



LUND
UNIVERSITY

Institution of Psychology

Who Do You Fear?

A Study in Fear of Crime and Risk Perception in Context of
the Relationship Between Victim and Perpetrator

Allis Andersson,

Sara Norring

Master thesis, fall 2013

Supervisor: Åse Innes-Ker

Abstract

The current study aims to clarify the relationship between fear of crime and risk perception, age, gender, direct victimization and indirect victimization. The study also aims to explore how the relationship between victim and perpetrator affect the victim's fear of crime and risk perception. A survey concerning fear of crime, risk perception, known/unknown perpetrator and earlier victimization was answered by 588 respondents, 397 females and 172 males. The survey was created by the authors of the current study. It was written in Swedish, and emailed to psychology students at the local university. Age and risk perception were significant predictors to fear of crime, which is in line with previous research. The relationship between victim and perpetrator was explored in relation to different crime types, age, gender and earlier victimization.

Keywords: fear of crime, risk perception, known perpetrator, unknown perpetrators, direct victimization, indirect victimization, media.

During the riots in Rosengård, Malmö 2011, a sense of fear of crime and unsafety arose from the violence in the neighborhood (Aftonbladet, 2011). But what does it mean to fear crime? Is it a state of mind that is always present or is it something we feel in certain situations? Is fear the same as worry or feeling unsafe? What about the perception of risk of being victimized? Is the apprehension of a risk the same as fearing said risk or are we more afraid the greater we perceive the risk? Fear of crime may sound straightforward but in reality the concept of fear is much more complicated. Most researchers have agreed on that fear is an emotion (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987; Ferraro, 1995; Warr, 2000; Hough, 2004; Jackson, 2005) but that does little to simplify the concept. Emotions can be hard to specify and there are often more factors involved. Some of the factors believed to affect fear of crime are age and gender. Another notion is that risk perception, which is believed to be a cognitive state, is a crucial part of fear of crime. Still, research is inconsistent in how age, gender and risk perception affects fear of crime. Another angle of fear of crime is the area of earlier victimization, where the research shows inconsistencies. Little research has been conducted on how the relationship between victim and perpetrator, if the perpetrator is known or unknown to the victim, affect the victim's fear of crime. Most research in that field concentrates on sexual assault crimes and little or none have included other types of crime. In the present study we will try to contribute to the understanding of fear of crime and risk perception. We will also look at how the relationship between victim and perpetrator affects the victim's fear of crime and risk perception and if that is affected by different crime types, age, gender and earlier victimization.

The following section will describe previous research on fear of crime through the years and some of the variables that is said to affect fear of crime. The last part of the introduction will address why it is important to measure fear of crime in consideration to when the perpetrator is known or unknown to the victim.

Fear of Crime

Fear activates physiological changes in the body that alert a person to possible danger. Ferraro and LaGrange (1987) states that "the concept of fear is limited to the emotional reaction arising from crime, or symbols that a person associates with crime, to others and to one's self" (p71). Ferraro (1995) defines fear of crime as "an emotional response of dread or anxiety to crime or symbols that a person associates with crime" (p23).

Hough (2004) discuss the fact that "fear of crime" is a misleading concept. He thinks that people use words as "fear", "concern" and "worry" as if they are synonyms, which they are not. The only thing they have in common is that they are mental events, emotions with physiological affiliations. These mental events can be counted and dated, at least in principle, since most people can bring back some memory of when they have been afraid, even though they have to go back to their childhood memories. Hough states that many mental events of this type are impossible to quantify and count which depends on both definitional problems but also due to the nature of the processes. This type of mental events is better treated as states rather than events. Hough also argues that when talking about mental states such as anxiety or worry, the focus should be on intensity, not frequency. However, fearfulness is a mental event and therefore fearfulness and anxiety cannot be treated as synonyms (Hough, 2004).

Risk perception of crime means that a person assesses the possibility and likelihood of being victim of a crime (Hicks & Brown, 2013). Warr (2000) defines fear as "an emotion, a feeling of alarm or dread caused by an awareness or expectation of danger". Custers and Van den Bulck (2011) argues that fear and risk perception are two separate concepts. Fear is an emotional reaction, while risk perception is a cognitive response. Also, fear is not a one-dimensional concept.

When measuring fear it is difficult to know in what way fear, as an emotion, should be handled. Jackson (2005) argues that one of the problems when measuring fear of crime is that standard measurement is a summary of the intensity of the respondents' feelings. That is, according to Jackson, very hard for the respondent to do, since emotions are often short-lived. Nowadays a new way of measuring fear is arising, namely frequency questions. When asked frequency questions the respondents' only have to think back over a small time period, counting how many times they have been worried or afraid of becoming a victim. According to Farrall and Gadd (2004) it is important to consider the frequency, not only the intensity, to become aware of how regular such emotions occur amongst the population at large.

Risk Perception and Fear of Crime: the Difference

It's been argued that when asking questions about peoples fear of crime it's really risk perception that is being investigated (Rountree & Land, 1996; Jackson, 2005; Wyant, 2008). Furstenberg (1971 in Wyant, 2008) was the first to separate fear of crime and perception of risk of crime, he did so by stating that fear is an emotional state and risk perception is a cognitive state. Researchers have come to agree with Furstenberg's conclusion about risk and fear as two different constructs (Ferraro, 1995; Rountree & Land, 1996; Russo, Roccato & Vieno, 2011).

According to LaGrange, Ferraro and Supancic (1992), not much research on the relationship between fear of crime and risk perception had been conducted by the time of their publication. LaGrange, Ferraro and Supancic examined how incivilities (such as litter, noise, public drunks) affect fear of crime and risk perception. They found that incivilities only had a significant impact on fear of crime when mediated through perception of risk. Rountree and Land (1996) generated results that strongly support the idea of risk perception and fear of crime as two different constructs. By the results Rountree and Land suggests that risk perception and fear of crime have different sociodemographic predictors, none of the

predictors examined (age, gender, income, ethnicity etc.) had equally impact on fear of crime and risk perception.

Jackson (2005) talks about fear of crime as a response to the risk of becoming a victim and sees risk perception as a part of the concept of fear of crime. However, Jackson emphasizes the importance of separating the two constructs, even though risk perception can be used as a predictor to fear of crime.

Gainey, Alper and Chappell (2011) concludes that risk perception and fear of crime is two different concepts but with a relationship that remains unclear. In their effort to find an explanation for this relationship they examined how earlier victimization, direct and indirect effects of sociodemographic characteristics along with social and physical disorder affect fear of crime and how these variables are mediated through risk perception. Their results showed that risk perception was directly related to higher levels of fear and this relationship mediated the impact of the other variables in the model. Though risk perception mediated the impact of neighborhood disorder, neighborhood disorder remained a significant predictor of fear of crime. This particular finding goes against the earlier mentioned report published by LaGrange, Ferraro and Supancic (1992), who found that the impact of incivilities, or neighborhood disorder, on fear of crime was almost completely mediated by perceived risk.

Fear of Crime, Risk Perception and Actual Crime

It's been well known that fear of crime don't correspond well to actual crime rate (Jackson, 2009; Drakulich, 2013). Elchardus, De Groof and Smits (2008) distinguish two paradigms to explain fear of crime in relation to actual crime. They claim that researchers use these two paradigms when explaining peoples feeling of vulnerability and fear of crime. The first, the rationalist paradigm, sees people as rational in their fears. Here, being afraid stems from perceived threat, vulnerability and helplessness. This paradigm focuses on crime, crime

prevention and aid to victims. The second, the symbolic paradigm, believes the feelings of fear can arise from different origins, not just the one mentioned in the rationalist paradigm. It is believed here that mass media plays a crucial role in forming fear and feeling of vulnerability. Elchardus, De Groof and Smits (2008) tried to significantly discriminate the two paradigms and found that the symbolic paradigm explains feelings of vulnerability and fear of crime among the respondents better than the rational paradigm. This indicates that the respondent's feelings of vulnerability don't correspond with reality and that their fear has a different origin than rational conclusions from facts. The rational paradigm still has some value of explanation though, earlier victimization showed a weak but significant effect. Elchardus, De Groof and Smits propose the use of the symbolic paradigm when interpreting feelings of insecurity and fear of crime, but that researcher should not ignore the rational effects of earlier victimization.

