

**FEAR OF CRIME:**  
**A SOCIO-CRIMINOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION**

**BY**

**FRANCES ANNE VAN VELZEN, MA (RAU)**

**Submitted in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**in the Department of Criminal Justice**

**University of Zululand**

**Promoter: Prof PJ Potgieter**

**Co-Promoter: Dr LP Mqadi**

**Date of Submission: January 1998**

NEITHER A MAN, NOR A CROWD NOR A NATION CAN BE  
TRUSTED TO ACT HUMANELY OR TO THINK SANELY UNDER  
THE INFLUENCE OF A GREAT FEAR

- Bertrand Russell

*Dedicated to family and friends*

## DECLARATION

I declare that the thesis "Fear of Crime: a Socio-criminological investigation" is my own work both in conception and in execution. All the sources that I have used or quoted from have been acknowledged by means of complete references.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'F. Van Velzen', written over a horizontal line.

F VAN VELZEN

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to the following organizations and persons:

- CSD for their financial assistance. (The statements made in this document do not reflect those of the CSD - but are those of the author);
- University of Zululand for their financial assistance and administrative efficiency;
- My promotor Professor PJ Potgieter for suggesting the study. His advise, pep-talks and guidance proved immeasurable - Dankie Pottie.
- Nigel Bell and Dr Boughey for proof reading and Jill Thomas and Daniela Viljoen for the typing of this document;
- Friends and family - without whose harassment, support and motivational talks I would never have finished this study; and
- Doctor Langalibalele Prince Mqadi - for his guidance and assistance during this study.  
Ngiyabonga - Langa.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	I
DECLARATION	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	III
CONTENTS	IV
TABLES	XI
BIBLIOGRAPHY	261
ANNEXURE A	271
ANNEXURE B	282
ANNEXURE C	312
SUMMARY	XV
OPSOMMING	XVII

### CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.2 FACTORS AFFECTING THE FEAR OF CRIME	2
1.2.1 Vulnerability	2
1.2.1.1 Age	3
1.2.1.2 Gender	4
1.2.1.3 Socio-economic status	4
1.2.1.4 Race	5
1.2.2 Environmental Factors	7
1.2.2.1 Size of the community	7
1.2.2.2 Neighbourhood incivilities and housing conditions	7
1.2.2.3 Neighbourhood cohesion	9
1.2.3 Actual versus perceived risk of victimisation	10
1.2.4 Previous victimisation	11
1.2.5 Types of crime	12
1.2.6 Mass media	13
1.2.7 Effectiveness of the criminal justice system	14

1.2.8	Precautionary measures	15
1.3	MOTIVATION OF THE STUDY	15
1.4	AIMS OF THE STUDY	16
1.5	RESEARCH APPROACH	16
1.6	DELIMITATION OF STUDY	18
1.6.1	Spatial Delimitation	18
1.6.2	Qualitative Delimitation	19
1.6.3	Quantitative Delimitation	19
1.7	DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS	19
1.7.1	Socio-criminology	19
1.7.2	Crime	20
1.7.3	Fear	21
1.7.4	Fear of crime	22
1.8	ORGANISATION OF STUDY	23
1.9	SUMMARY	23

## **CHAPTER TWO: MODELS OF VICTIMOLOGY AND THE FEAR OF CRIME**

2.1	INTRODUCTION	26
2.2	VICTIMISATION	26
2.2.1	Historical overview of victimology	26
2.2.2	Victim Typologies	29
2.2.2.1	Young-Rifai's victim typology	29
2.2.2.2	Mannheim's victim typology	30
2.2.2.3	Schafer's victim typology	31
2.2.2.4	Van der Westhuizen's victim typology	34
2.2.3	Theoretical perspectives of victimology	36
2.2.3.1	The "Synthesis" Approach of Fattah (1976)	37
2.2.3.2	The Routine Activity Approach by Cohen & Felson (1979)	37
2.2.3.3	Opportunity Theory of Cohen, Kleugel & Land (1981)	38
2.2.4	Victims and the fear of crime	39
2.3	MODELS OF FEAR OF CRIME	40
2.3.1	The Irrational Model	41

2.3.1.1	Clemente and Kleiman (1979)	41
2.3.1.2	Garofalo (1979)	42
2.3.1.3	Warr (1990)	44
2.3.2	The Cognitive Model	46
2.3.2.1	Stafford and Galle (1984)	46
2.3.2.2	Baumer (1985)	46
2.3.2.3	The lifestyle model of Hindelang, Gottfredson and Garofalo (1978)	48
2.3.3	The Social Control Model	52
2.3.3.1	Lewis and Maxfield (1980)	53
2.4	MEASUREMENT OF THE FEAR OF CRIME	56
2.5	SUMMARY	59

### **CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

3.1	INTRODUCTION	61
3.2	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	61
3.3	RESEARCH METHODS	63
3.3.1	Method of case analysis	64
3.3.2	Method of mass observation	64
3.3.3	Analytical method	65
3.4	RESEARCH STRATEGY	66
3.4.1	Identification of the research problem	66
3.4.2	The Literature review	67
3.4.3	Conceptualization of the research problem	68
3.5	RESEARCH TECHNIQUES	68
3.5.1	Survey Method	68
3.5.1.1	The questionnaire	69
3.5.1.2	Scales of measurement	74
3.5.1.3	Validity and reliability of the measuring instrument	75
3.5.2	Sampling Procedures	80
3.5.2.1	Spatial delimitation of the sample group	81
3.5.2.2	Qualitative and quantitative delimitation of the sample group	83

3.5.3	Statistical techniques	84
3.5.3.1	Frequency distribution	85
3.5.3.2	Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient ( $\rho$ )	85
3.5.3.3	Pearson's Correlation Coefficient ( $r$ )	86
3.5.3.4	F-distribution (F-test)	87
3.6	SUMMARY	87

## **CHAPTER FOUR: AGE, GENDER, HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS AND THE FEAR OF CRIME**

4.1	INTRODUCTION	89
4.2	AGE AND THE FEAR OF CRIME	90
4.2.1	General findings on age and the fear of crime	90
4.2.2	The elderly and the fear of crime	95
4.2.3	Inconsistent findings	97
4.2.4	Presentation and analysis of data	98
4.3	GENDER AND THE FEAR OF CRIME	102
4.3.1	General findings on gender and the fear of crime	103
4.3.2	Inconsistent findings	105
4.3.3	The presentation and analysis of data	105
4.4	HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS AND THE FEAR OF CRIME	109
4.4.1	General findings on household characteristics and fear of crime	109
4.4.2	Presentation and analysis of data	112
4.4.2.1	Household composition and the fear of crime	113
4.4.2.2	Types of housing and the fear of crime	117
4.5	SUMMARY	121

## **CHAPTER FIVE: PREVIOUS VICTIMISATION**

5.1	INTRODUCTION	122
5.2	GENERAL FINDINGS ON PREVIOUS VICTIMISATION AND FEAR OF CRIME	122
5.3	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	126
5.4	SUMMARY	148



**CHAPTER SIX: CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM**

6.1	INTRODUCTION	149
6.2	GENERAL FINDINGS ON CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND THE FEAR OF CRIME	149
6.3	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	153
6.3.1	Fear of crime and crime as a social problem	157
6.3.2	Fear of crime, crime as a social problem and respondents' opinion of police performance	161
6.4	SUMMARY	167

**CHAPTER SEVEN: THE ROLE OF THE POLICE AND THE FEAR OF CRIME**

7.1	INTRODUCTION	169
7.2	GENERAL FINDINGS	170
7.3	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	173
7.3.1	Fear of crime and the role of the police	183
7.3.2	Gender differences and the role of the police	194
7.4	SUMMARY	199

**CHAPTER EIGHT: RESPONSES TO THE FEAR OF CRIME**

8.1	INTRODUCTION	201
8.2	INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES TO THE FEAR OF CRIME	201
8.2.1	Defensive responses to the fear of crime	202
8.2.2	Offensive responses to the fear of crime	203
8.3	COMMUNITY RESPONSES TO THE FEAR OF CRIME	204
8.3.1	Informal social control	205
8.3.2	Formal social control	206
8.4	CRIME PREVENTION STRATEGIES	209
8.4.1	Vigilantism	209
8.4.2	Civilian police patrols	211
8.4.3	Establishing residential security: O'Block (1981)	213
8.4.4	Neighbourhood Watch Programme	214
8.4.5	Citizen patrols	215

8.4.6	Community Policing	216
8.4.7	The impact of social development programmes on crime prevention	218
8.5	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	219
8.5.1	Involvement of the neighbourhood and the fear of crime	225
8.6	SUMMARY	233

## **CHAPTER NINE: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

9.1	INTRODUCTION	236
9.2	LIMITATIONS AND PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN THIS STUDY	236
9.3	TESTING HYPOTHESES	237
9.4	GENERALISATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	248
9.4.1	Age, gender, household characteristics and fear of crime	248
9.4.1.1	Age and the fear of crime	248
9.4.1.2	Gender and the fear of crime	249
9.4.1.3	Household composition and fear of crime	250
9.4.1.4	Type of housing and fear of crime	251
9.4.2	Previous victimisation and fear of crime	251
9.4.3	Crime as a social problem and fear of crime	252
9.4.3.1	Crime as a social problem and respondents opinion of police performance	253
9.4.4	Role of the police	253
9.4.4.1	Fear of crime and contact with the police	254
9.4.4.2	Reporting and non-reporting of crime and the fear of crime	254
9.4.4.3	Obligation to crime prevention and fear of crime	254
9.4.4.4	Public's opinion of police performance and visibility and fear of crime	254
9.4.4.5	Gender differences in the respondents experience with the police	255
9.4.5	Involvement in the neighbourhood and fear of crime	255
9.5	CONCLUSIONS	256

9.6	RECOMMENDATIONS	258
9.6.1	Recommendation for police-community relations	258
9.6.2	Future research	260

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
3.1 VALIDITY OF THE FEAR OF CRIME MEASURE	75
3.2 RELIABILITY OF THE FEAR OF CRIME MEASURE	77
3.3 RELIABILITY OF THE FEAR OF SPECIFIC CRIME SCALE	78
3.4 RELIABILITY OF THE RATING SCALE OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS	79
3.5 RELIABILITY OF THE MEASURE OF RESPONDENTS VIEW OF POLICE SERVICE	80
4.1 AGE AND THE FEAR OF CRIME	100
4.2 AGE AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION	101
4.3 AGE AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME	102
4.4 GENDER AND THE FEAR OF CRIME	106
4.5 GENDER AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION	107
4.6 GENDER AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME	108
4.7 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION	113
4.8 HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION AND THE FEAR OF CRIME	114
4.9 HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION	115
4.10 HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME	116
4.11 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF TYPE OF HOUSING	117
4.12 TYPE OF HOUSING AND THE FEAR OF CRIME	118
4.13 TYPE OF HOUSING AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION	119
4.14 TYPE OF HOUSING AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME	120
5.1 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PREVIOUS VICTIMISATION	127
5.2 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PREVIOUS PERSONAL VICTIMISATION	128

