborhood, their perceived risk of victimization, prior victimization, fear of crime, and specific experiences with disorder in the neighborhood. The researchers then asked the residents to identify, on a map of the neighborhood, places that made them feel unsafe. They also asked the residents to compare their neighborhood to other neighborhoods and give an estimate of their neighborhood's crime rate. Over half of the respondents felt that their neighborhood had higher levels of crime compared to other neighborhoods. Overall, residents of Spence based their level of fear on disorder in the community. Social forms of disorder were the most commonly cited type of disorder by the residents. The residents reported public drinking, panhandling, and transients sleeping on the street as the type of disorder that evoked the most fear. The second most fear evoking behaviour was prostitution and drug dealing. The third most fear evoking behaviour was gang activity. Physical signs of decay were the least fear evoking type of disorder. Only fifty-six residents cited this type of disorder as fear evoking (Kohm, 2009). Franklin, Franklin, & Fearn (2008) also find neighborhood disorder (presence of gangs, noise, and traffic problems) to be the strongest predictor of fear. Gainey et al. (2010) in their study of 628 phone interviews of a medium southwestern city also find disorder to be a significant predictor of fear. Becoming

fearful of a neighborhood characterized by disorder is not an irrational response; Skogan (1990) finds out that levels of crime are strongly related to levels of disorder.

Skogan found that disorder has a detrimental impact on housing and, as a result, can sometimes make it unstable. Residents who can afford to move out of the neighborhood do so, and this leads to more abandoned houses. With vacant houses scattered about the neighborhood, it makes it difficult for the neighbourhood to attract any commercial businesses. He defines a stable neighborhood as one where the same number of residents moves in and moves out. Shaw and McKay (1942) find out, along with other Chicago school theorists, that social disorganization occurs in a community when there is high residential turnover. Financially stable or affluent residents choose to move to more desirable communities leaving the poorer communities with higher crime rates which lead to residential instability. Using 2,534 census tracts in thirteen cities, Hipp (2010) conducts a study on whether a neighborhood's structural characteristics affect crime rates or if crime rates affect the neighborhood's structural characteristics ten years later. Hipp found that neighborhoods in 1990 (the start of the study) with higher levels of disadvantage experienced higher levels of violent crime and property crime in 2000. He reported that violent crime seems to have higher levels of disadvantage ten years later but property crime does not. In relation to the ethnic/racial composition of neighborhoods, he did not find any evidence that neighborhoods with a higher level of African-Americans had a higher crime rate. On the contrary, he did find that neighborhoods with more African-Americans had lower crime rates ten years later. In relation to the amount of racial/ethnic heterogeneity, he found that neighborhoods with a greater amount of heterogeneity had an increased violent crime rate ten years later. Overall, Hipp found that neighborhoods with more concentrated disadvantaged people had higher crime rates, and neighborhoods with high crime rates had high levels of disadvantage. He also found that neighborhoods characterized by disadvantage had a lower number of retail businesses but a higher number of bars and liquor stores. Hipp also discovered that neighborhoods with more residential instability did not have increase in crime rate ten years later.

This is inconsistent with the social disorganization theory and prior research findings. Taylor and Covington (1993) sample sixty-six neighborhoods in Baltimore, Maryland, where they conducted interviews with the head of each household. In addition, twenty percent of the blocks the respondents lived in were measured to determine the amount of physical decay. They found that neighborhoods that experienced unexpected change in age and racial composition over ten years expressed higher levels of fear. They reported that the concentration of minorities in certain areas has only increased segregation. They stated that the problem was not that minorities are more prone to crime, but that they have fewer resources than others. The decreased amount of resources can lead to physical and social problems. These problems, Taylor and Covington reported, may be the reason that fear was increased. Skogan reported that there are a number of things that could cause a spiral downfall of neighborhoods. These include landowners and mortgage institutions failing to keep up housing, and highways constructed to run through neighborhoods. Real-estate agents have been known to scare whites out of neighborhoods, forcing them to sell their houses for less than they are worth, and then selling them at exorbitant prices to minorities. The folding up of factories has also led to despair among residents who moved to the city to begin work at the factories. This leaves inner city residents with little opportunity for work and adequate housing. With factories being closed and businesses leaving, it leaves old abandoned buildings all around the neighborhood (Skogan, 1986). These abandoned buildings and deteriorating conditions of the inner-city neighborhoods lead to fear of crime as reported by Wilson and Kelling (1982). While the research is mixed on the connection between residential stability, racial heterogeneity, and crime rates, it is clear that these ecological changes in inner city neighborhoods are not positive changes. Regardless of the causes, instability in neighborhoods, physical and social decay, and social isolation jointly lead to fear of crime.