According to the latest Swedish National Safety Survey (Brottsförbyggande rådet [BRÅ], 2012) 11% of the respondents expresses worry about being victim of physical assault or abuse. In relation to this only 2.5 % of the respondents reported being actual victims of physical assault or abuse. In the survey the definition used is *worry*, e.g. "has it happened during the last year that you've been worried about being physically assaulted or abused". Researchers (Kanan & Pruitt 2002; Hough 2004) have argued that even though worry is not the same thing as fear, it is considered an emotional state of mind rather than a cognitive one, which places worry in the same category as fear.

Russo and Roccato (2010) found that the participants in their study had a perception of risk consistent with the actual risk of being victimized. The participants successfully distinguished between relevant information (official crime rates) and information irrelevant (the more prominent information about immigrants) concerning their neighborhoods.

Fear of Crime, Risk Perception and Gender

Many researchers throughout the years have found that women are more fearful than men (Skogan, 1987; Williams & Dickinson, 1993; Rountree & Land, 1996; Chiricos, Padgett & Gertz, 2000; Nellis & Savage, 2012). Warr and Ellison (2000) investigate in their study how personal fear differs from altruistic fear (fear for others). They found that altruistic fear is more common and more intense than personal fear. Most research indicates that fear is a female concern. However, altruistic fear seems to be as common among men, especially when it concerns their wife and children (Gilchrist, Bannister, Ditton & Farrall 1998). In younger age it's more common that husbands worry about their wives than the other way around, and that they worry more about their wives than about themselves. Women are more worried about their own safety. Mothers are also more likely than fathers to express fear for the children, but both mothers and fathers express more fear for their daughters than for their sons. Callanan and Teasdale (2009) mean that many studies have uncovered the victimization-fear paradox, that women and elderly report higher levels of fear but lower levels of criminal victimization. Callanan and Teasdale found in their study that women's fear of crime increase significantly when there is a risk of physical harm. They also found, as many others that women report more fear of crime than men do.

Another aspect of the gender issue is how we communicate about gender. Hollander (2001) discusses how ideas about gender are partly based on the ideas about bodies, that female bodies are believed to be vulnerable and not a danger to other. This is based on their smaller size, perceived lack of strength and vulnerability to rape. Male bodies are seen as more dangerous to others since they are larger, stronger and could be used as a tool for sexual violence. Hollander's result indicate that men are seen as the source of potential violence and that women vulnerability is believed to have its origin in physical factors and potential as rape victims. An interesting note is that even smaller men are seen as dangerous to women.

One suggestion on why women tend to report higher fear of crime compared to men. is that men's fear of crime is seen as socially undesirable (Sutton & Farrall, 2005). They mean that for men it's more important to report what is socially desirable than what is true. Sutton and Farrall found in their study that men may be more afraid compared to women when the socially desirable tendency is corrected for. Women, who are seen as the weaker gender, do not feel the same pressure of suppressing their fear, and therefore reporting higher fear of crime. Sutton, Robinson and Farrall (2011) came to the same conclusion, even though they added a twist. In their study the participants were asked to answer “totally honest and accurate” or in a way that portrays them “in the best possible light” ('fake good'). They found that men asked to fake good reported less fear than those who answered truthfully. Interesting is that women asked to fake reported more fear than those reporting honestly. These data support earlier findings that men tend to minimize their fear because of the socially desirable tendency. Just like Sutton and Farrell did, Jackson (2009) found that males might be afraid and worry as often as females; they just don't want to admit it. Jackson found four possible reasons to why women are more afraid; a) they feel less able to defend themselves, b) they have lower perceived self-efficacy, c) they have higher perceived impact, and d) they think that their own social group has higher risk of becoming victimized compared to men. Smith, Torstensson and Johansson (2001) discuss that vulnerability have different meaning for the different genders, which is important to understand when discussing fear of crime. They argue that for men, vulnerability is more a personal issue, while women are more influenced by the social environment.

According to the National Safety Survey 2012 in Sweden (BRÅ, 2012) 75% of the women felt pretty or very safe when walking alone at night in their own neighborhood. Among the men it was 93% answering the same. According to the same survey, young men are most exposed to abuse crimes while young women are most exposed to threats. Single

parents, mostly mothers, are most exposed to harassment. When women are exposed to crimes such as threats, abuse and harassment, the culprit are most often kin. The place of the crime is often the home. For men it's the opposite, the culprit is most often an unknown person and the crime takes place in a public area. In general, men and women are exposed to crimes in the same extent; though the kind of crime they are exposed to differ.

Fear of Crime, Risk Perception and Age

It is said that elderly people express greater fear of victimization than young people; even though young males are most likely to be victims of a crime (Jackson 2009). The definition most frequently used for elderly is the age of 65 and above (Addington, 2012). According to the Swedish National Safety Survey (BRÅ, 2012) people in the age between 20-24 are twice as likely to be victims of violent crime than any other age group. This “victimization-fear paradox” is proposed by Kappes, Greve and Hellmers (2013) to be a methodological consequence. The authors believe that questions about neighborhood safety, e.g. “how safe do you feel being out alone in your neighborhood after dark”, don't actually ask the elderly about their feelings about the possibility of victimization but rather about physical attributes like impaired eyesight which might cause a fall.

When distinguishing between different types of crime elderly peoples general fear of crime seems to decrease (LaGrange, Ferraro, Supancic, 1992). According to the Swedish National Safety Survey (BRÅ, 2012) elderly is the group least concerned about being victim of a violent crime. Yet, elderly feels more unsafe in their neighborhood than other groups do.

According to findings published by Kanan and Pruitt (2002) age shows a negative correlation with fear of crime. The more afraid: the younger the respondents are. The questions asked in the survey regarded how worried and how safe the respondents felt in their neighborhood.

Risk Perception, Fear of Crime and Earlier Victimization

In his study, Skogan (1987) addresses the issues of fear of crime and people's victimization experiences and whether the impact of crime is general. He believes that the relationship between victimization and fear is partly reciprocal. That means that victimization leads to fear-related behavior which may lower the risk of exposure to risk, and that leads to lower chance of victimization in the future. Skogan (1987) adds that this cannot be true for everyone, but perhaps for a part of the population. Skogan found that earlier victimization was related to measures of concern about crime and to crime-related defensive behavior. Property victimization was the source of more concern than personal victimization, which could be based upon that a larger part of the participants had been victims of property crimes compared to those who had experienced personal crimes. There were three main findings: people who have experienced crime think more crimes occur, they are more worried about being a victim and they take more actions to protect themselves, probably since they have already experienced crime.

Russo and Ruccato (2010) studied the relationship between victimization and fear of crime longitudinally. They found that recent direct victimization was the strongest victimization predictor of both abstract and concrete fears. Multiple direct victimization was also an effective predictor. Direct victimization occurring more than 12 months before the study did not foster fear. Their findings also show that multiple direct victimization foster a weaker effect on fear of crime than single direct victimization. Tseloni and Zarafonitou (2008) discovered that indirect and direct earlier victimization and crime exposure shape the perceived future risk of becoming a victim. Those who have experienced victimization, direct or indirect, report more than non-victims that they are afraid of being home alone after dark.

Another aspect of previous victimization are how the victims adapt and go on with their lives. Norris and Kaniasty (1994) investigated the psychological distress among violent

crime victims, property crime victims and non-victims. Still, 15 months post-crime, victims showed symptoms of anxiety, fear of crime, depression, phobic anxiety, somatization and avoidance. Improvements were seen between 3 and 9 months, thereafter they did not improve. Violent crime victims remained more distressed than property crime victims. Hanslmaier (2013) found similar results. He looked at how victimization experiences affect the life satisfaction and fear of crime. His findings show that victimization experience has a positive impact on fear of crime. Fear of crime and victimization experience significantly lower the life satisfaction, at the same time; fear is influenced by the victimization experience.