5.3	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PREVIOUS PROPERTY VICTIMISATION	129
5.4	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PREVIOUS PERSONAL VICTIMISATION EXPERIENCE AND THE FEAR OF CRIME	131
5.5	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PREVIOUS PERSONAL VICTIMISATION EXPERIENCE AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION	134
5.6	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PREVIOUS PERSONAL VICTIMISATION EXPERIENCE AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME	137
5.7	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PREVIOUS PROPERTY VICTIMISATION AND THE FEAR OF CRIME	140
5.8	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PREVIOUS PROPERTY VICTIMISATION EXPERIENCE AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION	143
5.9	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PREVIOUS PROPERTY VICTIMISATION EXPERIENCE AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME	146
6.1	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENT RATING OF TYPES OF CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM IN THEIR AREA OF RESIDENCE	155
6.2	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE INCREASE IN CRIME RATE	157
6.3	STATUTORY CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND FEAR OF CRIME	158
6.4	PERSONAL VICTIMISATION AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND FEAR OF CRIME	159
6.5	PROPERTY CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND FEAR OF CRIME	160
6.6	STATUTORY CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND POLICE PERFORMANCE	162

6.7	PERSONAL VICTIMISATION AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND POLICE PERFORMANCE	163
6.8	PROPERTY CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND POLICE PERFORMANCE	165
7.1	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF TYPE OF CONTACT WITH THE POLICE	174
7.2	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE REPORTING OF CRIME	175
7.3	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING CRIME	176
7.4	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS' ATTITUDE TOWARD COMBATING CRIME	177
7.5	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF FEELINGS TOWARD CONTACT WITH THE POLICE	178
7.6	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS' FEAR OF POLICEMEN	179
7.7	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLIC'S OPINION OF POLICE PERFORMANCE	180
7.8	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE PATROLLING OF THE RESIDENTIAL AREAS	182
7.9	FEAR OF CRIME, CONTACT WITH THE POLICE AND CRIME REPORTING	184
7.10	FEAR OF CRIME AND THE RESPONDENTS FEELINGS TOWARD CONTACT WITH THE POLICE	187
7.11	FEAR OF CRIME AND THE PUBLIC'S OBLIGATION TOWARDS CRIME PREVENTION	189
7.12	FEAR OF CRIME AND THE PUBLIC'S OPINION OF POLICE PERFORMANCE	191
7.13	FEAR OF CRIME AND POLICE VISIBILITY	193
7.14	GENDER AND CONTACT WITH THE POLICE	195
7.15	GENDER AND FEELINGS TOWARDS CONTACT WITH POLICE	196
7.16	GENDER AND OBLIGATION TO COMBAT CRIME	197

7.17	GENDER AND PUBLIC'S OPINION OF POLICE PERFORMANCE	198
7.18	GENDER AND POLICE VISIBILITY	199
8.1	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SECURITY MEASURES TAKEN TO PROTECT PROPERTY	221
8.2	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SECURITY MEASURES TAKEN TO PROTECT PROPERTY	223
8.3	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF INVOLVEMENT OF NEIGHBOURS AS A PROTECTIVE MEASURE	224
8.4	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF INVOLVEMENT IN A NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAMME	225
8.5	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO ARE INVOLVED/UNINVOLVED WITH THEIR NEIGHBOURS	228
8.6	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO ARE INVOLVED/UNINVOLVED IN NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAMMES	231

## SUMMARY

Each individual's personal security is basic to the quality of life of a community. If the quality of life is affected by crime or the fear of criminal victimisation, then both crime and the fear of crime should be viewed as a social problem.

The fear of crime is the focus point of this study as it produces changes in the lifestyle of the individual and the functioning of the community. Fear of crime generates feelings of anxiety, general mistrust, alienation and suspicion. At a social level, it can lead to a break down of social cohesion, the curtailment of normal activities and an unwillingness to help others.

The study aims at bridging the gap in our substantive knowledge regarding the fear of crime. Through the use of a questionnaire, the study further seeks to establish the following:

- \* Statistically measure and describe the nature and extent of fear of crime.
- \* Determine the factors affecting fear of crime.
- \* Account for the differences and variations in the fear of crime according to age, gender, household composition and type of housing, previous victimisation, crime as a social problem, role of the police and community neighbourhood involvement.
- \* Make non-prescriptive recommendations for the prevention of criminal victimisation that might directly influence the quality of life.

Research techniques employed in the study included the following:

- \* Literature study of research done on the fear of crime covering the 1970s, 1980s and early 1990s.
- \* A structured questionnaire consisting of demographical information and questions pertaining to the factors influencing fear of crime.



- \* Non-probability sampling techniques.
- \* Statistical techniques to test the reliability of the measuring instrument and ten formulated hypotheses.

The findings of the study indicate the following:

- (a) Age is related to fear of crime.
- (b) Gender is the strongest predictor of fear.
- (c) Household composition is related to the fear of crime.
- (d) No significant differences were found between the type of housing respondents live in and fear of crime.
- (e) In general, people who have been previously victimised are more fearful of crime than those who have not.
- (f) Concern about crime and fear of crime are related issues, as people who are concerned about crime, generally fear crime.
- (g) The role of the police has not proved to be a significant factor influencing the fear of crime of respondents.
- (h) Neighbourhood involvement tends to reduce levels of the community's fear of crime.

The following non-prescriptive recommendations are made:

- \* Improvement of the image of the South African Police Service (SAPS) is a necessity to foster confidence in and respect for policing.
- \* Increased role visibility of the police.
- \* Promotion of effective Neighbourhood Watch Programmes.
- \* Active involvement of citizens in community policing forums.

## OPSOMMING

Elke individu se persoonlike veiligheid is afhanklik van die kwaliteit van lewe in 'n gemeenskap. Indien hierdie kwaliteit van lewe deur misdaad of vrees vir kriminele viktimisasie geaffekteer word, dan behoort misdaad en vrees vir misdaad as maatskaplike probleme beskou te word.

Vrees vir misdaad vorm die fokuspunt van die onderhawige studie, aangesien dit lei tot veranderinge in die lewenstyl van die individu en beïnvloed ook die funksionering van die gemeenskap. Vrees vir misdaad kweek gevoelens van angs, wantroue, vervreemding en agterdog. Op maatskaplike vlak kan dit lei tot 'n ineenstorting van sosiale kohesie, die inkorting van normale aktiviteite en 'n onbereidwilligheid om ander te help.

Hierdie studie beoog om die gaping in ons kennis van vrees vir misdaad aan te vul. Deur gebruik te maak van 'n gestruktureerde vraelys, beoog die studie verder om:

- \* die aard en omvang van die vrees vir misdaad statisties te beskryf;
- \* faktore te identifiseer wat vrees vir misdaad beïnvloed/affekteer;
- \* die variasies en verskille in vrees vir misdaad te analiseer - spesifiek wat betref ouderdom, geslag, hoeveelheid inwoners van 'n huis, en tipe behuising, vorige viktimisasie ondervinding, misdaad as in maatskaplike probleem, rol van die polisie en die gemeenskap se buurtbetrokkenheid;
- \* nie-voorskriftelike voorkomingsmaatreëls aan die hand te doen wat 'n afname in die vrees vir misdaad tot gevolg kan hê.

Navorsingstegnieke wat in hierdie studie gebruik word behels die volgende:

- \* 'n Literatuurstudie betreffende navorsing oor die vrees vir misdaad sedert die sewentiger jare tot die vroeë negentigs.
- \* 'n Gestruktureerde vraelys wat die demografiese gegewens van respondente en

hulle response insluit betreffende faktore wat vrees vir misdaad beïnvloed.

- \* Nie-waarskynlike steekproefneming.
- \* Statistiese tegnieke om die geldigheid en betroubaarheid van die meetinstrument en tien geformuleerde hipoteses te toets.

Die bevindings van die studie dui daarop dat:

- (a) Ouderdom verband hou met vrees vir misdaad.
- (b) Geslag die sterkste voorspeller van vrees vir misdaad is.
- (c) Die hoeveelheid mense wat saamwoon verband hou met vrees vir misdaad.
- (d) Geen beduidende verskille tussen die tipe behuising van 'n respondent en die vrees vir misdaad voorkom nie.
- (e) Respondente wat 'n vorige viktimisasie beleef het meer vreesbevange is as dié wat nooit vantevore gevitimiseer was nie.
- (f) Besorgdheid oor misdaad en vrees vir misdaad hou verband met mekaar. Respondente wat misdaad as 'n maatskaplike probleem in hul residensiële gebiede beskou, vrees ook kriminele viktimisasie.
- (g) Die rol van die polisie nie 'n beduidende invloed op die vrees vir misdaad gehad het nie.
- (h) Buurtbetrokkenheid tot 'n afname in die gemeenskap se vlakke van vrees lei.

Die volgende aanbevelings word voorgelê ten opsigte van die voorkoming van vrees vir misdaad:

- \* Verbetering van die beeld van die Suid-Afrikaanse Polisie diens om vertroue in en respek vir polisiëring te bewerkstellig.
- \* Rolsigbaarheid van die polisie moet verhoog word.
- \* Doeltreffende buurtwagprogramme behoort bevorder te word.
- \* Aktiewe deelname van inwoners in gemeenskapspolisiëringsforums.

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **GENERAL ORIENTATION**

#### **1.1 INTRODUCTION**

South Africa is a society in transition. Through this process of change, tensions and strains are being created which often take their overt form in crime and violence.

Each individual's personal security is basic to the quality of life of a community and Conklin (1975:1) states that personal security is "... affected more by crime than by anything else". If the quality of life experienced by the individual and community is affected by crime, then crime itself can be viewed as a social problem. However, often crime and violence are not experienced directly by either the individual or in the community itself. Instead, via information obtained from the media, friends and/or police, the individual and the community begin to view crime as a threat. They perceive a risk of actually being a victim of crime. This threat, whether real or perceived, promotes a fear of crime and this fear generates changes in the individual's lifestyle and in the community at large. Fear of crime then becomes a social problem, and can be recognised as an issue which is, according to Smith and Glanz (1989:54), "... separate from crime itself".

The fear of crime and crime itself are perceived as social problems because they threaten lives, security, property, the sense of well-being, social order and, most importantly they reduce our quality of life (Garofalo 1979; Garofalo & Laub 1978 and Maris 1987). Clemente and Kleiman (1977:520) claim that the fear of crime has had severe consequences in that it has forced a change in our daily habits ".....as well as .... negative psychological effects of living in a state of constant anxiety".

The consequences of fear of crime are varied and numerous, but two areas which are severely affected by this fear are the psychological and social lives of people. Psychologically, fear of crime generates feelings of anxiety, general mistrust, suspicion, alienation, dissatisfaction with life and, in some cases, mental illness (Box, Hale &

Andrews 1988; Glanz 1989; Liska, Sanchirico & Reed 1988).

Socially, the fear of crime holds the following consequences:

- breakdown of social cohesion and solidarity
- curtailment of normal activities
- perpetuation of the violent subculture
- avoidance of sites and situations associated with crime
- disappearance of sociability, mutual trust, willingness to help others
- avoidance of strangers (Box et al. 1988; Clemente & Kleiman 1979; Liska et al. 1988; Smith & Glanz 1989 and Warr 1990).