City Level Predictors

Research efforts on city level predictors of crime are quite scarce. Consequently, there are a few city-level predictors of crime that have not been discussed. Measures of disadvantage such as overpopulation, unemployment and the number of female-headed households may certainly have a significant effect on fear of crime within cities. It is plausible that cities containing higher amounts of unemployment,

poverty, and female-headed households are more fearful of crime. Like (2011), in a study on urban inequality and violent victimization, finds that blacks were more likely to be victims of violent victimization in higher segregated cities. Like also finds out that residential instability and disadvantage was positively associated with blacks' risk of violent victimization. She reports that the relationship between these factors may be that blacks in highly segregated cities are more likely to be found in disadvantaged areas where there is an increased risk of victimization.

Using regional analysis, Hung and Nguyen (2002) give an account of differences between cities at the individual country level when crime profile for four different regions in Canada was examined. The study finds out that cities in the Atlantic and Prairie regions have slightly above average minor and violent crimes while cities in the Quebec region have low minor crimes, average violent crimes, and slightly above average major property crimes. The city-size effect of crime rate was further established by Hung and Nguyen to the extent that violent crimes are higher in towns (<10,000 inhabitants) than in larger cities. However, property crime rates were highest in large cities (>10,000 inhabitants) and second highest in medium cities (50,000-100,000 inhabitants). It is also important to note that factors such as ethnic inequality, specifically segregation between majority and minority groups, as well as socio-economic status within cities, affect city-level fear of crime and disorder.

Discussion

It is evident that the fear of crime and the predictors of victimization in the built environment is a complex phenomenon. While some studies show that age is a significant predictor of fear of crime, some studies show that age is not a significant predictor of fear of crime at the neighbourhood level. On the other hand, some found that age, when considered alone, was not a significant predictor of fear of crime. However, when neighbourhood context was taken into account in some studies, age became a significant predictor of fear of crime. Age, however, is shown to be a significant predictor of fear of crime at the city level. The results show that age is positively related to fear of crime, with older respondents being more fearful of city crimes. However, the disparate results in the literature between neighbourhood and age could have contributed to the rationale that the elderly might feel safer in their

neighbourhoods compared to their cities. Gender is shown to be a significant predictor of fear of crime. The gender that is more fearful of crime varies, and these fears are between fear of neighbourhood and fear of city crimes. Males were found to be more fearful of crime in their neighbourhoods while females were found to be more fearful of crime in their cities. The contradictory results of fear of neighbourhood crime could be due to the types of neighbourhoods. Males might be more fearful in that they might be involved in riskier behaviours in their neighbourhoods compared to females. They might also take on the role of the protector which could incite fear. It stands to reason that females would be more fearful of crime in their cities compared to their neighbourhoods. Their neighbourhoods are more familiar places than their cities. Unfamiliar locations could incite fear with females because they may feel more vulnerable to crime in such locations.