According to the National Safety Survey 2012 in Sweden (BRÅ, 2012) a larger amount of those who have experienced crime, direct or indirect, feel unsafe compared to those who have no such experiences. The largest difference is among women, those with victimization experiences feel four to five times as unsafe in relation to those women who have never experienced a crime.

Fear of Crime and the Media

Nellis & Savage (2012) performed a study where they investigated how media exposure affects fear of terrorism. They assume that media plays a greater role in fear of terrorism since it is a very rare phenomenon that requires media-related information. How much attention the participants pay to the news do not affect the fear of terrorism or the perceived risk of terrorism. However, the researchers found that perceived risk of terrorism is associated with fear of terrorism and that exposure to news is associated with perceived risk. Chiricos, Eschholz och Gertz (1997) found that the frequency of watching news on TV and listening to news on the radio is significantly related to fear of crime while reading the newspaper and news magazines are unrelated to fear of crime.

Amerio and Roccato (2005) found in their study that those who report watching the news always or often are six times more likely to be concerned about crime in their homeland in contrast to those who reported that they seldom or never watch the news.

Hanslmaier (2013) found that only those who read the local newspaper are affected by the county crime rate. How well informed people are, most often through media, affects their fear since they know more about the crime trends in the society (Balkin, 1979; Hanslmaier, 2013).

Heath (1984) investigated how newspapers reported crime news affected people's fear of crime. Those reading newspapers with a high proportion of local crime news that seems to be random or sensational, reported higher levels of fear in contrast to those reading papers with low proportion of local crime news. Crimes that happen in other places than the closest environment, even if bizarre and frightening, are still more reassuring. People tend to compare, and as long as other crimes are worse than those local, they feel safe. Reports of crime that seem randomly and without any reason are most frightening.

Nowadays, new media is rising. Yar (2012) discuss that new media, example blogs and social networks, change people's law- and rule-breaking behaviors. Now people have access to cameras all the time and use these to show their act of crimes. This changes the media and fear of crime relationship. According to Kort-Butler and Sittner Hartshorn (2011) different television program types affect fear of crime differently. No significant relationship was found between watching crime dramas and fear of crime. However, the more people watched nonfictional crime programs, the more afraid they were of criminal victimization. Chiricos, Padgett and Gertz (2000) did also find that local crime news on TV have a stronger effect on fear of crime than national news, especially when there is recent victim experience involved. Kohm, Waid-Lindberg, Weinrath, O'Connor Shelley and Dobbs (2012) found similar results. Local TV news was the strongest predictor for increased fear of crime. Smolej

and Kivivuori (2006) found that those who expose themselves to many different sources of crime news are more likely to fear violence. Williams and Dickinson (1993) saw that those reading newspapers containing more spectacular crime reports reported more fear of crime. Also, the tabloids were judged to be the most sensational and fearful in their reporting's about crime.

Known or Unknown Perpetrator

How the victim experience the crime could be related to if the victim knows the perpetrator. The relationship between the victim and the perpetrator seems to be unexplored in many ways, especially depending on different crimes. However, the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator has shown being a significant factor (BRÅ, 2012). People are less likely to report a crime to the police if the victim knows the perpetrator. In half of the reported cases of assault the perpetrator was unknown but the distribution is different for males and females. Males are more likely to be assaulted by an unknown perpetrator whilst women are most likely to be assaulted by someone they know. The same results are found when analyzing threat.

In some research the impact of the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator has been investigated, but the only crime used in this research is sexual assault. Hickman and Muehlenhard (1997) had college women answer a survey about their fear concerning stranger and acquaintance rape. The women reported being more fearful of rape conducted by a stranger, but at the same time did they estimate that acquaintance rape as more common. Even if they reported being raped by an acquaintance, they were still more fearful of being raped by a stranger.

Stermac, Del Bove and Addison (2004) investigated rape victims at a care center. They saw that more male than female victims reported physical disabilities. The male victims

of assaults made by strangers were also more likely to be attacked by multiple assailants. Both male and female victims of acquaintance rape were more likely to be assaulted in the assailant's or victim's home, even though male victims more often compared to female victims, are assaulted in parks or other public areas. Wilcox, Jordan and Pritchard (2006) found that college women in their study were more afraid of sexual assaults by a stranger, than by an acquaintance. Even though women are more often sexually assaulted by an acquaintance, they still express their fear about being stalked or assaulted by a stranger as higher. Overall, the college women were more afraid of being victimized by a stranger, especially when it comes to sexual assault. Tetreault and Barnett (1987) looked at participant's reaction to a rape victim of a stranger or an acquaintance and the difference. In a situation where the victim is raped by an acquaintance, according to the female participants, the victim is most often blamed for the situation. Men seem to blame the victim more if the perpetrator is a stranger. Stermac, Du Mont and Dunn (1998) found that being assaulted by a current or previous boyfriend/husband more often resulted in more physical trauma compared to being assaulted by a stranger. McCormick, Maric, Seto and Barbaree (1998) found contrary results, that acquaintance rapist's use less force than stranger rapists. In a study by Koss, Dinero, Seibel and Cox (1988) stranger rapes are seen as more violent than acquaintance rapes, with exception for rapes conducted by husbands or other family member. These was seen as equally violent as stranger rape.

The research presented above solely addresses rape victims where the perpetrator is either known or unknown. No research has been found on how the relationship between victim and perpetrator affect the victim's fear of crime and risk perception. This field lacks some major important parts; we believe it is important to address other types of crime than just sexual assault. Therefore, the current study will explore if and how the victim's fear of crime and risk perception differs depending on if the victim know or don't know the

perpetrator when it comes to other types of crime. In the current study three types of crime will be addressed: threat, physical assault and mugging.

Overview

In the present work we intend, in more detail, to explore, in a Swedish sample, the relationship between fear of crime, risk perception, types of crimes, past victimization and possible sources of risk perception. We also aim to explore how the relationship between victim and perpetrator affect the victim's perception of risk and fear of crime. To do so, we created a survey that assessed how the respondents perceived the risk and their fear of three different crimes; mugging, physical assault and threat. These types of crimes were chosen because they are the most common violent crimes committed against individuals in Sweden (BRÅ, 2012). The questions asked concerned two types of situations: when the perpetrator was known and when the perpetrator was unknown to the respondent. We asked about the respondents experiences with earlier victimization and which crime they believed to be the most common in Sweden. The respondents were asked to list what source they base their judgments on (e.g. friends, family and media) when it comes to risk and most common crime in Sweden.

We expect that the relationship between risk perception and fear of crime will be similar to the relationships previously seen, that is, to some degree overlapping, but still distinct constructs. We also expect to replicate earlier findings on the relationship between age and fear, and gender and fear. In addition, earlier victimization will be investigated as a predictor to fear, as will risk perception. In aim to contribute to the lacking field we will examine the angle of how the relationship between the victim and perpetrator affects the victim's perception of risk and fear of crime.

Is there a correlation between risk perception and fear of crime? Earlier research has shown that fear of crime and risk perception is positively correlated. We expect to find the same correlation in the current study, and by so contribute to the notion that there is a relationship between fear of crime and risk perception.

Do age, gender, risk perception, direct victimization and indirect victimization predict fear of crime? We hope to be able to give some answer to what predicts fear of crime. In the earlier research there are some inconsistencies in how age and gender predicts fear of crime. We hope to be able to contribute to a clearer view here. Also, earlier victimization will, according to previous research, predict fear of crime, as will risk perception.

How does the relationship between the victim and perpetrator affect the victim's fear of crime and risk perception? The research in how the relationship between perpetrator and victim affect the victim's fear of crime and risk perception is lacking. In this study the relationship between the victim and perpetrator, known and unknown, will be investigated in relation to age, gender and direct/indirect victimization. The earlier research show that it's most likely that the respondent's will report the unknown perpetrator as more frightening.