The social consequences of the fear of crime or victimization is what makes this fear a major social problem. Some of the fear can be accounted for by the actual amount of crime in the neighbourhood, but much of this fear is caused by subjective, perceptual and sociostructural factors.

## **1.2 FACTORS AFFECTING THE FEAR OF CRIME**

One of the most prominent factors affecting fear of crime is: vulnerability.

### **1.2.1 Vulnerability**

Vulnerability to crime and victimisation can be approached on two distinct levels, the physical and the social. Physical vulnerability refers to certain personal traits which render the individual incapable of protecting himself or herself physically and emotionally from victimisation and its consequences. Such traits include age and gender (Baumer 1985; Box et al. 1988 and Toseland 1982). Social vulnerability refers to circumstances such as being poor or belonging to an ethnic minority group which makes it difficult for the individual to prevent victimisation (Smith & Glanz 1989; Toseland 1982).

Vulnerability implies a sense of powerlessness on the part of individuals to protect themselves from being victimised and to recover from the victimisation experience.

Being vulnerable also puts the individual at risk of possible victimisation, i.e. the vulnerable are easy prey for criminals because of their inability to fight back. Crime becomes a disturbing threat to those who are vulnerable, and the resulting fear of crime can have debilitating consequences for their behaviour. Researchers (Box et al. 1988; Baumer 1978; Baumer 1985; Clemente & Kleiman 1977 and Toseland 1982) have identified four human groups which can be considered vulnerable, namely the elderly, women, the poor, and ethnic minority groups. However, since age, gender, socio-economic status and ethnic groups are all factors influencing fear, the vulnerable will be discussed within the framework of the broader categories.

#### 1.2.1.1 Age

The influence that age has on the fear of crime is inconsistent. Research findings vary from positive correlations between age and fear (Clemente & Kleiman 1977; Conklin 1975; Garofalo 1979 and Toseland 1982) to findings that indicate no relationship between the two variables (Smith & Glanz 1989). Baumer (1985:256) is of the opinion that there is a relationship between the fear of crime and age, i.e. there is a higher fear of crime among respondents over the age of sixty. The question which now arises is why the elderly are more fearful than other age categories. Several reasons have been proposed by various authors (Baumer 1978; Box et al. 1988; Clemente & Kleiman 1977 and Toseland 1982). The most likely explanations given are that, firstly, the elderly are more open to physical attack because their physical strength and agility is declining. Secondly, they lack the resources to cope with victimisation, i.e. they are poorer so it is difficult to replace that which is lost; they are frailer and minor injury can be incapacitating and they quite often lack emotional support from friends and family. Box et al. (1988:352) conclude that "... age gnaws the strongest spirit ...", making older men and women equally vulnerable to the threat of criminal victimisation.

However, it has been noted by various researchers (Baumer 1985; Box et al. 1988 and Toseland 1982) that although the elderly fear crime, their actual victimisation rate is low. Toseland (1982:205) found that older people, being more fearful, tend to reduce their social activities and implement measures because they are fearful of crime, i.e. precautionary steps are taken by the elderly to reduce their risk of victimisation. The

elderly, knowing that the consequences of victimisation can affect their quality of life markedly, change their lifestyle accordingly. The mere perception of the consequences of victimisation may thus account for the high fear of crime experienced by the elderly.

#### 1.2.1.2 Gender

Gender has emerged as the most powerful predictor of fear of personal crimes. Various authors (Clemente & Kleiman 1977; Conklin 1975 and Garofalo 1978;) have found that women are considerably more fearful of crime than men. The explanations for these findings are firstly, that women as a group are more vulnerable as they lack physical strength and fighting powers; secondly, they are targets for a larger range of personal and life-threatening offences such as rape. Garofalo (1979:87) suggests that high levels of fear among women may be due to passive sex-role socialisation, i.e. women are taught to think of themselves as helpless and powerless.

However, Clemente and Kleiman (1977:522) note that women were less likely to be victims of personal crime than men but that they reported more fear of crime than men. Various authors (Clemente & Kleiman 1977; Garofalo 1979 and Toseland 1982) opine that men are reluctant to admit to fear because of the expectations associated with the masculine role, and this could be a reason why a disparity exists between the sexes. Box et al. (1988:352) also point out that because women consider themselves vulnerable to personal victimisation they have developed "... the subtle arts of offender avoidance". That is, they tend to take precautionary steps to avoid victimisation. Toseland (1982:205) notes that women avoid walking alone in the evenings. Women perceive themselves as vulnerable to victimisation and thus their fear of crime increases.

#### 1.2.1.3 Socio-economic status

The socio-economic variable encompasses income, education and occupation. The relationship between these factors and the fear of crime has varied from a definite influence to no influence at all. Clemente and Kleiman (1977:523) found an inverse relationship between socio-economic status and the personal victimisation rate, but the

reverse was true for property crimes. When fear of crime is considered, a negative relationship develops with socio-economic status. Garofalo (1979:85) also reported that fear of crime and rates of victimisation both decline as income increases. The conclusion drawn may be that people with greater financial resources are able to protect themselves from harm and are therefore less fearful of crime. People with low incomes do not have the resources to replace that which is lost and therefore are more fearful of crime.

Various authors (Baumer 1978; Clemente & Kleiman 1977 and Garofalo 1979) propose that the relationship between fear of crime and socio-economic factors may be due to the 'areal' effect. People who are the same tend to group together in a homogenous neighbourhood. Thus, high crime areas are most often populated by lower income groups. Higher income groups can afford to stay in safer neighbourhoods. Smith and Glanz (1989:59) noted that within the South African context, socio-economic status (as measured by education level) influenced the fear of crime. Among the white population group, higher income ensures relative isolation from the risk of personal victimisation and a greater ability to protect against property victimisation. Higher income residential areas are also fairly isolated from high crime areas. Upper income coloured and indian areas are close to high crime areas, and thus fear of crime can be expected to increase as socio-economic status increases. Black residential areas are not segregated along income lines, but residents in high income areas are targets of property victimisation.

Schurink and Prinsloo (1978:8) in their analysis of the fear of crime among black urban residents, found that an increase in income led to an increase in fear of both male and female respondents. Women were reported to fear crime more as their education level increased, but men were found to be less fearful of crime.

Fear of crime, then, affects not only the well-educated, higher income person, but also the less educated and lower income person (Toseland 1982:207).

#### 1.2.1.4 Race

Various researchers in the USA have proposed that a high fear of crime is associated



with being black, and having a low income and education level. Clemente and Kleiman (1977:523) claim, however, that although empirical evidence suggests that blacks are more afraid of victimisation than whites, their research indicates that race ranked fifth out of six explanatory variables, and thus the effects are less than what has been previously proposed. Parker and Ray (1990:37) reveal that in their study, black males reported higher fear of crime than their female counterparts. The researchers suggest that the reasons for this finding could be ascribed to black males being engaged in activities which include risk of victimisation, and that the mass media shows them to be victims of violent crimes. This creates the impression that they are targets for crime, and increases their level of fear and perceived risk of victimisation.

Smith and Glanz (1989:59) noted that within the South African context, blacks are less fearful of crime than other population groups. This is inconsistent with the high reported rate of victimisation. The work of Conklin (1975) provided a reason for this as he proposed that people who live in high crime areas tend to deny the high risk of victimisation so that they can preserve a sense of security.

Garofalo (1979:86), as well as other authors (Baumer 1978; Clemente & Kleiman 1977), reported that the principle of homogeneity discussed within the socio-economic status applied to race as well. That is, people tend to group together spatially according to income and racial characteristics. This would imply that the fear of crime and the risk of victimisation may be a reflection of the convergence of these factors in geographical location. In contrast to Parker and Ray (1990:37), who claim that race is a powerful predictor, Toseland (1982:204) opines that race is relatively unimportant as a predictor of fear of crime. He found that although black respondents were more fearful of crime than white respondents, the relationship was very weak. Thus contradictory evidence exists with regard to race as a factor which influences the fear of crime.

Although contradictory evidence exists pertaining to the effect that vulnerability (either age, gender, socio-economics or race) has on the fear of crime, it is important to note that vulnerability must be considered in terms of the impact of crime on its victims: i.e. how victims perceive crime and how it affects them. If people perceive themselves as being vulnerable, their perceived risk of victimisation is high, and they will fear crime

and take preventative measures to combat it.

### **1.2.2 Environmental factors**

Fear of crime affects not only the possible victim but also the community at large. Lewis and Salem (1986:5) propose that fear of crime can be approached in two ways, namely by focusing on the individual (i.e. demographic factors), or by focusing on an assessment of the neighbourhood (i.e. the environment) in which people live. Characteristics of the environment include size of the community, neighbourhood incivilities, housing conditions and neighbourhood cohesion.

#### **1.2.2.1 Size of the community**

The size of the community is related to fear of crime. Clemente and Kleiman (1977:524) reported that the crime rate for personal crimes increases as one moves from smaller towns to suburbs and into the central city. Baumer (1985:245) found that residents of cities over 10,000 reported more fear than residents of suburbs or smaller towns. This observation seems to confirm previous research which reported that urban dwellers tend to be more fearful of crime than residents in other areas (Clemente & Kleiman 1977; Lewis & Maxfield 1980). Toseland (1982:207) expressed the view that the reason for this relationship is that urban dwellers are more exposed to crime than residents of small towns or rural areas. Crime rates are known to be higher in urban areas. The likelihood of being an actual witness to a criminal act is greater and the chance of having friends who have been victims is also greater in urban areas. Conklin (1975:139) claims that people in cities tend to 'expect crime', while those living in suburbs, small towns and rural areas are less expectant of criminal victimisation.

#### **1.2.2.2 Neighbourhood incivilities and housing conditions**

When people view their neighbourhood as threatening, they may become fearful of criminal victimisation. Box et al. (1988:541) argues that neighbourhoods which include noisy neighbours, graffiti, gangs, vagrants, uncollected garbage and abandoned buildings may be regarded as unpredictable, in a state of decline, and threatening.

Previous research by Lewis and Maxfield (1980) and Lewis and Salem (1986) indicated that all of the above characteristics promoted fear. However, other characteristics such as empty streets, drug use, vandalism, ethnic conflict and inadequate municipal services also act as indicators of neighbourhood decay and incivility. Certain of the abovementioned incivilities are, according to Lewis and Maxfield (1980:180), youth-related, i.e. drugs, vandalism, gang activity and teenagers hanging around. Respondents living in neighbourhoods with a large number of teenagers reported greater concern with youth-related incivilities than with crimes of assault and rape. The authors concluded that fear of crime may be directly affected by concern for local adolescents. Later research by Smith and Jarjoura (1989:682) confirmed the relationship between victimisation and youth, as they concluded that neighbourhoods with high victimisation rates can be characterized by "... greater family disruption, lower socio-economic status, or a relatively larger population of youth".