It is deducible that ethnicity/race may be a significant predictor of fear of crime in the neighbourhood and city when only individual, and neighbourhood characteristics are considered. For instance, it was evidence that indigenes (in Nigerian Studies) or Whites are more fearful of crime in their neighbourhoods while non-indigenes (in Nigerian studies) or blacks are more fearful of crime at the urban level. In both Nigerian and Western cities, ethnicity/Race, however, is not a significant predictor of fear of crime when measures of structural and economic disadvantaged areas are considered. Studies have found out that race alone was a predictor of fear of crime but when neighbourhood context and attitudes were included, the relationship became insignificant. It appears that race is a predictor of fear of crime but the relationship is limited. When other factors are considered, the significance between race and fear of crime decreases. Therefore, ethnicity and its effects on fear of crime cannot be absolutely defined given the difference in the relationships to fear on the neighbourhood and urban levels.

Marital status, educational attainment, and prior victimization are significant predictors of fear of crime. Marital status is mainly a predictor of fear of city crime. While some findings show that married people are more likely to be afraid of crime in their towns, other findings are somewhat contrary as they reported that single individuals are more fearful of assault. It is assumed that married individuals may be more fearful of crime in their cities because they are not as familiar or

integrated with their cities as they are with their neighbourhoods. Neighbourhood context must also be taken into account. The neighbourhood the individual comes from could certainly affect the way the individual perceives fear at the city level. Marital status may not matter as it relates to neighbourhood context in that, individuals may be well integrated and familiar with their neighbourhoods. Therefore, living alone or being alone would not matter as much in the neighbourhood context as it does in the urban context. Furthermore, single individuals might have greater exposure in the city than those of married people. As a result of this, they might not perceive their risk of victimization to be high because they are more familiar with their cities.

Researches have shown that education level is only a significant predictor of fear of urban crime. People who have attained higher education are less fearful of crime in their cities. Similarly, victimization is a significant predictor of fear of crime. Nonetheless, the literature on previous victimization is mixed. Some report that it does have an effect on fear of crime while others report that it does not. Those who have been victimized (violent or property) are less fearful of crime in their neighbourhoods than those who have not been previously victimized. On the other hand, those that were previous victims (violent or property) were more fearful of crime in their cities than those who were not victimized. Previous victims of crime in their neighbourhoods may be desensitized or might have become accustomed to crime in their neighbourhoods. Thus, it is not something that would contribute to their fear because it has happened to them before. Alternatively, because these individuals may not be as integrated in their cities as they are in their neighbourhoods, their previous victimization experiences might bring on anxiety of being re-victimized and fear of crime in general.

Neighbourhood disorder is a significant predictor of fear of crime, but its impact is different across neighbourhood fear and city fear. While some findings have shown that disorder is negatively related to fear of neighbourhood crimes, but positively related to fear of city crimes, others have shown neighbourhood disorder to have a positive relationship to fear of crime with higher levels of disorder producing fear of crime. The difference in these studies could be related to the types of neighbourhoods considered. Respondents within those neighbourhoods could be used to the types of physical and social disorder in their

neighbourhoods and therefore their fear of crime there decreases. Individuals are desensitized to their environment the longer they live in that environment. Supposed a person lives in a home in a disorderly neighbourhood for some five to ten years, the neighbourhood would not look as bad to the person that has lived there for so long. Conversely, someone who did not live in that neighbourhood may perceive that neighbourhood as much more disorderly than the person that has lived there for years. The same reasoning can be applied as to disorder at the city level. Individuals may not frequent their cities often; as a result any type of disorder that is present may seem more conspicuous because they are not accustomed to seeing disorder. Furthermore, studies have shown that all of the measures of disadvantage are significant predictors of fear of crime. Findings, as shown in the available literature, reveal that as all of the measures of economic disadvantage (unemployment, poverty, overpopulation) rise, so does fear of crime in the city. Structural disadvantage is also a significant predictor of fear of crime with levels of ethnic and racial segregation within the urban centres impacting the fear of crime.