Method

Respondents

A total of 588 respondents that have been registered at any psychology course at Lund University participated in the study. The respondents were approached by email with a link to the survey. There were 397 females (67,5%) and 172 males (29,3%). The option Other was selected by 3 Respondents (0,5%) and 16 respondents (2,7%) did not want to report their gender. The mean age was 28,7 years; the oldest respondent was 64 years old and the youngest 18. The highest education level for the respondents was university (60,4%), followed by high school (39,6%). The respondents lived in cities with more than 200 000 residents (31,4%), in cities with between 50 000 and 200 000 residents (52,6%) or smaller cities with less than 50 000 residents (16%).

Measure

A 21-item questionnaire, divided in five sections was developed (Appendix A). Section one consisted of demographic questions concerning the respondents age, gender, education and size of their current city. In section two the respondents were asked to rate different crimes (murder, robbery, physical assault, rape and threat) from 1 to 5, where 1 was the most common crime and 5 the least common. To make sure the respondents answers weren't affected by the order the crime types were written two versions of the questionnaire was constructed (Survey A and Survey B) where the order of the crimes were the only difference. No significant difference between the questionnaires was found. A question about what influenced the respondent's opinion (e.g. friends, media, work etc.) when rating the different crimes was added in the end of section two. In section three the respondents was asked to rate the perception of risk in different scenarios, e.g.; *how big do you believe the risk is for you to be mugged by an unknown perpetrator*, and *how big do you believe the risk is for*

you to be mugged by a perpetrator known to you. Three types of crime figured in the different scenarios: assault, mugging and threat. Questions concerning unknown and known perpetrator were added to see if there was a difference in risk perception and/or fear of crime depending on who the perpetrator was. Questions about fear were formulated to examine if the respondents experienced fear the last month, e.g.; *If you think about the last month, how many times have you've been afraid of being assaulted by an unknown perpetrator* and *If you think about the last month, how many times have you been afraid of being assaulted by a perpetrator known to you.*

The respondents answered two different five-item Likert scales from one to five. For risk 1= very low risk and 5= very high risk, and for fear; 1= it hasn't happened the last month and 5= very often (for the full scales, see Appendix A). The minimum score for both scales was 6 and the maximum 35, higher scores indicates greater fear and risk perception. Since the questionnaire was newly developed and used for the first time a test of internal consistency was conducted. Cronbach's alpha for the risk scale was .741 and for the fear scale .674, which is within the recommendations considering the low amount of items (Field, 2009, p. 675).

In section four the respondents was asked if they've been exposed to one or several of the following crimes; assault, mugging or threat and also if a close acquaintance has been exposed to said crimes, this was done to see the effects of direct and indirect victimization. The fifth and last section consisted of one question asking the respondents of what source (e.g. friends, family, media, etc.) they believed influenced their risk perception in section three.

Procedure

The questionnaire was published online using Google Drive. It was disseminated via email addresses that were available at an educational platform. Survey A was sent to half of the addresses and Survey B to the other half with hope that about the same amount of respondents would answer each of them. The respondents were told that their participation was voluntary and that they had the right to stop participating at any time without any consequences. No compensation for participating was offered. The questionnaire took approximately 10 minutes to complete. At the end of the survey the researchers email addresses could be found so that the respondents could send questions or thoughts if they wanted.

Results

Descriptive Results

The following section will describe and explore the different variables in the current study. The results presented here are strictly descriptive and exploratory, and are not a part of the main analysis that answers the research questions. Here the respondent's distribution on the variables direct and indirect victimization is explored. The mean values of the different crime types will be displayed. Also, the ratings of most common and uncommon crime in Sweden in relation to actual crime will be displayed. When rating most common crime and risk perception the respondents were asked which source they based their judgments upon, these sources will be explored and compared. The last part of this section will address any violations of the assumptions demanded for parametric testing's and how they are dealt with. The findings presented here will later be addressed in the discussion.

From the questions in section three in the survey, two main scales were made: fear of crime and risk perception. Each scale was then divided into four subscales: fear of crime-known perpetrator and fear of crime- unknown perpetrator, and risk perception- known perpetrator and risk perception- unknown perpetrator. The four subscales each consist of three questions.

Table 1 and 2 displays how many respondents that was directly and indirectly victimized and what crime they were exposed to. Some respondents reported being exposed to more than one type of crime and Table 2 displays the percentage of respondents that reported being exposed to each type of crime. These results will later be addressed as a part of research question two in the discussion.

Table 1: Distribution of direct and indirect victimization

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
Direct victimization	251 (42,7%)	337 (57,3%)
Indirect victimization	453 (77%)	135 (23%)

Table 2: Direct and indirect victimization distributed over the different types of crime.

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Threat</i>	<i>Abuse</i>	<i>Robbery</i>
Direct victimization	33,3%	15,3%	13,3%
Indirect victimization	53,4%	52,2%	49,1%

In Table 3 we can see that the respondents rated risk perception and fear of mugging when the perpetrator was unknown highest. Perception of risk of physical assault when the perpetrator was known had the lowest mean, as had fear of mugging when the perpetrator was known.

Table 3: Mean values for the different crime types, depending on if the perpetrator is known or unknown to the respondent.

		<i>Risk perception</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Fear of crime</i>	<i>SD</i>
Mugging	Known perp.	1.68	.673	1.07	.286
	Unknown perp.	2.62	.753	1.81	.930
Physical assault	Known perp.	1.62	.714	1.10	.357
	Unknown perp.	2.28	.619	1.44	.706
Threat	Known perp.	1.71	.819	1.14	.503
	Unknown perp.	2.52	.760	1.52	.773

Table 4 displays the respondents rating of the most common crime. In Sweden, the most common crime is threat, which corresponded with the respondent's ratings. The most uncommon crime in Sweden is murder, which also corresponded with the respondent's ratings.

Table 4: The respondent's ratings over most common and uncommon crime ($N=588$).

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Murder	4,63	1,071
Mugging	3,01	0,916
Physical assault	2,08	0,915
Rape	3,42	0,800
Threat	1,82	1,176

1 = most common, 5 = most uncommon.

The respondents were asked upon what main source they base their risk perception and most common crime in Sweden. Figure 1 display descriptive data of the alternative sources available and the respondent's ratings.




Figure 1. Source of judgment upon risk perception and most common crime.

The source Other included answers like intuition, combination of all the alternatives, own experiences, education and gut feeling.

Analysis was performed on all variables for violation of assumptions. Age, risk perception and fear of crime were skewed and were transformed using a LOG 10-transformation to be used in the regression analysis. Still, fear of crime remained skewed. To avoid violation of the assumptions where non-parametric tests couldn't be used; the decision to turn fear of crime into a dichotomous variable was made. In Table 5 we can see the distribution of the respondents answer to the questions about fear. As shown in the table, the answer "It hasn't happened the last month" was the most selected alternative. When turning the variable into a dichotomy we chose to merge alternative 2-5 in to a "yes, I've been feeling afraid during the last month"-alternative and alternative 1 was kept as "it hasn't happen the last month". Hellevik (2007) sees few problems with a dichotomous variable as dependent

variables in regression analyses and regards the reservation against this as exaggerated. The use of dichotomous variables as dependent variables in a regression analyses violates the homoscedasticity, but according to Hellevik this has little effect on the outcome of the analyses. Thus, fear of crime was transformed into a dichotomous variable when answering research question two.

Table 5: The distribution of answers to the questions about fear.

<i>Variable</i>	<i>1. It hasn't happened the last month</i>	<i>2. Very rarely</i>	<i>3. Pretty rarely</i>	<i>4. Pretty often</i>	<i>5. Very often</i>
Fear question 1: mugging- known perp.	552 (93.9%)	31 (5.3%)	5 (.9%)	0	0
Fear question 2: mugging- unknown perp.	279 (47.4%)	185 (31.5%)	85 (14.5%)	37 (6.3%)	2 (.3%)
Fear question 3: assault- known perp.	543 (92.3)	35 (6%)	9 (1.5%)	1 (.2%)	0
Fear question 4: assault- unknown perp.	394 (67%)	138 (23.5%)	47 (8%)	9 (1.5%)	0
Fear question 5: threat- unknown perp.	370 (62.9%)	143 (24.3%)	63 (10.7%)	11 (1.9%)	1 (.2%)
Fear question 6: threat- known perp.	529 (90%)	42 (7.1%)	11 (1.9%)	3 (.5%)	3 (.5%)

The table displays frequency of the respondents answer to each question about fear. For the specific questions see Appendix A.