Neighbourhood incivilities produce anxiety among neighbourhood residents and can easily generate fear. Many of the incivilities are not criminal offences which can be controlled by the traditional criminal justice system. Although some of the incivilities will attract police attention, e.g. gang activity, drug use or vandalism, police are not required to deal with less offensive neighbourhood incivilities - such as abandoned buildings, uncollected garbage or noisy neighbours. Kelling and Wilson (1982:29-38) proposed that the police are responsible for eliminating such incivilities as rowdy teenagers, drunkards appearing in public, panhandlers, etc. who create fear and lead to neighbourhood decay. These authors coined the broken windows metaphor to refer to neighbourhood deterioration - a sign that nobody cares. Once a window is broken and left unrepaired, other windows are soon broken. Similarly (and analogous to this viewpoint), once a 'social window' is broken and left unrepaired (such as vagrancy, vandalism, loitering, and public drunkenness), Regoli and Hewitt (1996), state that "... (t)his sets in motion a downward spiral of deterioration ... (g)radually, crime in the neighbourhood increases" (Regoli & Hewitt 1996:231).

Incivilities define a perceived problem with social disorganisation in the neighbourhood and in the community at large. Hunter (in Lewis & Salem 1986:9) views fear within the

urban environment as a fear of social disorder that "... results more from experiencing incivility than from direct experiences with crime". Incivility then reflects circumstances suggesting that the neighbourhood is unsafe and that the mechanisms for exercising social control are no longer effective. Lewis and Maxfield (1980:185), in their analysis of fear in various neighbourhoods in Chicago, found that people who are concerned about crime are also concerned about incivility and social order. Their evidence suggests that it is a continuation of incivility and concern with crime that affects neighbourhood fear levels. However, the belief is held by various authors (Box et al. 1988; Lewis & Maxfield 1980) that if a sense of community well-being and co-operation can be developed, the fear of crime will be reduced. If order can be re-established, the neighbourhood will become a safe place to live in once more.

#### 1.2.2.3 Neighbourhood cohesion

Within neighbourhoods, certain conditions exist which provide the residents with information regarding the safety of their environment. One of these conditions is neighbourhood incivilities, and the other is the degree of cohesiveness (measured by the amount of solidarity, integration, trust, support, involvement and co-operation) present within the community.

In their analysis of the impact of social integration on fear of crime, Lewis and Salem (1986:84) propose that in neighbourhoods where there is a high degree of social integration, residents feel that they are part of the neighbourhood, and also tend to develop a friendship network within their own community. Bonds of friendship are established through informal neighbouring activities that increase over a period of time. Such integration provides a support system for neighbourhood residents. The support involves a willingness to help each other, and this engenders feelings of security and safety. Various researchers (Box et al. 1988; Hartnagel 1979; Kennedy & Silverman 1985) are of the opinion that a lack of social support, friendship networks and co-operation could lead residents to feel isolated and afraid. Residents who are uninvolved in their community tend to be more fearful of crime than those who are involved. Conklin (1975:141) reported in this regard that areas with less crime showed greater social solidarity, social interaction between neighbours, and participation in local

organisations.

Interaction between neighbours generates trust and interdependence. When neighbours know each other they are able to guard each other from harm through informal social control mechanisms. However, when there is limited contact between neighbours, mistrust and lack of co-operation prevail and, consequently the informal mechanisms of social control are not established. Lack of informal social control may result in an increase in the crime rate and a resulting increase in the fear of crime. Thus, if cohesiveness between neighbours and within the community is established, the fear of crime is likely to be reduced (Box et al. 1988; Garofalo & Laub 1978; Lewis & Salem 1986; Toseland 1982).

Particular emphasis is placed on informal mechanism for social control when reference is made to cohesiveness. However, as this is both a consequence of, and a solution to, the problem of fear of crime, greater attention will be paid to it in later chapters.

### **1.2.3 Actual versus perceived risk of victimisation**

Various researchers (Baumer 1985; Clemente & Kleiman 1977; Garofalo 1979 and Toseland 1982) have noted that discrepancies exist between the actual rate of victimisation and the perceived risk of victimisation and, in turn, their relationship to the fear of crime. A classic example of this discrepancy is that although the elderly have a low rate of actual victimisation, they perceive their risk of victimisation as greater, and are therefore more frightened than other age groups.

Conklin (1975:17) reports that people tend to react to their perception of social problems rather than to the problems themselves. With regard to crime, perceptions are influenced by officially reported rates of crime, but neither the perceptions nor the reported rates reflect the actual amount of crime within the society. The information individuals receive and the ideas they form about crime can create the impression that crime is escalating. As individuals grow more anxious about the crime rate the more fearful they become, as the perception is formed that crime is becoming a personal threat. Lab (1988:7) opines that fear of crime is not related to actual levels of

victimisation. Rather, levels of fear increase faster and appear to exceed the actual levels of victimisation. People then respond to factors which are not related to the actual chance of being victimised. The imbalance between actual levels and perceived risk of victimisation could be explained as follows:

- ◆ *Direct knowledge* about someone who has been victimized, or simply being told by someone else about a harmful act, may elicit a sympathetic reaction and empathetic fear of crime. *Indirect knowledge* about crime may result from real or dramatic depictions of crime in the mass media.
- ◆ Ordinate levels of fear may result from potential harm during victimisation encounters. For example, the elderly and women are more fearful of victimisation because of their vulnerability.
- ◆ Actual levels of crime in society also influence the level of fear through sensational reporting of crime in the mass media (Lab 1988:8-9).

In conclusion, Baumer (1985:251) notes "... that overall fear is a response to subjectively defined risk and personal vulnerability".

#### **1.2.4 Previous victimisation**

Knowledge of crime, whether directly or indirectly obtained, affects people's fear of crime. Various authors (Skogan 1987, Baumer 1985; Garofalo 1978) agree that a simplistic relationship does not exist between previous victimisation and fear. Rather, any link between previous victimisation and fear of crime must take into account the time-lapse between the victimisation and the research study, the type of victimisation (i.e. either property or personal), and possible precautionary measures instituted by the victim after the victimisation experience.

Garofalo (1979:87) and Baumer (1985:250) stated that personal experience of victimisation can only be used to explain the fear of crime if it occurred in a certain reference period. Furthermore, Garofalo (1979:87) opined that "... victimizations that occurred more than twelve months before the interview - unless they were extremely serious - would have little affect on fear of crime at the time of the interview". These

authors also reported that victims are more fearful than non-victims. However, the number of victims is relatively small compared to the number of non-victims, and thus their higher level of fear does not affect the overall level of fear of the general population.

Individuals who have suffered previous property victimisation are more fearful of crime than those who have not been victimised (Toseland, 1982:106). This fear may be due to the violation of a person's security, and the fear that the next time the person may be present and become a victim of a personal crime.

In general, the findings tend to be inconclusive as to the relationship between previous victimisation and fear of crime. It must be noted, however that victims will tend to take more precautionary action than non-victims. This could alleviate fear and enable the victim to neutralise his/her experience. Box et al. (1988:351) found that the effect of knowing someone who has been victimised is likely to increase the level of fear for non-victims. They also linked previous victimisation to the level of incivility in the neighbourhood. Victims who live in areas of high incivility generally have a higher level of fear. The reverse is also true for victims living in areas of low incivility. The authors propose that the victim in the latter case is able to neutralise his/her experience.

### **1.2.5 Types of crime**

Assessment of the fear of crime must take into account the variety of crimes which exist in society. A distinction can be drawn between property crimes and personal crimes. Property crimes refer to crimes in which the cases accrued are due to loss or damage to property, e.g. burglary, larceny and car theft. Personal crimes include attempted and completed acts of assault, mugging, rape and murder. Ferraro and La Grange (1987:80) suggest that not all criminal offences pose similar levels of threat to individuals. However, it is generally agreed that offences such as robbery, rape and aggravated assault (which are categorised under the heading of street crimes) tend to evoke the greatest fear of all. Various authors (Garofalo & Laub 1978; Miethe, Stafford & Long 1987) agree that street crime not only victimises individuals but prevents the formation and maintenance of community life. Street crime reduces interaction and

levels of mutual trust, thus having an erosive effect on the quality of life. Thus it is the individual's assessment of street crime that has a direct influence on the level of fear.

Toseland (1982:206) found that personal victimisation is associated with the fear of crime. The level of fear experienced by victims of a burglary may be due to the person feeling that the next time his or her residence is burgled he or she may be present, and become a victim of a personal crime. The author noted, however, that evidence on the effects of muggings, beatings and other crimes was inconclusive as less than 5 per cent of his respondents had reported being victimised in this manner.

However, Ferraro and La Grange (1987:80) comment that any attempt to measure fear of crime should make "... explicit reference to crime". Specific victimisations must be used to assess an individual's fear reaction. These sentiments were echoed by Smith and Glanz (1989:89) who conclude that a shortcoming of their own study on fear of crime is that no distinction had been drawn between fear of personal crime and fear of property crime. Thus any future research should clarify this distinction.

#### **1.2.6 Mass media**

Sources of fear of crime are many and varied. As a victim, one's physical vulnerability and environmental characteristics all seem to influence fear. However, most people have neither been a victim nor a witness to crime. This implies that the perception of crime that individuals develop may be due to indirect sources. One of these sources is the mass media.

According to Conklin (1975:20), the climate of concern about crime can be generated or reinforced by information from the mass media. This information can create the impression that crime is a threat and result in an increase in fear. Baumer (1978:259) indicates that media reports of crime tend to overemphasize serious crimes or those of personal violence. Williams and Dickinson (1993:49) confirm these results in their analysis of crime reporting in British newspapers. They concluded that people who read newspapers which contain crime reports show more fear of crime. However, they warned that the causal link between newspapers and fear of crime is not clear.



Garofalo (1978:91) opines that media depictions of crime does have some effects on the public's fear of crime, but that the effect of the media on fear of crime is difficult to quantify.

When looking for a link between the mass media and fear of crime consideration must be given to other influences as well and the compounded effect they may have on fear of crime.

### **1.2.7 Effectiveness of the criminal justice system**

The nature of the image of the police is determined by their relationship with the public. The image is based on the public's perception of police performance, i.e. their delivery of a service. A positive image will promote willing participation by the community in combating crime; while a negative image places power structure/order of the community under suspicion (Van Heerden 1976:140).

Although the majority of the population never comes into direct contact with the police, their knowledge of police activity is based on personal observation at street level and media representations of the police.

The main goal of the police is to prevent crime (Van Heerden 1976:156). Crime weakens the fabric of social life and also reduces the public's support for the law, their willingness to report crime and increases the public's criticism of the police. If people believe that the police are effective, that is, that they apprehend criminals, respond to calls quickly and have a physical presence, then they are less likely to fear crime. The findings of various authors (Baumer 1985; Box et al. 1988 and Conklin 1975) indicate that individuals who have confidence in the functioning of their local police have a lower level of fear than individuals who have no confidence in the police. Within the South African context, Neser, Geldenhuys, Stevens, Grobbelaar and Ladikos (1993:41) found that individuals who have a general fear of crime have little confidence in the police and in the courts. When people lack confidence in the criminal justice system they will be unwilling to report a crime or assist the police in any way. If this lack of support

becomes known to criminals, they are more likely to perpetrate crime, as their risk of apprehension is lower. This in turn can lead to a higher crime rate, which produces an increasing reliance on the police to combat crime and also increases people's fear of crime.