Conclusion and Recommendations

It is evident that vulnerability is not so much the individual characteristic, but more so the contextual characteristic that has the largest impact on fear of crime. This chapter has shown that individual characteristics alone are limited in explaining the vulnerability relationship with the fear of crime. Many people fear different spaces at different times and these fears are expressed in different behavioural patterns. These include men as well as women, young people as well as older people and people of diverse ethnicity and tribes. Women are still acknowledged as experiencing a high level of fear of crime, largely because of fear of sexual violence, but men's low fear and the nature of the relation of different masculinities to fear of crime are being questioned. With the exception of much excluded groups, older people suffer the consequences of fear less than was once thought, and younger people are increasingly recognised as more at risk from victimisation and fear while the fear of crime of people of colour is partly structured by racism, racist violence and harassment. Thus, it is inappropriate to deal with the vulnerable simply as descriptive categories in the analysis of the fear of crime. Rather, in each case, fear of crime (and the crimes feared)

is often structured by individual, neighbourhood, and city characteristics, as this Chapter has outlined. When gender and age, for instance, were viewed as neighbourhood relations, they begin to explain who is most affected by fear, and where. Central to this argument is the consideration of ways in which these and other social identity intersections are not enough, alone, to predict people's position in relation to fear. Some of these intersections have been illustrated. This framework helps to get beyond some of the dichotomised thinking around 'feared-fearful' which has influenced so much literature on the fear of crime.

Equally, the particularities of place are a further axis of differentiation and are helpful in constructing a more diverse and realistic account of the fear of crime of the vulnerable groups. Place affects fear in the city at a number of scales. For example, this happens under the micro-scale environmental features; the avoidance of neighbourhoods or city centres perceived as dangerous at certain times; and the influence of local constructions of identities such as masculinity, femininity, and age. This chapter has hinted at the social construction of different discourses of fear and the fact that these discourses have been widely employed for political ends. However, it has also shown that fear of crime has tangible and serious effects on social interaction, use of space, and the quality of life especially among those who experience some level of exclusion from mainstream social spaces, amongst whom fear is often a reaction to significant risks of violence and crime.

These findings give optimism to policy makers for the reason that it is the contextual and environmental, and not individual factors that can be changed. Next policy implication would be to educate the public on the reality and prevalence of crimes in the built environment. When citizens understand that their likelihood of becoming victims of crime is not as likely as they once believed, it will hopefully decrease some of the consequences of fear of crime. Education of members of the public on crime would lead to more informed political decisions that are based on facts rather than fears. Policy makers, law enforcement officials, and town planners should spend resources and time on the predictors of fear of crime such as poverty, unemployment, neighbourhood disorder, among others. For instance, if the police were concerned with protecting citizens they needed to be concerned with the fear of crime as well. The best way to do this is to work on decreasing the amount of social and

physical disorder within a community. If law enforcement is partnered in partnership with communities to educate the public on crimes and victimization, with resources deployed appropriately and programmes developed to provide education for the people along with job creation opportunities, fear of crime and crime rates would decrease. Time and energy spent working on troubled and disadvantaged areas, may not only decrease fear of crime but also decrease crime in itself. Things like neighbourhood watch, environmental sanitation days, and community policing could certainly decrease fear of crime. With fear of crime decreasing, citizens would be more eager to venture into more productive activities. Urban safety administrators who implement safety plans should integrate vulnerable population's needs for safety in the design of built environment infrastructures such as mass transit infrastructures, public/open spaces, and recreational areas. Some vulnerable groups such as the elderly, those with physical disabilities, and the mentally challenged who are particularly vulnerable must be considered in the design and distribution of urban facilities, infrastructure, and land uses in order to reduce the chances of their victimization which in turn will reduce their fear of crime and feeling of vulnerability. There is an indication that reducing the level of neighbourhood disorders might have a positive effect on the level of perceived safety. Therefore, enforcement of the provisions of CPTED, 'secured by design', especially the aspects which address vulnerability, must be encouraged to make neighbourhood and urban centres (living, commuting areas, and working areas) safer for residents.