Research Questions

Is there a correlation between risk perception and fear of crime?

Since fear of crime was skewed, it was decided to use a non-parametric method. The Spearman rho showed a significant positive correlation ($r_s=.454$, $n= 588$, $p <.001$) between risk and fear of crime. This means that the respondents risk perception follow the same direction as their fear of crime.

Do age, gender, risk perception, direct victimization and indirect victimization predict fear of crime?

A multiple regression analysis was performed between fear of crime as the dependent variable (dichotomous variable) and age, gender, risk perception, direct victimization and indirect victimization as independent variables. In the first step age and gender was entered since there is substantial evidence for these two as strong predictors of fear. In the second step risk perception, direct victimization and indirect victimization where entered.

Table 6: Multiple regression analysis.

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>Sig.</i>	Adjusted R^2
<i>Step 1</i>					.030
Gender	.153	.101	.062	.128	
Age	-2.222	.543	-.167	.000	
<i>Step 2</i>					.168
Gender	.069	.095	.028	.467	
Age	-1.265	.520	-.095	.015	
Risk perception	6.099	.636	.379	.000	
Direct victimization	.131	.120	.044	.275	
Indirect victimization	-.033	.138	-.009	.811	

The results indicate that step 2 is a stronger model for predicting fear of crime with risk perception as the strongest predictor of fear, followed by age, which relates negatively. Table 6 displays the correlation between the variables, the standardized regression coefficients (β) and adjusted R^2 . R for regression was significantly different from zero in both steps. Step 1; $F(2, 587) = 10.02, p < .001$, step 2; $F(5, 587) = 24.74, p < .001$.

How does the relationship between the victim and perpetrator affect the victim's fear of crime and risk perception?

The lowest total score in each of the four scales was three, which means that the respondents had to answer “no risk” on all questions. 15 were the highest total score possible, which means that the participant would have to answer “very high risk” on all questions. No respondent had a total score of 15.

Frequency output showed that the respondents perceived a higher risk of crime when the perpetrator was unknown to the respondent than when the perpetrator was known. 99.3% of the respondents saw a risk of being victimized when the perpetrator was unknown and 73.9% believed there was a risk of victimization by a known perpetrator. 17.5% of the respondents reported being afraid of victimization by someone they know during the last month. 63.2% have been afraid of being victimized by an unknown perpetrator during the last month. The percents presented accounts for those who answered “low risk” or more at the risk perception scales and those whom answered “very rarely” or more at the fear of crime scales.

Risk perception by an unknown perpetrator had the highest mean (7.42) and fear of being victimized by a known perpetrator had the lowest mean (3.31). Wilcoxon signed-rank test was performed to see if the difference between the means in fear of crime with known/unknown perpetrator and risk perception with known/unknown perpetrator was significant. Table 7 displays mean values for the four subscales along with results from

Wilcoxon signed-rank test.

Table 7: Mean values of each the subscales ($N=588$) and the results from Wilcoxon signed-rank test.

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>
Risk- Known	5,01	1,80	-18.40	<.001	.76
Risk- Unknown	7,42	1,73			
Fear- Known	3,31	0,81	-15.42	<.001	.63
Fear- Unknown	4,80	2.00			

Results indicated that the mean difference between known and unknown perpetrator when it comes to fear of crime was significant: $z=-15.42$ $p<.001$, $r=.63$. The respondents report higher fear of crime when the perpetrator was unknown. The mean difference between known and unknown perpetrator when it comes to risk perception was also significant: $z=-18.40$, $p<.001$, $r=.76$. This indicates that the respondents report higher perception of risk when the perpetrator was unknown.

When looking at known and unknown perpetrator distributed over gender the mean value for both men and women were higher in risk perception than in fear of crime (see Table 8). Women had in general a larger mean than men and both groups had higher means on the variable unknown perpetrator. The differences between men and women and risk perception with known and unknown perpetrator and fear of crime with unknown perpetrator in Table 8 are significant.

Table 8: Mean values distributed over gender and results from Mann Whitney U-test

	<i>Gender</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>
Risk Unknown	Male	7.04	1.70	27869.5	.001	.15
	Female	7.58	1.75			
Risk Known	Male	4.70	1.76	28594.5	.002	.13
	Female	5.14	1.81			
Fear unknown	Male	4.28	1.79	26565.5	<.001	.18
	Female	4.98	2.06			
Fear known	Male	3.26	.75	32562.0	.189	.06
	Female	3.34	.85			

In order to explore known/unknown perpetrator and age, a correlation using Spearman's rho was conducted. Results indicates a significant negative correlation between age and risk perception when the perpetrator is unknown: $r_s(577)=-.202, p<.001$, and a significant negative correlation between age and fear when the perpetrator is unknown: $r_s(577)=-.165, p<.001$. However, the correlations are weak and there is a strong possibility the significant results arise from the high number of respondents. Results from frequencies displayed that respondents between age 20 and 30 years showed the highest scores of fear of crime and risk perception, regardless of the relationship with the perpetrator. The oldest respondents reported the lowest levels of fear of crime and risk perception.

When looking at direct victimization in relation to known/unknown perpetrator the results indicated that when the perpetrator is unknown the respondents perceived the risk as larger if they had been directly victimized before. The perception of risk when the perpetrator

was unknown and the respondent had been victimized before had a higher mean than risk perception when the perpetrator was known. Regarding fear of crime, both when the perpetrator was known and unknown those who have been victimized before report higher mean which indicates more fear. To see if the mean differences were significant a Mann Whitney U-test was performed. Table 9 displays the mean differences and the results from Mann Whitney U-test.

Table 9: Mean differences between direct victimization and no direct victimization and results from Mann Whitney U-test.

<i>Direct victimization</i>		<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>
Risk unknown	No	337	7,27	1,73	37784.5	.022	.09
	Yes	251	7,60	1,74			
Risk known	No	337	4,83	1,70	37027.5	.008	.12
	Yes	251	5,25	1,90			
Fear unknown	No	337	4,66	1,94	39656.0	.181	.06
	Yes	251	4,91	2,07			
Fear known	No	337	3,23	0,64	39851.0	.070	.07
	Yes	251	3,41	0,99			

Results from Mann Whitney U-test showed a difference in risk perception when the perpetrators was known: $U(586)=37027.50$, $p=.008$, $r=.12$ and unknown: $U(586)=37784.50$, $p=.022$, $r=.09$ depending on if the respondents have been directly victimized. Fear of crime when the perpetrator is known and unknown showed no significant differences.

When looking at indirect victimization, those who reported indirect victimization had a higher mean in risk perception when the perpetrator was unknown. Fear of crime when the perpetrator was unknown when the respondent reported no indirect victimization had the lowest mean. The means are displayed in Table 10 along with results from a Mann Whitney U-test.

Table 10: Mean differences between indirect victimization and no indirect victimization and results from Mann Whitney U-test.

<i>Indirect victimization</i>		<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>
Risk unknown	No	135	7,16	1,90	26462.0	.014	.10
	Yes	453	7,49	1,68			
Risk known	No	135	4,67	1,75	25860.0	.005	.12
	Yes	453	5,11	1,80			
Fear unknown	No	135	4,65	2,11	28360.0	.186	.05
	Yes	453	4,80	1,96			
Fear known	No	135	3,26	0,68	30228.5	.761	.01
	Yes	453	3,32	0,84			

The results from Mann Whitney U-test showed a significant difference in indirect victimization and risk perception when the perpetrator was known: $U(586)=25860.0$, $p=.005$, $r=.12$ and also a significant difference in indirect victimization and risk perception when the perpetrator was unknown: $U(586)=26462.0$ $p=.014$, $r=.10$. Indirect victimization and fear of crime when the perpetrator was known and unknown showed no significant differences.