### **1.2.8 Precautionary measures**

Precautionary measures refer to those measures taken, before or after criminal victimisation, to protect the person or property against any future victimisation. These precautionary measures refer to defensive and offensive responses to crime and the fear of crime. Defensive responses involve avoidance behaviour on the part of the individual (e.g. not going out at night or alone) and offensive responses which involve active measures of crime prevention (e.g. purchasing a firearm, installing burglar proofing and joining a neighbourhood watch programme). These measures can influence the individual's fear of crime, as they are implemented to make the individual feel safer.

## **1.3 MOTIVATION OF THE STUDY**

The study to be undertaken is regarded as necessary to our understanding and management of the fear of criminal victimisation.

The following served as the motivation for the undertaking of this study:

- (i) With the exception of Schurink and Strijdom (1976) and Schurink and Prinsloo (1978), Glanz (1989), Smith and Glanz (1989), Pretorius (1994), Naser et al. (1993) and Maree (1993) research on the fear of crime in South Africa is limited.
- (ii) The physical area of the research is the developing area of Richards Bay and Empangeni in KwaZulu-Natal. Although this area can be regarded as rural, its growth and political background ensure that violence (whether politically or criminally motivated) is a daily reality.

- (iii) As crime is omnipresent, it is the opinion of the researcher that fear of crime is pervasive in the Richards Bay and Empangeni community. A study of this social phenomenon therefore becomes a necessity.

#### **1.4. AIMS OF THE STUDY**

Fear of crime is omnipresent. South Africans are confronted daily with news of criminal activities and the actual experience of criminal victimisation. In the light of the violent times we live in and which will, no doubt, continue for some time and possibly worsen, it is the aim of the research study to highlight the fear of crime as it presently exists in the Richards Bay and Empangeni area and to recommend what can be done to regain a life of quality for those affected by the fear of crime.

For the purpose of the present study, the following objectives are formulated:-

- (i) To bridge the gap in our substantive knowledge regarding the fear of crime.
- (ii) To statistically measure and describe the nature and extent of the fear of crime.
- (iii) To determine the factors influencing the fear of crime.
- (iv) To account for differences and variations in the fear of crime according to age, gender, household composition, type of housing, previous victimisation, crime as a social problem, the role of the police and neighbourhood involvement.
- (v) To statistically reflect on the ecological distribution of crime and the fear of crime.
- (vi) To make recommendations for the prevention of criminal victimisation that might directly influence the quality of life.

#### **1.5 RESEARCH APPROACH**

The nature of the research approach is exploratory, descriptive and comparative. The research is exploratory in that it seeks to gather information and gain insight into the phenomenon of the fear of crime, which is considered to be a major social problem. It is descriptive in that it seeks to identify and verify the influence of various factors on the fear of crime. The research is also comparative in that it makes a systematic and explicit comparison between the risk and the actual experience of victimisation, the age,

gender and race differences in the fear of crime, and other important variables.

The operational framework followed in this research included the following:

Firstly, a broad literature study was undertaken in order to ascertain the nature of the fear of crime. This literature study included both international and national publications. Research conducted by the following authors was closely scrutinised:

- (i) Ferraro, K.F. and La Grange, R.L. 1987. The measurement of fear of crime. *Sociological Inquiry*, 57:70-101.
- (ii) Garofalo, T. 1978. Victimization and fear of crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 16:80-97.
- (iii) Glanz, L. 1989. *Coping With Crime: The South African Public's Perception of and Reaction to Crime*. (Report ASS/BBS - 9). Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.
- (iv) Glanz, L. 1992. Fear of crime among the elderly in the Cape Peninsula. *Acta Criminologica*, 5(2):16-26.
- (v) Skogan, W.G. 1987. The impact of victimisation on fear. *Crime and Delinquency*, 33:135-154.

Secondly, a precoded, structured questionnaire was developed to gather information about people's fear of crime.

Thirdly, the questionnaire was distributed to a non-probability sample of residents in the Richards Bay and Empangeni area.

Fourthly, the raw data was processed and presented in frequency distribution tables.

Lastly, the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient ( $\rho$ ), the Pearson Correlation

Coefficient (r) and the F-test will be used to test the following hypotheses:

- Hypothesis 1: There is a relationship between age and the fear of crime.
- Hypothesis 2: There are significant differences between male and female respondents and their fear of crime.
- Hypothesis 3: There is a relationship between household construction and the fear of crime.
- Hypothesis 4: There are significant differences between the type of housing of a respondent and the respondents fear of crime.
- Hypothesis 5: There are significant differences in the fear of crime between respondents who have been victimised (victims) and those who have not (non-victims).
- Hypothesis 6: There is a relationship between the respondents rating of crime as a social problem and the fear of crime.
- Hypothesis 7: The opinion respondents have of the service rendered by police will influence how they rate different crimes as a social problem in their area of residence.
- Hypothesis 8: The role of the police influences the fear of crime.
- Hypothesis 9: There are significant differences between male and female respondents and their experiences with the police.
- Hypothesis 10: There are significant differences in the fear of crime between respondents who are involved in their neighbourhoods and those who are uninvolved.

## **1.6 DELIMITATION OF RESEARCH**

### **1.6.1 Spatial delimitation**

For the purpose of the proposed study, it has been decided to limit the area of study to the Richards Bay and Empangeni region of the KwaZulu-Natal province (also known as North Zululand).

### **1.6.2 Qualitative delimitation**

Respondents, irrespective of race, residing in the above-mentioned region will be included in the study. Efforts will be made to secure respondents with households only, so as to assess the impact of fear of crime and crime risk as far as property crimes are concerned. Attempts will be made to ensure an equivalent distribution of gender by requesting both male and female residents of households to complete the questionnaire.

### **1.6.3 Quantitative delimitation**

Respondents will be randomly selected and surveyed by means of approved scientific sampling techniques. It is the intention of the researcher to select a group that will not exceed one thousand (1 000) respondents.

## **1.7 DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS**

The following concepts will be defined in this section, namely; socio criminology, crime, fear and fear of crime.

### **1.7.1 Socio-criminology**

The title of this study is "Fear of Crime: A Socio-criminological Investigation". Therefore, it becomes necessary to highlight this field of study of criminology. Socio-criminology approaches the study of crime and crime-related issues from a community and/or cultural perspective. Causes and consequences of crime and crime-related issues are sought in society, communal life and social conditions. Crime is a social phenomenon and its explanation can be sought in the relationship between people, groups and communities.

According to Van der Walt, Cronje and Smit (1982:44), socio-criminology gives attention to the following, namely:

- ◆ groups as factors in crime
- ◆ social classes
- ◆ race and culture
- ◆ geographical elements
- ◆ economic factors
- ◆ mass communication
- ◆ relationship between social problems
- ◆ gender and age as factors in crime.

Crime thus is seen as part of the life world of persons, and this extends to the fear of crime.

### 1.7.2 Crime

Crime can refer to a wide range of activities which include violent personal crime, property crime, organised crime and political crime. Van der Walt et al. (1982:22) distinguish between crime defined juridically and crime defined in a non-juridical sense.

Judicially, crime can be defined as "... a contravention of the law to which a punishment is attached and imposed by the state" (Van der Walt et al. 1982:24). In other words, crime is any act which is forbidden by law, and, if detected is likely to be punished.

Non-judicially, crime can be viewed as an act of anti-social behaviour, which influences the quality of life of the individual, his/her community and society at large. Van der Walt et al. (1982:31) define crime in a non-juridical sense as "... an antisocial act entailing a threat to and a breach or violation of the stability and security of a community and its individual members".

Society is a network of interacting persons, groups and institutions. Interaction involves establishing relations between these individuals, groups and institutions. Crime is an act which violates these social relations, and it is this violation which harms the individual and society at large. Therefore, crime in its non-juridical sense (i.e. when it is perceived as a personal threat) leads to feelings of fear and mistrust.

### 1.7.3 Fear

The concept **fear** can be viewed from various points of view. Silberman (in Ferraro & La Grange 1987:72) describes fear from a physiological point of view as "... a series of complex changes in bodily functioning that alerts an individual to potential danger". Fear can either stimulate the individual to perform major feats or it can incapacitate the individual. However, there is also an internal reaction which Du Bow, McCabe and Kaplan (in Ferraro & La Grange 1987:73) describe as feelings of violation, hopelessness, anger, outrage and frustration.

Fear can also be considered as a response to certain stimuli encountered in the environment. Warr (1990:892) refers to the work of Goffman in an attempt to clarify how individuals respond to their environment when they encounter stimuli or cues which signal danger. If no danger cues are perceived, the individual continues his/her normal activities. If danger cues are perceived, however, the environment is viewed as unsafe, which can result in feelings of vulnerability.

Vulnerability is also associated with a state of powerlessness. This implies that the individual feels an inability to control his/her future, and a general anxiety about their social environment prevails. This state of powerlessness can manifest itself in the fear of crime.

Baumer (1985:251) states the following in regard to fear:

"... overall fear is a response to subjectively defined risk and personal vulnerability".

The consequences of fear are of equal importance. Fear becomes dysfunctional to the individual when the individual remains afraid regardless of the circumstances. Fear will then affect the individual's ability to anticipate danger and estimate the risk of danger in their environment. Once the individual is afraid, social relations become affected, and this has implications for the community and society as a whole.



#### 1.7.4 Fear of crime

Fear of crime has a wide range of meanings. Although each researcher defines the concept to suit his/her research purpose, they all concur that fear itself remains defined as anticipating the occurrence of a criminal event. Fear of crime then becomes a consequence of the potential for victimisation.

Furstenberg (1971:603) differentiates between the fear of crime as "... a measure of self-perceived chances of victimisation..." and fear of crime as a concerned reaction to crime. Fear, refers to the anxiety associated with perceived risk; while concern refers to the cognitive consideration of the seriousness of crime as a social problem.

Keane (1992:217) uses the terms **formless fear** and **concrete fear** in a distinction similar to Furstenberg's. Formless fear reflects a perception of vulnerability to crime either of a physical or socio-economic nature or a generalised feeling that one is unsafe. Concrete fear refers to the perceived risk of victimisation and the type of crime likely to occur or fear of specific crimes.

According to Van Dijk (1979:72), fear of crime contains four components, namely:

- ◆ Cognitive component. This refers to the perceptions of personal risk of victimisation and the crime rate in the neighbourhood.
- ◆ Normative component, which refers to the concern about personal safety and the security of members of the community.
- ◆ Emotional component, which relates to feelings of anxiety.
- ◆ Behavioural component, which refers to actual steps taken for the protection of life and property, and the adjustments made based on the impact of fear of crime.

Ferraro and La Grange (1987:76) warn, however, that perceived risk of victimisation is different from the feeling of fear of victimisation. Therefore they conclude that fear of crime refers exclusively to the negative emotional reaction generated by crime or symbols associated with crime. Warr (1990:891) also prefers the term "fear of criminal victimisation" to the term "fear of crime". It is left, however, to Baumer (1985:242) who

describes fear of crime as "... an essentially rational response to a subjectively defined threat of harm". The most fearful, according to Baumer (1985), are those who:

- ◆ perceive a threat
- ◆ are vulnerable to attack
- ◆ have been victimised
- ◆ have friends who are victims
- ◆ live in dangerous neighbourhoods
- ◆ lack social bonds
- ◆ are physically or socially vulnerable (Baumer, 1985:243).