References

- Abegunde, A, Badiora, A & Ntamark, J. J. (2015). Criminality in Public Places in Urban Communities: Examining Crime Incidences around Transit Stop Stations in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Journal of Environmental Design and Management* 7(2): 41 – 50.
- Abodunrin, F.O. (2004). Spatio-Temporal Variation and Residents Response to Crime in Ogbomosho. M.Tech, Dissertation Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology.
- Adigun, F. O (2013). Residential Differentials in Incidence and Fear of Crime Perception in Ibadan. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences Vol.3, No.10, pp. 96-104.*
- Adigun, F. O. (2012). Spatio-temporal Analysis of Urban Crime in Selected Nigerian Cities. Ph.D thesis, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomosho.
- Afon, A.O (2001). Residents' Diversity Factor in the Perception of and Response to Fear of Crime in Nigeria. Paper presented at the International Conference on Security, Segregation and Social Networks in West Africa Cities 19th- 20thcenturies, held at the International Centre for African Studies (IFRA) University of Ibadan.
- Austin M., Furr A., Spine, M. (2002). The effects of neighbourhood conditions on perceptions of safety. *Journal Criminal Justice* 30(1):417-427.
- Badiora A, Fadoyin O and Omisore E (2013): Spatial Analysis of Residents' Fear and Feeling of Insecurity in Ile-Ife, Nigeria. *Ethiopian Journal of Environmental Studies and Management*, 6 (3): 317-323.
- Badiora A.I, Popoola K & Fadoyin P (2014). Gender Differences in Risk Perception and Precautionary Behavior among the Residents of Yoruba Traditional City. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, 9 (1): 143-153.
- Badiora, A. I. & Ntamark, J. J. (2016). Fear on the Streets: The Vulnerable and their Self-Protective behaviours in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Lagos Journal of Environmental Studies*, 8 (2): 111-122.
- Chadee, D. (2003) Fear of crime and risk of victimization: An ethnic comparison. *Social and Economic Studies*, 52 (1), 73-97

- Clare K. (2012) Re-locating Fear on the Streets: Homelessness, Victimization and Fear of Crime. *European Journal of Homelessness Volume 6, No. 2, pp. 121-136*
- Clemente, F., & Kleiman, M.B. (1977). Fear of crime in the United States: A multivariate analysis. *Social Forces*, 56 (2), 519-531
- Ferraro, K.F. (1995) *Fear of Crime: Interpreting Victimization Risk*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Franklin, T. W., Franklin, C.A., & Fearn, N.E. (2008). A multilevel analysis of the vulnerability, disorder, and social integration models of fear of crime. *Social Justice Research*, 21 (2), 204-227
- Frederickson, N.Ø, S.V. Breau and A. Glad, 2015, Fokus På Sårbare Familier i Udsatte Boligområder: En Kortlægning AF Problemstillinger OG Indsatser. (Center for Boligsocial Udvikling, Hvidovre).
- Gainey, R., Alper, M., & Chappell, A.T. (2010). Fear of crime revisited: Examining the direct and indirect effects of disorder, risk perception, and social capital. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36 (2), 120-137
- Garland, D. (1996) The Limits of the Sovereign State: Strategies of crime control in contemporary society, *The British Journal of Criminology* 36(4): pp.44571
- Garofalo, J. (1973). The fear of crime: Causes and consequences. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 72 (2), 839-857.
- Gilson, E. C. (2016) Vulnerability and Victimization: Rethinking Key Concepts in Feminist Discourses on Sexual Violence. *Signs Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 42(1):71-98. Available online at <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086/686753>
- Hale, C. (1996) Fear of Crime: A Review of the Literature, *International Review of Victimology* 4(2) pp.79-150.
- Hipp, J.R. (2010). A dynamic view of neighborhoods: The reciprocal relationship between crime and neighborhood structural characteristics. *Social Problems*, 57 (2), 205-230
- Keane, C. (1992). Fear of crime in Canada: An examination of concrete and formless fear of victimization. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 34(2), 215-224