Discussion

We conducted this study in order to establish a relationship between fear of crime and risk perception. Further we examined what variables can predict fear of crime. Also, we looked at the relationship between victim and perpetrator when it came to fear of crime and risk perception of the victim.

Results from the current study indicate a relationship between fear of crime and risk perception. This is consistent with some of the previous research in the field that suggests a, somewhat unclear, relationship between the two concepts (LaGrange, Ferraro & Supancic, 1992; Jackson, 2005; Gainey, Alper & Chapell, 2011). The results in the current study indicate a positive correlation between risk and fear, when risk perception increases so do fear of crime. Also, results from the multiple regression analysis tells us that risk perception is the strongest predictor of fear of crime- even stronger than age and gender which are the most common explored variables when it comes to fear of crime. The model from step two in the regression has an effect size of .16, which is low. The model doesn't really explain fear of crime that good and other variables need to be examined. Age as a predictor for fear of crime was significant and indicates that the younger the participant is the more afraid he or she is. Research in this field has been inconsistent; support have been found that the older population is most afraid (Lindquist & Duke, 1982; Stafford & Galle, 1984; Weinrath & Gartell, 1996) but findings supporting the younger part of the population as the most afraid have also been presented (LaGrange & Ferraro; 1989, Kanan & Pruitt, 2002). The results in the current study support to the notion that younger people are more afraid. However, in the current study no respondent was older than 64 and only 27 out of the 588 respondents were older than 50. According to Addington (2012) the term elderly is used as a concept for people over 65, this tells us that the sample in the current study is not representative for the population elderly. Still, a conclusion can be made that the younger part of the population

expresses more fear than those above the age of 30.

Gender proved to be a non-significant predictor to fear of crime, even when mediated through risk perception. One explanation for the lack of gender differences could be that the sample investigated is less likely to conform to social desirability. According to Sutton and Farrall (2005) a possible explanation for the gender differences found in earlier research (Skogan, 1987; Williams & Dickinson, 1993; Rountree & Land, 1996; Chiricos, Padgett & Gertz, 2000; Nellis & Savage, 2012) could be that men are more likely to express lower fear of crime than they really feel. Both men and women conform to stereotypes where men express less fear whilst women exaggerate their fear. Another reasonable explanation could be that in this survey the respondents were asked about three different crime types: mugging, assault and threat. No questions were asked about sexual assault, which are the crime women in general is said to fear the most (Callanan & Teasdale, 2009). Perhaps gender differences would be found with other types of crime.

Risk perception proved to be the strongest predictor of fear of crime. This supports the earlier mentioned notion about a strong relationship between fear of crime and risk perception (LaGrange, Ferraro & Supancic, 1992; Jackson, 2005; Gainey, Alper & Chapell, 2011). However, the relationship is still not clear, more research needs to be conducted on how risk perception in combination with other variables could predict fear of crime.

Neither direct nor indirect victimization proved to be significant predictors of fear of crime, which was not an expected result based on earlier research. 42% of the respondents reported direct victimization and 77% reported indirect victimization. Weinrath and Gartell (1996) found that older women were desensitized by earlier victimization and expressed less fear than those not exposed to crime before. A similar result was found by Box, Hale and Andrews (1988) whom found a negative relationship between earlier victimization and fear of crime. Earlier research has shown that the time since the victimization took place matters

(Russo & Roccato, 2010). The current study don't provide any information on how much time has passed since the respondents victimization but perhaps Russo and Roccas findings have an impact here as well. They suggest a neutralization perspective by Robert Agnew, which is a coping strategy to decrease the impact of victimization.

The relationship between victim and perpetrator and how that affects the fear of crime and risk perception of the victim was explored. The respondents report being more afraid of unknown perpetrators and report the risk of being victimized by a stranger as higher. Although earlier research has been concentrated on sexual assault crimes our results indicate that people fear an unknown perpetrator independent of the crime. For example, Hickman and Muehlenhard (1997) found that even if the participants had been raped by an acquaintance earlier, they were still more afraid of being victimized by strangers. In this study we have not controlled for if the respondents have been assaulted by a stranger or an acquaintance earlier in life and can therefore not draw any conclusions about this.

When looking at gender differences, both men and women report the risk of being assaulted by a stranger as higher than by an acquaintance and that women express higher fear and risk perception than men. In many different studies and reports it is a fact that women are most often victims of an acquaintance rape. Why are they still more afraid of the strangers and perceive them as a higher risk? As Callanan and Teasdale (2009) discuss, it could be that women are more afraid of being physical injured, which correlates with the findings of Koss, Dinero, Seibel and Cox (1988) and McCormick, Maric, Seto and Barbaree (1998) who discuss that strangers use more violence than acquaintances. Another aspect could be physical attributes. Hollander (2001) discusses the issue of body size. Women are smaller and therefore easier targets, which could be a reason for why women are more afraid overall. The notion that men are reporting lower risk and fear could be partly because of their body size, but also because of that men's fear is socially undesirable (Sutton & Farrall, 2005). As seen in

earlier research, this area of research is most often conducted on women. Not many studies where men have been the target group has been conducted.

Like the Swedish National Safety Survey (BRÅ, 2012) discuss, people in the mid 20's are most afraid of being victimized. The results in the current study show that young people, 20-30 years, report higher risk when the perpetrator is unknown and also higher fear when the perpetrator is unknown. However, the effect sizes are small and therefore it is possible that these results arise just by the large amount of data collected. It is probable cause to believe that these results follow the same negative direction as the earlier findings about age (see Kanan and Pruitt, 2002). Since young people, in general, are more afraid and report higher risk of being victimized by an unknown perpetrator it is likely that this also reflect the age variable. However, more research needs to be conducted in this area.

When looking at the results for indirect and direct victimization in relation to known and unknown perpetrator it seems that our findings again support Hickman's and Muehlenhard's (1997) study. When our respondents reported being directly victimized before, they reported higher risk perception of being victimized by an unknown perpetrator. Skogan (1987) discuss that perhaps those who have experienced direct victimization are more aware of the risk and therefore take more actions to protect themselves. This could lead to that they think about crime more, since they think about protecting themselves, and therefore perceive the risk as greater. Also, the results about fear in relation to perpetrator show that no matter if the perpetrator is known or unknown, those respondents that report being victimized before are more afraid of experiencing it again. According to the Swedish National Safety Survey (BRÅ, 2012), women that have experienced direct victimization feel much more unsafe than those who have never experienced a crime. As we can see in the results, also indirect victimization seems to have the same effect. Those who have experienced indirect victimization also report higher risk of being victimized, especially when the perpetrator is

unknown. In our survey we had no question about how long ago the respondents were victimized and therefore it is impossible to say if time is a factor in this, as Russo and Ruccato (2010) thinks.

Descriptive Results

Mugging by an unknown perpetrator was the crime the respondents rated highest, both when it came to risk perception and fear of crime. However, the mean values are low thus the respondents still rated the perceived risk and their estimated fear as low. Mugging, according to BRÅ (2012), is the least common crime among the crimes investigated in the present study. Risk perception and fear of physical assault showed the lowest mean values when the perpetrator was known. Physical assault had low mean values when the perpetrator was unknown as well (see Table 3). The respondents express more fear and a higher risk of being mugged than experiencing physical harm. Perhaps our materialistic society can explain these results. The respondents did not perceive the risk of threat highest, even though it is the most common crime in Sweden (BRÅ, 2012).

The respondents were asked to rate which crime they thought were the most common and then to name the main source of their rating. The respondent's appreciation of the most common and uncommon crime corresponded well to the reality in Sweden and media were the most common source reported. Also, when the respondents named their main source of their risk perception media was the most common source. Media often lead the reader to believe a crime is more common than it is. Reporting's of murder are often followed by a list of the most sensational murders, making the reader overestimate the frequency of the crime (Smolej & Kivivouri, 2008). Apparently the Swedish respondents in current study have not suffered this effect by the media and report a accurate view of actual crime. These results are in line with those presented by Russo and Ruccato (2010).