## **1.8 ORGANISATION OF STUDY**

In Chapter 2, the various models of fear and the research findings which substantiate these models are discussed.

In Chapter 3, the research methodology of this research study will be presented.

In Chapter 4, 5, 6 and 7 the hypotheses formulated in this chapter will be tested.

In Chapter 8, a description of the precautionary measures taken by the respondents will be given

In Chapter 9, the conclusions and recommendations of this study will be presented.

## **1.9 SUMMARY**

In this chapter, an attempt has been made to introduce the concept of fear of crime, to highlight the factors which affect fear of crime, and outline the basic aims and research methodology of the study. The factors affecting the fear of crime have been classified under eight major headings, namely vulnerability, environmental conditions, actual and perceived risk of victimisation, previous victimisation, types of crime, mass media, the effectiveness of the criminal justice system and precautionary measures taken by individuals. Research has indicated that a few groups can be identified as being

vulnerable, namely the old, women, the poor and those belonging to ethnic minorities. Reasons for this vulnerability include the inability of the vulnerable to react physically, and to replace property which is lost. The vulnerable may also be unable to cope with the effects of victimisation. People may also become fearful of victimisation because they perceive their environments to be threatening. The size of the community is related to fear of crime in that as the move is made from city centre to suburb to rural areas, fear of crime decreases.

Neighbourhoods characterised by incivilities which include vandalism, drug use, teenagers hanging around, abandoned houses, ethnic conflict, and lack of municipal services have residents with high levels of fear of, and concern about, crime. Neighbourhoods that lack cohesion also tend to intensify the residents' fear of crime.

Actual risk and perceived risk of victimisation are also related to fear of crime. It was noticed that people who perceive themselves at high risk of victimisation are not actually at risk. For example, the elderly actually have a low rate of victimisation, but they perceive themselves to be more vulnerable and therefore have a high level of fear. The level of fear is often unreliable in relation to the actual risk of victimisation, and is thus based on the individual's subjective evaluation of vulnerability.

Little research has been done on the exact relationship between fear of crime and the types of crime. A distinction can be made between personal crimes and property crimes. Most research done has been based on personal crimes, which are viewed by people as more threatening than property crimes. However, property crimes involve an invasion of privacy and increased anxiety about a possible return of the offenders while the offended is not home. This could lead to increased fear on the part of the offended.

Previous victimisation has been noted as having a contradictory relationship with fear of crime. Some results have indicated that knowledge about victimisation increases the level of fear. However, other research findings show that victims tend to negate the effects of victimisation after a period of time, and become no more afraid than non-victims. Measurement problems abound because under normal circumstances, the respondents of most research studies are mainly non-victims. One source of crime

information which might affect fear is the mass media. Media reports of crime tend to be sensationalised, and too much emphasis is placed on serious crime. People who react to newspapers whose content is crime related tend to be more fearful of crime. However, researchers have noted that much work still has to be done on this topic.

When the criminal justice system is held to be efficient and effective in its protection of citizens, fear of crime is lessened. However, when systems of formal control are unable to protect their citizens this leads to the development of informal mechanisms of social control. Mechanisms of social control, both formal or informal, will affect people's perception of crime and fear of crime.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **MODELS OF VICTIMOLOGY AND THE FEAR OF CRIME**

#### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

Victimisation and the fear of victimisation damages the individual, families, businesses and communities, and can be regarded as a societal problem.

Whenever a person is victimised by crime, the individual, his/her family, his/her friends, colleagues and acquaintances are also victimised, as they are reminded that they too are vulnerable (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux 1990:130). Crime and the fear of crime exact a toll, not only in active losses incurred by the victimised, their families and the community but also in the necessitated change of behaviour and lifestyle that are forced on victims and potential victims. Everyone is a potential victim of a criminal act and therefore it is deemed necessary to expose the study of victims, potential or actual.

#### **2.2 VICTIMISATION**

Victimisation is defined by Cloete (in Cloete & Stevens 1990:39) as the intentional and unlawful action of a criminal toward an innocent person. It is by definition characterised by physical, emotional and/or financial harm and represents an asymmetrical relationship that is exploitative, parasitical, oppressive and alienating.

According to Karmen (1984:3), after many years of neglect, the study of victims has been rediscovered by social scientists and the criminal justice system.

##### **2.2.1 Historical overview of victimology**

The systematic study of victims and victimisation only began in the USA in the 1940s. The first scientific contribution towards victimology was the study by Von Hentig called *The Criminal and His Victim* (1948). This work suggested that some persons are prone

to victimisation as a result of their personality or demographic characteristics (Brown, Esbensen & Geis 1991:32).

The work of Schafer, *Victimology, The Victim and His Criminal* (1977), also highlighted the role of victims in the criminal process, especially the fact that their actions may precipitate crime.

According to Karmen (1984:2), the plight of the victim was also rediscovered through the influence of the following:

- ◆ *Mass Media*: the experience of the victim is often sensationalised by the media. Crime is portrayed as rampant in society, and the general public can read about, view, listen to and empathise with the victims' suffering. However, the media have a tendency to distort reality by creating false impressions of both the victim and offender, by portraying life as violent and exploiting the "story" for commercial gain. Karmen (1984:5) opines that avid viewers of television become concerned about crime and wary of strangers, i.e. a relationship between fear of crime and the mass media is possible.
- ◆ *Social Movements*: victims differ in their life stories, but the Women's Movement, Civil Rights Movement and the Law and Order Movement have contributed to the growing awareness of the victim. In the U.S.A., victims of rape, wife beating, sexual harassment and incest were rediscovered by the *Feminist Movement* in the early 1960s. These offences were viewed as oppressing all women and caused by economic and racial disadvantages. The male-dominated criminal justice system was viewed as being unsympathetic, and after concerted efforts by the Women's Movement attention was finally given to the victims of male versus female offences. Closely related to the Feminist Movement is the Children's Rights Movement, Gay Rights Movement and Self-Help Movement.

In the USA, *civil rights groups* in the 1960, rallied to assist victims of racist violence and protect victims of police brutality, miscarriage of justice, and attacks

by the Ku Klux Klan. In the 1970s the plight of victims of black-on-black violence was addressed as this form of crime was seen to be "... poisoning the quality of life in black communities ... destroying houses, driving away jobs and closing down services" (Karmen 1984:21). Fear levels were also reported as being higher in the ghettos than in white neighbourhoods. The contribution of these movements has been to promote increased police professionalism and guarantee the equal protection of the law to all victims.

In the USA, the law and order movement in the mid 1960s campaigned for the restoration of "law and order" and a crackdown on crime. The criminal justice system was viewed as being "too soft" in its handling of criminals, and its critics called for a victim-oriented criminal justice system.

- ◆ *Social Scientists:* although social scientists have been aware of the relationship between criminal and victim, it was only in the 1940s that victimology finally came into its own.

Similar trends have followed in South African society. Our mass media, especially television, have sensationalised crime and violence. At present, almost every news programme contains a report on crime and violence, and the government's concern about these issues.

People Opposing Women Abuse (established originally as Rape Crisis South Africa in 1977) has succeeded in highlighting the plight of women as victims of violence within and outside the home setting. Child Line was established in 1983 in Durban by the Department of Health Services and Welfare as a method of protecting children from all forms of abuse. The Child Protection Unit of the South African Police was established in 1986 to handle child abuse cases. In 1994, South Africans of all races went to vote for a political system of their choice. The hope was expressed that injustices, racial tension and police brutality would cease. However, to what extent victims of racial violence exist is unknown. Ethnic violence (clashes between rival ethnic and tribal groups)

persists.

The moratorium on the Death Penalty, introduced in 1995, has resulted in a multitude of feelings. Many people feel that the criminal justice system is now a farce, and that criminals are protected but not the victims. Others, especially groups such as Lawyers for Human Rights, consider that the ban is justified. Whatever the feelings are, the present situation must be analysed, as people's perceptions of the validity and reliability of the criminal justice system directly affect the fear of crime.

## **2.2.2 Victim typologies**

The concept of victim can be traced back to ancient cultures. In the original meaning of the term, a victim was a person or criminal that was put to death during a ceremony in order to appease some supernatural power or deity. Today's usage of the term victim encompasses many facets, and the victim typologies of Young-Rifai, Mannheim, Schafer and Van der Westhuizen will be highlighted.

### **2.2.2.1 Young-Rifai's victim typology**

Young-Rifai (in Schurink et al. 1992:38) suggests the following categorisation of victims:

- ◆ Victims who suffer from physical or mental handicap.
- ◆ Victims who have suffered owing to a natural catastrophe, e.g. victims of floods.
- ◆ Victims who have suffered through interaction with their environment, e.g. air pollution, water pollution.
- ◆ Victims who have suffered owing to the technological environment, e.g. in car accidents.
- ◆ Victims who have suffered because of the social environment in which they have found themselves e.g. crime victims.

It is the last type of victim who is of interest in this study. Karmen (1984:1) defines a crime victim as a person or entity that has suffered because of illegal acts.



#### 2.2.2.2 Mannheim's victim typology

Mannheim's typology of crime victims revolves around the criterion of involvement, which is divided into direct, indirect and latent involvement of the victim in the crime situation, thereby adhering to the demands or requirements of completeness, universality and meaningfulness. However, this typology is not mutually exclusive, because though a person may be regarded as a direct or indirect victim of crime, it does not mean that he/she cannot at the same time be labelled a latent victim of crime. This typology does not meet the requirement of *pragmatism* because it does not take into account the share of guilt of the parties involved (criminal and victim) (Van der Walt et al. 1985:11).

##### (i) **Victims of crime (indirect victims)**

These are victims who, by virtue of the unlawful actions of others, are maliciously harmed. They include the following:

Firstly, the criminal who is the victim of a crime because he/she has to bear both the penal and non-penal consequences of his/her own crime.

Secondly, the direct dependents of the person whose body, life, honour and goods are affected by the criminal act are regarded as indirect victims of the crime.

Thirdly, the rest of society, consisting of members of the criminal's family, his/her group associates, his/her community, etc. are also indirect victims (Van der Walt et al. 1985:34).

(ii) **Victims of the criminal (direct victims)**

These types of victims are those whose body, life, honour and goods are affected in the criminal situation. By definition, the criminal can therefore be his/her own victim, as in the case of suicide. However, suicide does not qualify as a crime in South Africa, and therefore a study of the direct victim of criminal violence involves firstly, the criminal who murders a fellow-man, and then commits suicide. (This person is regarded as being his/her own victim. An example is family murders). Secondly, all those people who are, for example, killed, robbed, bereaved, assaulted, maimed, etc. in the crime situation can be depicted as the direct victims of the criminal.