- Kelling, G.L., & Bratton, W.J. (1998). Declining crime rates: Insiders' views of the New York City story. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 88 (4), 1217-1231
- Kohm, S.A. (2009). Spatial dimensions of fear in a high-crime community: Fear of crime or fear of disorder? *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 51 (1), 1-30
- LaGrange, R.L., & Ferraro, K.F. (1989). Assessing age and gender differences in perceived risk and fear of crime. *Criminology*, 27 (4), 697-719
- Larsen, S.B., M.F. Madsen & N. Avlund, (2015). På Vej Frem: En Analyse Af Uddannelsesmønstret for Unge i Udsatte Boligområder. (Center for Boligsocial Udvikling, Hvidovre).
- Lee, M. (2007) *Inventing Fear of Crime: Criminology and the Politics of Anxiety* (Devon: Willan).
- Like, T.Z. (2011). Urban inequality and racial differences in risk for violent victimization. *Crime & Delinquency*, 57 (3), 432-457
- Liska A.E., Lawrence J.J., & Sanchirico, A. (1982). Crime as a social fact. *Social Forces*, 60 (3), 760-770.
- Liska, A.E., & Baccaglini, W. (1990). Feeling safe by comparison: Crime in the newspapers. *Social Problems*, 37 (3), 360-374
- Ortega, S.T., & Myles, J.L. (1987). Ethnicity and gender effects on fear of crime: An interactive model with age. *Criminology* 25 (1), 133-152
- Pain, R.H. (1997). Social geographies of women's fear of crime. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series*, 22 (2), 231-244
- Pantazis, C. (2000) 'Fear of Crime', Vulnerability and Poverty. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 40(3) 1:414-436, Available online at <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/40.3.414>
- Perloff, L. S. (1983). Perceptions of Vulnerability to Victimization. *Journal of Social Issues* Volume 39(2) 41-61
- Rountree, P.W. (1998). A reexamination of the crime- fear linkage. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 35 (3), 341-372
- Scarborough, B.K., Like-Haislip, T.Z., Novak, K.J., Lucas, W.L., & Alarid, L.F. (2010). Assessing the relationship between individual characteristics, neighborhood context, and fear of crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 819-826
- Shaw, C., & McKay, H.D. (1942). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Sigurd, F.M.; and Madsen, M.F. 2011. Kriminaliteten Ud Af Boligområderne. Effekten Af Boligsociale Helhedsplaners Arbejde Med Kriminelle Og Kriminalitetstruede Børn Og Unge. (Center for Boligsocial Udvikling, Hvidovre).
- Sigurd, F.M., Christensen, K.O., Madsen, M.F. and Leer, K. 2011. Boligsociale Beskæftigelsesindsatser. Effektmåling Af Boligsociale Beskæftigelsesindsatser i Udsatte Boligområder i Danmark. (Center for Boligsocial udvikling, Hvidovre).
- Skogan, W. G. (1990). Disorder and decline: Crime and the spiral of decay in American Neighborhoods, Los Angeles: University of California Press
- Skogan, W.G. (1986). Fear of crime and neighborhood change. *Crime and Justice*, 8, 203-229
- Taylor, R.B. & Covington, J. (1993). Community structural change and fear of crime. *Social Problems*, 40 (3), 374-397
- Wanner, R.A., & Caputo, T.C. (1987). Punitiveness, fear of crime, and perceptions of violence. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 12 (4), 331-344
- Warr, M. (2000). Fear of crime in the United States: Avenues for research and policy. *Criminal Justice*, 4, 451-489.
- WHO (2002): Environmental health in emergencies and disasters: A Practical Guide
- Wilson, J.Q., & Kelling, G. (1982, March). Broken windows. *Atlantic*, 29-38.