Limitations

One limitation in the present report is how concept of fear is measured. Difficulties with measuring emotions have been established (Jackson, 2005), and suggestions on how to make the concept more approachable have been made. One approach is to ask about frequency, which has been used in this study. Still, measuring emotion is a complex task and the results need to be interpreted with reservation.

Some of the variables used in the analysis didn't fulfill the requirements for parametric testing. When possible, non-parametric methods were used but the results from the regression analysis might have been compromised. Precautions were made, such as transformations and fear of crime was made into a dichotomous variable but generalizations to a larger population needs to be made with caution.

Further research

The relationship between risk perception and fear of crime needs more exploration. The existence of a relationship between the concepts is well established but how this relationship is actually formed remains uncertain. Other variables that might have an impact on fear of crime must be examined, e.g. neighborhood incivilities, socioeconomic status. The regression model presented in the current research needs to be further developed in order to find the variables that explain fear of crime. A different angle would be to look at how people, depending on their ethnic background or sexual disposition, experience the fear of hate crime and the risk of being exposed to it. Finally, the victim's relationship to the perpetrator in other crimes than sexual assault and how this affect the victim's fear of crime and risk perception needs to be developed. A suggestion is to see how earlier victimization affect fear of crime over time.

References

- Addington, L. A. (2012). Who You Calling Old? Measuring “Elderly” and What It Means For Homicide Research. *Homicide Studies: An Interdisciplinary & International Journal*, 17(2), 134-153.
- Aftonbladet (2011, January 18). Upplopp i Rosengård “bakslag” för polisen. Collected January 9, 2014 from <http://www.aftonbladet.se/nyheter/article12494430.ab>
- Amerio, P., Roccato, M. (2005). A Predictive Model for Psychological Reactions to Crime in Italy: An Analysis of Fear of Crime and Concern about Crime as a Social Problem. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 17-28.
- Balkin, S. (1979). Victimization Rates, Safety and Fear of Crime. *Social Problems*, 26(3), 343-358.
- Box, S., Hale, C., Andrews, G. (1988). Explaining fear of crime. *British Journal of Criminology*, 2, 340-356.
- Brottsförebyggande rådet. (2012). *NTU 2012: Om utsatthet, trygghet och förtroende*. Stockholm: Brottsförebyggande rådet.
- Callanan, V. J., Teasdale, B. (2009). An Exploration of Gender Differences in Measurement of Fear of Crime. *Feminist Criminology*, 4(4), 359–376.
- Chiricos, T., Eschholz, S., Gertz, M. (1997). Crime, News and Fear of Crime: Toward an identification of Audience Effects. *Social Problems*, 44(3), 342-357.
- Chiricos, T., Padgett, K., Gertz, M. (2000). Fear, TV news, and the reality of crime. *Criminology*, 38(3), 755-785.
- Custers, K., Van den Bulck, J. (2011). The Relationship of Dispositional and Situational Fear

- of Crime with Television Viewing and Direct Experience with Crime. *Mass Communication and Society*, 14, 600–619.
- Drakulich, K. (2013). Perceptions of the local danger posed by crime: Race, disorder, informal control and the police. *Social science research*, 42, 611-632.
- Elchardus, M., De Groof, S., Smits, W. (2008). Rational Fear or Represented Malaise: a Crucial Test of Two Paradigms Explaining Fear of Crime. *Sociological perspectives*, 51(3), 453-471.
- Farrall, S., Gadd, D. (2004). The Frequency of the Fear of Crime. *British Journal of Criminology*, 44(1), 127–132.
- Ferraro, K. F. (1995). *Fear of crime: Interpreting Victimization Risk*. SUNY Press, Albany.
- Ferraro, K. F., LaGrange, R. (1987). The Measurement of Fear of Crime. *Sociological Inquiry*, 57 (1), 70-101.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS (and sex and drugs and rock 'n' roll)*. London: SAGE publications ltd.
- Gainey, R., Alper, M., Chappell, A. T. (2011). 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.
- Gilchrist, E., Bannister, J., Ditton, J., Farrall, S. (1998). Women and the 'fear of crime': Challenging the accepted stereotype. *British Journal of Criminology*, 38(2), 283-298.
- Hanslmaier, M. (2013). Crime, fear and subjective well-being: How victimization and street crime affect fear and life satisfaction. *European Journal of Criminology*, 10(5), 515-533.
- Heath, L. (1984). Impact of Newspaper Crime Reports on Fear of Crime:

- Multimethodological Investigation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(2), 263-276.
- Hellevik, O. (2007). Linear versus logistic regression when the dependent variable is a dichotomy. *Qual Quant* 43, 59-74.
- Hickman, S. E., Muehlenhard, C. L. (1997). College Women's Fears and Precautionary Behaviors Relating to Acquaintance Rape and Stranger Rape. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 527-547.
- Hicks, S., Brown, S. (2013) Perceptions of risk: A review of the effects of individual and community-level variables on perceptions of risk. *International Review of Victimology*, 19(3), 249-267.
- Hollander, J. A. (2001). Vulnerability and Dangerousness: The Construction of Gender through Conversation about Violence. *Gender and Society*, 15(1), 83-109.
- Hough, M. (2004) Worry about crime: mental events or mental states? *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 7(2), 173-176.
- Jackson, J. (2005). Validating New Measures of the Fear of Crime. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(4), 297–315.
- Jackson, J. (2009) A psychological perspective on vulnerability in the fear of crime. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 15(4), 365-390.
- Kanan, J. W., Pruitt, M. V. (2002). Modeling Fear of Crime and Perceived Victimization Risk: The (In)Significance of Neighborhood Integration. *Sociological Inquiry*, 72(4), 527-548.
- Kappes, C., Greve, W., Hellmers, S. (2013). Fear of crime in old age: precautions behaviour

- and its relation to situational fear. *European Journal of Ageing*, 10, 111-125.
- Kohm, S. A., Waid-Lindberg, C. A., Weinrath, M., O'Connor Shelley, T., Dobbs, R. R. (2012). The Impact of Media on Fear of Crime among University Students: A Cross-National Comparison. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 67-100.
- Kort-Butler, L. A., Sittner Hartshorn, K. J. (2011). Watching the Detectives: Crime programming, fear of crime, and attitudes about the criminal justice system. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 52, 36-55.
- Koss, M. P., Dinero, T. E., Serbel, C. A., Cox, S. L. (1988). Stranger and Acquaintance Rape, are There Differences In the Victim's Experience? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 12, 1-24.
- LaGrange, R. L., Ferraro, K. F. (1989). Assessing age and gender differences in perceived risk and fear of crime. *Criminology*, 27, 697-719.
- LaGrange, R. L., Ferraro, K. F., Supancic, M. (1992). Perceived Risk and Fear of Crime: Role of Social and Physical Incivilities. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 29(3), 311-334.
- Lindquist, J. H., Duke, J. M. (1982). The Elderly Victim at Risk. *Criminology* 20(1), 115-126.
- McCormick, J., Maric, A., Seto, M., Barbaree, H. (1998). Relationship to Victim Predicts Sentence Length in Sexual Assault Cases. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 13(3), 413-420.
- Nellis, A. M., Savage, J. (2012). Does Watching the News Affect Fear of Terrorism? The Importance of Media Exposure on Terrorism Fear. *Crime & Delinquency*, 58(5), 748-768.