(iii) **Latent victims**

Every member of society is a potential victim. Everyone in society runs the risk of being robbed, bereaved, assaulted or even killed by criminals. Likewise, certain other persons can be referred to as **latent victims**, such as:

- ◆ Firstly, those persons who through the nature of their professions, are regarded as more vulnerable than others, e.g. policemen, taxi drivers, cashiers and clerks transporting large sums of money, petrol dispensers and prostitutes.
- ◆ Secondly, those persons suffering from personality deviance and who consciously or unconsciously wish to be victims, for example those who derive intense pleasure and satisfaction from pain.

2.2.2.3 Schafer's victim typology

Schafer (1977:45-47) classifies victims of crime in terms of responsibility. He regards this concept as decisive in determining the criminal-victim relationship. In this regard, his typology could be regarded as comprehensive because it can always be linked with either the victim or the criminal, or both depending on the responsibility of each party.

With regard to the biologically and socially poorly-integrated victims in society, Schafer argues that the ruling authority as well as the community are to be held responsible for the victim's misfortune. This also applies to the criminal's unlawful action. He makes, however, no mention anywhere of why these two categories of victim should not also bear some measure of responsibility, given the fact that they could just as well be regarded as precipitating victims. This would mean placing a distinct responsibility on such people without abrogating the responsibility of the criminal and/or the community or government. In this way, victims belonging to these two categories are reminded that they should at least adopt some sort of responsibility for protecting themselves.

**(i) The innocent victim**

According to Schafer (1979:45) the innocent victim has no engagement with the criminal - except for the crime committed against him/her. He regards the victim as an accidental choice, for instance where the victim is involved in a crime situation where he/she necessarily (but accidentally) becomes a victim, e.g. during a bank robbery. The criminal has to bear the sole responsibility for the crime.

**(ii) The defiant victim**

This type of victim does something to the criminal which forces the latter to commit a crime against the victim. A broken promise, the grossest insult, forming a liaison with another's lover, or similar offences lead the offender to cause the victim harm. In the case of this category, responsibility is largely borne by both parties.

**(iii) The precipitation victim**

Precipitation victims are regarded as innocent, but might through their own thoughtless actions taunt or entice the offender. For example those who wander alone in a deserted and lonely place (Schafer 1977:46).

**(iv) The biologically weak victim types**

This type of victim's bodily condition and physical and mental attributes make the victim susceptible to crime, e.g. children, the elderly, women, the disabled and the mentally ill. According to Schafer (1977:46-47), these victims actually bring crime upon themselves, but cannot avoid it, and for this reason, responsibility for the criminal act is apportioned as follows:

- ◆ On the one hand, the criminal has to bear the major portion of the guilt for taking unlawful action
- ◆ On the other hand, society or its leaders are partially to be blamed for having not made adequate provision to protect such people.

**(v) The socially poorly-integrated victim**

Normally, this type of victim is not accepted by others as a full and equal member of society. Among these are the following victim types: immigrants, ethnic minority groups (e.g. Hispanics in the United States), people who belong to specific religious denominations, or who are of low social status. Schafer (1977:47) contends that these victims are in fact guiltless of the crimes committed against them. Again, the responsibility ought to be equally divided between the criminal and the community.

**(vi) The victim who victimises himself/herself**

This type of victim is regarded as his/her own "criminal". Victims who may be classified in this category are drug addicts, alcoholics, homosexuals, gamblers and masochists. These victims not only harm themselves, but also the interests of the community. Responsibility for the crime rests, therefore, totally on the shoulders of the victim himself (or herself).

(vii) **The political victim**

These victims suffer at the hands of their political opponents. In a certain sense, the political victim himself gives rise to his victimisation - especially by striving for a particular position.

2.2.2.4 Van der Westhuizen's victim typology

Van der Westhuizen (1981:123-125) uses the susceptibility of the potential victim of crime as criterion for the classification of victims. In terms of this criterion, the victim's activities, predisposition, hereditary factors, personality traits, habits, religion, vices, life philosophy and culture, are all considered in order to classify the victims in terms of susceptibility. The typology is, however, not mutually exclusive and consists of the following categories of victims:

(i) **The Defenceless victims**

Defenceless victims are those who are defenceless, physically, mentally and/or totally, against the criminal. Examples are: women, children, the elderly, the ill, disabled persons, the naive, people in mourning, the lonely, the emotionally unstable and the dying.

(ii) **Ostentatious victims**

To this type of victim belong people who have an exaggerated desire to display everything they possess, e.g. women who flaunt their jewellery, money, possessions and even their bodies by means of meagre apparel.

(iii) **Sensual victims**

These victims are people who opt for devious sexual practices, for example, love-making in deserted places, masochism, adultery, whoring, homosexual

activities, sexual orgies and sexual perversions.

(iv) **Covetous victims**

These victims are those who exploit their fellow-man out of greed, and as a result fall prey to it themselves. Crimes emanating from these situations go hand in hand with financial malpractices such as extortion, cheating, fraud, swindling, blackmailing, and the embezzlement of trust funds.

(v) **Aimless victims**

This category comprises persons who lie about or wander aimlessly, e.g. hoboes, beggars, tramps and army deserters.

(vi) **Aggressive victims**

These victims make themselves guilty of provoking the criminal by way of gibes, suggestions, insults, quarrelling, swearing, threatening and assaulting the criminal. To this category belong mainly victims of crimes of violence such as assault and murder.

(vii) **Negligent victims**

The negligent behaviour and habits of the victim make it easy for the criminal to steal from him or her, or, in the case of a woman, to rape her. Other examples include merchants who display their goods without proper protection, holiday-makers who leave their doors and windows unlocked, the careless victim who leaves money, property or keys about - in other words, people who do not take proper precautions against theft, fraud and housebreaking.

(viii) **Occupational hazard victims**

The occupations of these victims, especially those in the latent category, leave them as open targets for the murderer, the robber, the assailant, the rapist, the extortionist and the thief. Victims in this category include: criminal justice practitioners, e.g. policemen and women, judges (remember those judges who were killed by the drug cartels of Columbia in the United States during 1990-1991), and correctional (prison) officials, night workers (doctors, nurses, shift workers), travellers (e.g. travelling sales representatives and taxi drivers, isolated people such as farmers and fieldworkers) and cashiers (especially in cases of bank robbery and terrorism where they are held hostage).

(ix) **Aberrant group-bound victims**

These victims participate in, or are drawn into, hazardous and/or criminal group activities, and include boozers, drug pedlars, brothel keepers, smugglers, crime gang leaders, as well as members of mafia movements.

(x) **Casual victims**

Despite the fact that some people take reasonable precautions against crime, or lead a fairly sheltered existence, they nevertheless fall prey to the criminal; for example, the householder who notwithstanding a watchdog and burglar-proofing, is burgled, or passengers who are robbed or shot dead on a packed train (Van der Walt et al. 1985:23-25; Van der Westhuizen 1981:12-125).

This typology serve to highlight possible factors precipitating actual victimisation or contributing to the fear of victimisation. They are interesting, informative and meaningful to our understanding of the victimisation experience and the fear of crime.

### 2.2.3 Theoretical perspectives of victimology

Although there is no single theoretical perspective which dominates contemporary victimology, it is important to briefly examine four of the most relevant theories pertaining to the fear of crime.

#### 2.2.3.1 The "Synthesis" Approach of Fattah

Strydom and Schurink (in Schurink et al. 1992:40) review the work of Fattah (1976), whose main contribution is "... to establish why certain individuals or organisations are more popular targets than others, to focus on the role played by the victim in the justification process and explain how this process is often used by the criminal as a means of self-legitimation". Fattah (in Schurink et al. 1992:40) hypothesises that the potential for victimisation depends on whether or not the victim can be used as an agent of self legitimisation by the criminal. In other words, can the criminal make the victim appear at fault? This self-legitimation by the offender is an attempt at justifying the criminal act, and also influences the choice of a victim.

Denial of the victim as a victim can be highlighted as an attempt at neutralising the victim. An example is where, in the case of rape, a young girl is not viewed as a human being, but rather as a sex object. Devaluing the victim entails using certain attributes about the victim as justification for the victimisation. An example would be the justifying of rape on the grounds that the girl had been dressed in a sexually attractive manner. Denying injury to the victim is also used to justify a criminal act. An example would be vandalism and theft of property where the victim is viewed as being too rich to suffer.

Blaming the victim is another way of justifying a criminal act. The offender in this instance is convinced of the victim's guilt. For example, where a black chooses a white victim the act is legitimised as a retaliatory attack against whites for their exploitation. Although the theory of Fattah (1976) is viewed as being simplistic by Schurink et al. (1992:40) he does manage to imply that certain categories of persons are potential victims, namely women, the elderly, the rich and certain population groups. Being a



potential victim is also likely to affect the fear of crime felt by these groups.

#### 2.2.3.2 The Routine Activity Approach by Cohen and Felson

Cohen and Felson (in Schurink et al. 1992:54) define routine activities as

“... any recurrent and prevalent activities which provide for basic population and individual needs, whatever their biological or cultural origins”.

These routine activities will thus include work, provision of food, shelter, sexual outlet, leisure, social interaction, teaching and child rearing.

Using this approach, Lab (1988:57) points out that the normal movements and routine activities of both potential offenders and victims play a role in the occurrence of crime. There are three distinct criteria which must exist for a crime to occur, namely, a suitable target, a motivated offender, and an absence of guardians. Routine daily activities, therefore, will affect the likelihood of an attack on property and personal targets which have a high visibility and accessibility at particular times. The timing of the criminal act will be based on what the offender thinks he or she knows about the activity of the target.

#### 2.2.3.3 Opportunity Theory of Cohen, Kleugel and Land

Cohen et al. (1981:50) focused on the mediating role of five risk factors in criminal victimisation, namely, exposure, guardianship, proximity to potential offenders, attractiveness of potential targets and definitional properties of specific crimes.

- ◆ Exposure is defined as the physical visibility and accessibility of persons or objects to potential offenders at any given time or place.
- ◆ Proximity refers to physical distance between areas where potential targets of crime reside, and areas where large populations of potential offenders are found.
- ◆ Guardianship implies the effectiveness of persons or objects in preventing

violations from occurring, either by their presence or by direct or indirect action.

- ◆ Target attractiveness refers to the material or symbolic desirability of persons or property to potential offenders as well as the perceived apathy of the target toward illegal treatment. Target attractiveness can either be instrumental, i.e. the offence is a means of acquiring something, or expressive, which involves the act of attacking a person or stealing property as the reward that is sought.
- ◆ Defectional properties of specific crimes which implies that constraints are placed on instrumental action which limit the ability of the offender to act against a target.

In their research, Cohen et al. (1981:520) report that exposure, guardianship and proximity all have effects on the risk of victimisation. When dealing with proximity, the researchers found that nearness to central city and low-income areas increases the risk of victimisation.

Instrumental motives were largely implicated in property crimes, and the research indicated that persons in higher income categories have a greater risk of victimisation. The last risk factor, that of definitional properties of specific crimes, implied that the risk of victimisation crimes would be higher where there are fewer constraints placed on the criminal action. This was confirmed by the research, as theft outside the household is more open to instrumental action, and the value of the property being stolen is more visible to the offender.