- Norris, F. H., Kaniasty, K. (1994). Psychological Distress Following Criminal Victimization in the General Population: Cross-Sectional, Longitudinal, and Prospective Analyses. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62(1), 111-123.
- Rountree, P. W., Land, K. C. (1996). Perceived Risk versus Fear of crime: Empirical Evidence of Conceptually Distinct Reactions in Survey Data. *Social Forces*, 74(4), 1353-1376.
- Russo, S., Roccato, M. (2010). How long does victimization foster fear of crime? A longitudinal study. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 38(8), 960-974.
- Russo, S., Roccato, M., Vieno, A. (2011). Predicting Perceived Risk of Crime: A Multilevel Study. *American Journal Community Psychology* 48(3-4), 384-394.
- Skogan, W. G. (1987). The impact of victimization on fear. *Crime & Delinquency*, 33(1), 135-154.
- Smith, W. R., Torstensson, M., Johansson, K. (2001). Perceived Risk and Fear of Crime: Gender Differences in Contextual Sensitivity. *International Review of Victimology*, 8, 159-181.
- Smolej, M., Kivivuori, J. (2006). The Relation Between Crime News and Fear of Violence. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 7, 211-227.
- Smolej, M., Kivivuori, J. (2008). Crime news trends in Finland: A review of recent research. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 9(2), 202-219.
- Stafford, M. C., Galle, O. R. (1984). "Victimization Rates, Exposure to Risk, and Fear of Crime. *Criminology* 22, 173-85.
- Stermac, L., del Bove, G., Addison, M. (2004), Stranger and Acquaintance Sexual Assault of

- Adult Males. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 19(8), 901-915.
- Stermac, L., Du Mont, J., Dunn, S. (1998). Violence in Known-Assailant Sexual Assaults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 13(3), 398-412
- Sutton, R. M., Farrall, S. (2005). Gender, socially desirable responding and the fear of crime: Are Women Really More Anxious about Crime? *British Journal of Criminology*, 45(2), 212–224.
- Sutton, R. M., Robinson, B., Farrall, S. D. (2011). Gender, fear of crime, and self-presentation: an experimental investigation. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 17(5), 421-433.
- Tetreault, P. A., Barnett, M. (1987). Reaction to Stranger and Acquaintance Rape. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 11, 353-358.
- Tseloni, A., Zarafonitou, C. (2008). Fear of Crime and Victimization: A Multivariate Multilevel Analysis of Competing Measurements. *European Journal of Criminology*, 5(4), 387-409.
- Warr, M. (2000). Fear of Crime in the United States: Avenues for Research and Policy. *Criminal Justice*, 4, 451-489.
- Warr, M., Ellison, C. G. (2000). Rethinking Social Reactions to Crime: Personal and Altruistic Fear in Family Households. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106(3), 551-578.
- Weinrath, M., Gartrell, J. (1996). Victimization and Fear of Crime. *Violence and Victims*, 11,187–97.
- Wilcox, P., Jordan, C. E., Pritchard, A. J. (2006). Fear of acquaintance Versus Stranger Rape as a “Master Status”: Towards Refinement of the “Shadow of Sexual Assault”. *Violence and Victims*, 21(3), 355-370.

Williams, P., Dickinson, J. (1993). Fear of crime: read all about it? The Relationship between Newspaper Crime Reporting and Fear of Crime. *British Journal of Criminology*, 33(1), 33-56.

Wyant, B. R. (2008). Multilevel Impacts of Perceived Incivilities and Perceptions of Crime Risk on Fear of Crime: Isolating Endogenous Impacts. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 45(39), 39- 64.

Yar, M. (2012). Crime, media and the will-to-representation: Reconsidering relationships in the new media age. *Crime Media Culture*, 8(3), 245-260.

APPENDIX A: The survey.

Tack för att du ställer upp och svarar på vår enkät! Din medverkan är helt frivillig, du har rätt att avbryta undersökningen när helst du önskar. Dina svar kommer att vara helt anonyma och ingen kommer att kunna knyta dig till dina svar i framtiden. Undersökningen tar ca. 5 minuter och det är till stor hjälp för oss om du tar dig tid att svara på alla frågor så sanningsenligt som möjligt.

Kön:

- Man
- Kvinna
- Annat
- Vill inte säga

Ålder:

Vilken är din högsta avslutade utbildning?

- Högstadium
- Gymnasium
- Universitet/Högskola

Vilket av följande alternativ stämmer bäst överens med staden du bor i?

- Mer än 200 000 invånare
- 50 000-200 000 invånare
- Mindre än 50 000 invånare

Rangordna vilka av följande våldsbrott du tror är vanligast i Sverige genom att sätta 1,2,3,4, eller 5 efter varje brott där 1 är det vanligaste brottet och 5 det ovanligaste. Se till att inte sätta

samma siffra på olika brott.

- Mord
- Rån
- Misshandel
- Våldtäkt
- Hot

På vilken källa baserar du din uppfattning om vilket som är det vanligaste och ovanligaste våldsbrottet?

- Vänner
 - Nyheter i tidningar, TV och på internet
 - Familj
 - Sociala medier, t.ex. Facebook och Twitter
 - Via jobbet
- Annan källa:

Hur stor tror du risken är att du blir rånad av någon du känner?

- Våldigt hög risk
- Hög risk
- Varken eller
- Låg risk
- Ingen risk alls

Om du tänker på den senaste månaden, har du någon gång under denna tid känt dig rädd för att bli rånad av någon du känner?

- Våldigt ofta

- Ganska ofta
- Ganska sällan
- Våldigt sällan
- Det har inte hänt den senaste månaden

Hur stor tror du risken är att du blir rånad av en främmande person?

- Våldigt hög risk
- Hög risk
- Varken eller
- Låg risk
- Ingen risk alls

Om du tänker på den senaste månaden, har du någon gång under denna tid känt dig rädd för att bli rånad av en främmande person?

Våldigt ofta

- Ganska ofta
- Ganska sällan
- Våldigt sällan
- Det har inte hänt den senaste månaden

Hur stor tror du risken är att du blir oprovocerat misshandlad av en person du känner?

- Våldigt hög risk
- Hög risk
- Varken eller
- Låg risk
- Ingen risk alls

Om du tänker på den senaste månaden, har du någon gång under denna tid känt dig rädd för att bli oprovocerat misshandlad av en person du känner?

- Våldigt ofta
- Ganska ofta
- Ganska sällan
- Våldigt sällan
- Det har inte hänt den senaste månaden

Hur stor tror du risken är att du blir oprovocerat misshandlad av en främmande person?

- Våldigt hög risk
- Hög risk
- Varken eller
- Låg risk
- Ingen risk alls

Om du tänker på den senaste månaden, har du någon gång under denna tid känt dig rädd för att bli oprovocerat misshandlad av en främmande person?

- Våldigt ofta
- Ganska ofta
- Ganska sällan
- Våldigt sällan
- Det har inte hänt den senaste månaden

Hur stor tror du risken är att du blir utsatt för hot om våld av en främmande person?

- Våldigt hög risk
- Hög risk

- Varken eller
- Låg risk
- Ingen risk alls

Om du tänker tillbaka på den senaste månaden, har du någon gång under denna tid känt dig rädd för att bli utsatt för hot om våld av en främmande person?

- Våldigt ofta
- Ganska ofta
- Ganska sällan
- Våldigt sällan
- Det har inte hänt den senaste månaden

Hur stor tror du risken är att du blir utsatt för hot om våld av en person du känner?

- Våldigt hög risk
- Hög risk
- Varken eller
- Låg risk
- Ingen risk alls

Om du tänker tillbaka på den senaste månaden, har du någon gång under denna tid känt dig rädd för att bli utsatt för hot om våld av en person du känner?

- Våldigt ofta
- Ganska ofta
- Ganska sällan
- Våldigt sällan
- Det har inte hänt den senaste månaden

Har du någon gång blivit utsatt för något av följande brott? Kryssa för de brott du blivit utsatt för:

- Misshandel
- Personrån
- Hot
- Har aldrig blivit utsatt för något av ovanstående brott

Har någon i din närmaste bekantskapskrets blivit utsatt för något eller några av följande brott?

- Misshandel
- Personrån
- Hot
- Jag känner inte någon som blivit utsatt för något av ovanstående brott.

Om du tänker på frågorna där du har blivit ombedd att skatta hur stor du uppfattar risken för olika händelser, vilken källa tror du din uppfattning främst baseras på?

- Familj
 - Nyheter i tidningar, TV och på nätet
 - Vänner
 - Sociala medier, t.ex. Facebook, Twitter
 - Via jobbet
- Annan källa:

Vi uppskattar din hjälp. Tack så mycket!