According to the researchers, although there were measurement problems, they viewed their efforts as “.... moving in the proper direction in our effort to predict and explain criminal victimisation patterns in the United States” (Cohen et al. 1981:523).

The theoretical overview of victimisation has highlighted various factors which influence crime, and thus are related to the fear of crime. But the risk of victimisation or actual victimisation cannot be ignored as a factor influencing the fear of crime.

## 2.2.4 **Victims and the fear of crime**

Any individual can become a victim of crime. This victimisation can be either direct or indirect. Direct victimisation refers to the actual losses incurred by the individual, i.e. property damage, money stolen, injuries both physical and psychological, and also the resulting changes in the victim's behaviour. The indirect cost refers to the fear that is aroused by media reports on crime, contact with victims, or witnessing criminal behaviour. This indirect victimisation leads to changes in a person's behaviour, and therefore has psychological consequences. Actual victimisation, or the possibility thereof, will affect the person's attitude and behaviour patterns, and result in the fear of crime.

Although victimology is the study of the relationship between victims and offenders, its main concern is with the victims and their experiences. Being a victim, or the possibility of becoming a victim, depends on various factors. Briefly, these factors (taken from the work of Cohen & Felson and Cohen et al.; Fattah, Hindeling et al.) can be highlighted in question form, and include the following:

- ◆ Can the victim be used as an agent of self legitimisation by the criminal?
- ◆ Can the victim be neutralised and devalued?
- ◆ Can the victim be blamed for the crime?
- ◆ What is the lifestyle of the victim?
- ◆ What are the routine activities in which the victim engages?
- ◆ What are the demographic characteristics of the victim?
- ◆ Do the victims present opportunities to offenders to victimise them?

These questions in turn allow for the discovery of the factors which can be seen to influence people's fear of crime, such as age, gender, income, education, activities, neighbourhood conditions and risk of victimisation. These factors, and others which directly influence the fear of crime, have already been discussed. However, being a victim, or the threat of becoming a victim, has certain consequences.

## 2.3 MODELS OF FEAR OF CRIME

Theoretical developments relating to the study of fear of crime involve the development of three models which attempt to explain the fear of crime, namely, the irrational, the cognitive and the social control model. Each model, with substantiating literature will be discussed.

### 2.3.1 The irrational model

The irrational model views the fear of crime as an irrational response to a perceived situation. *In simpler terms, the fear of crime would appear to be disproportional to the actual risk of victimisation (Glanz 1989:24).*

There are certain sectors of the population that are least at risk of criminal victimisation (women and the elderly) but who are more fearful of crime. Researchers claimed that this proves that fear of crime is an irrational response to a perceived threat. Fear of crime is also closely related to the fear of strangers in this model. In support of the irrational model, the work of Clemente and Kleiman (1977) Garofalo (1979) and Warr (1990) will be discussed.

#### 2.3.1.1 Clemente and Kleiman (1977)

Clemente and Kleiman (1977:520) proposed a multivariable research approach to the fear of crime so as to assess the independent affects of relevant variables. These variables include those most often used in studies of victimisation and fear of victimisation, namely: gender, race, age, socio-economic status and size of the community.

As far as the gender variable is concerned, Clemente and Kleiman (1977:522) noted that although females are unlikely to be victims of personal crimes, women are more afraid of crime than men. The researchers warn, however, that it is not possible to control for men's reluctance to admit to fear.

The second variable, race, highlights that blacks are more likely to be victims of personal crime than whites, and therefore the evidence suggests that blacks are also more afraid of victimisation. (It must be noted that the evidence is based on surveys done in the United States of America.)

The relationship between the third variable, age and actual victimisation is, according to Clemente and Kleiman (1977:503), inverse. Although the elderly have low rates of victimisation, they fear victimisation more than any other age cohort group.

The fourth variable, socio-economic status (SES), also has an inverse relationship with victimisation for crimes against the person, but the reverse is true for property crimes. However, Clemente and Kleiman (1977:523) note that a negative relationship exists between SES and the fear of crime. The reason put forward for this relationship is that people who have money are better able to protect themselves, and can afford to live in safer neighbourhoods.

The last variable, size of the community, has been found to be directly related to the crime rate. As one moves from the central city to suburbs, and to smaller towns and rural areas, the crime rate decreases. The fear of crime seems to follow the same tendency.

Clemente and Kleiman (1977), after having analysed their data, concluded as follows:

- ◆ Sex has an explanatory utility in the study of fear of crime
- ◆ Community size, although not as influential as sex, also can be used to explain fear of crime
- ◆ Race, socio-economic status and age are less important as explanatory variables in the study of fear of crime.

However, the authors noted the limitations of their study, especially the disjunction between objective conditions and the subjective interpretation of those conditions.

### 2.3.1.2 Garofalo (1979)

Garofalo (1979:82) attempted to develop a working model of the influences on the fear of crime. The reason proposed for the attempt is that fear not only leads people to suffer psychological discomfort, but also leads many people to restrict their behaviour. Therefore Garofalo (1979:83) says "... a better understanding of the fear of crime could lead to action that will have the affect of improving the quality of life for many people". Five general factors affecting crime are identified, and comprised the following:

Firstly, **the actual risk of victimisation**. Previous data has shown that several personal characteristics are related more or less strongly to rates of victimisation and the fear of crime, namely, age, sex, race and income. Age has a negative relationship with victimisation rates and a positive relationship with the fear of crime, i.e. as age goes up, victimisation rates decrease and fear of crime increases. The same occurs for males and females, i.e. males show higher victimisation rates and females show higher levels of fear. The data on race indicates that whites have a slightly lower rate of victimisation and fear of crime levels than do blacks. As income goes up, so fear of crime and rates of victimisation decline.

Secondly, **experience with victimisation**. Garofalo (1979:87) indicates that previous experience of victimisation is related to the fear of crime. Within each age/sex group non-victims express less fear of crime than do victims.

Thirdly, **the socialisation processes** connected to particular social roles. Garofalo (1979:87) proposes that sex- and age-specific socialisation patterns are responsible for the disjunction between fear and risk. Socialisation for the female sex role has traditionally emphasised submissiveness and stressed assertiveness for males. Accordingly, females are taught to fear crime - especially crime of a personal nature - and therefore females express more fear than males. Older people also experience fear of crime, and this could be due to the combination of various factors which then produce dependency, isolation and fear. Some of these factors could be the shift away from the extended family structure, private retirement policies, physical changes, and

declining health. Garofalo (1979:88) notes that younger people and males might be disinclined to tell the truth, i.e. admit fear, because of the expectations associated with their roles.

Fourthly, **the media presentations** about crime and victimisation. Garofalo (1979:88) reports that respondents who thought that crime was less serious than portrayed in the media expressed less fear of crime than other respondents. However, few people thought that the media were underestimating the seriousness of crime. The inference can be made on the evidence available that the media's depiction of crime does have some effect on the public's fear of crime, but the exact nature of the effects on their quantification is difficult to specify.

Lastly, **the effectiveness of the official barriers against crime**. Garofalo (1979:92) opines that in the modern urban environment, the task of insulating people from crime tends to be the job of the police. Therefore the confidence people have in the police should be related to their fear of crime. However, the relationship between the evaluation of police performance and the fear of crime is weak in this author's study.

However, Garofalo (1979:76) concludes that fear of crime is not a reflection of the risk or experience of crime, but rather of social role expectations.

#### 2.3.1.3 Warr (1990)

It is Warr's (1990:892) contention that certain cues exist in an individual's social and physical environment which signal danger to individuals. The first is novelty or unfamiliarity with environments, the second is fear of strangers; and the third is reluctance to enter a new area. Warr (1990:893) proposes that novelty can provoke fear in the following ways:

- ◆ The appearance of new cues or signs of danger that have not been assimilated into the person's experience framework
- ◆ The realisation that old and taken for granted sights or situations have taken on

new meaning

- ◆ The feeling that the individual is not observing or interpreting accurately what cues or signs of danger do exist in his or her environment

The second cue in the environment that could prove fear-provoking is the dark. Warr (1990:94) uses the work of Goffman to clarify the effect of night-time on fear. Goffman claims that as individuals move through their environment there are barriers, access points, and lurk lines. The lurk lines demarcate zones that are beyond the individual's line of sight, i.e. blind spots. Lurk lines include the area behind one's back, any partitions that block visibility, e.g. drugsters in alleys, shrubbery, and parked vehicles in the street. The one routine event that always transforms the outside world into a variety of lines is darkness. The notion of night as a dangerous time and its effects on individual behaviour has been studied previously (Du Bow, McCabe & Kaplan 1979; Warr 1985).

The third cue from the environment which affects fear is the presence of others in the individual's immediate environment. Once again, Goffman's work is used by Warr (1990:895), although he notes that Goffman's arguments are incomplete. Goffman stresses that an individual in the presence of others is vulnerable to them, so he or she attempts to ascertain what the motives of the others are. But Goffman seems to overlook the possibility that the presence of others can reassure individuals as well as scare them. Warr (1990:895) contends that human beings form groups for safety, and being alone in a dangerous environment " ... is the stuff of nightmares".

Previous research (Stafford & Galle 1984 and Warr 1984) indicated that fear of victimisation is strongly related to age and gender. Warr (1990) therefore included these two variables as controls in all models.

The following results were obtained, namely;

- ◆ darkness has an effect on fear
- ◆ novelty increases fear
- ◆ young males are the least fearful of being alone



- ◆ young females are more fearful of being alone than any other group
- ◆ for young individuals, being alone and in the dark are two fear-provoking situations
- ◆ for older individuals, darkness and unfamiliarity with the locale are the two most fear-provoking cues
- ◆ the presence of others is a cue which can be both reassuring or frightening to the individual (Warr, 1990:897).

Glanz (1989:24) reported that even if the actual amount of crime in society was reduced, the irrational model claims that the fear of crime will not be automatically reduced. Since the fear of crime is irrational in nature, reducing the level of fear will be difficult to achieve.

### 2.3.2 The cognitive model

The cognitive model of the fear of crime proposes that the fear of crime is "... a rational response to a perceived threat of harm" (Baumer 1985:241). Proponents of this model contend that crime is perceived as a threat by those who are physically, and socially vulnerable. It is therefore the perception of vulnerability which is the basis of the fear felt by the elderly, women, the poor and certain ethnic groups.

The work of Stafford and Galle (1984), Baumer (1985) and Hindelang, Gottfredson and Garofalo (1978) will be used to substantiate the claims of the cognitive model.

#### 2.3.2.1 Stafford and Galle (1984)

According to Stafford and Galle (1984) there is a paradox between those who report high levels of fear of crime and the low rate of victimisation of this group. Previous research has indicated that men have a higher risk of victimisation but lower levels of fear compared to women and that age is inversely related to personal victimisation but positively related to fear of crime. Stafford and Galle (1984:179) therefore concluded that the perception of risk of personal victimisation explains levels of fear in certain

groups.

#### 2.3.2.2 Baumer (1985)

Baumer (1985:240) states that a general cognitive/volitional model of the fear of crime which views fear as a rational response to a perceived threat of harm has been identified by various researchers (Garofalo 1979; Skogan & Maxfield 1981).

This general model consists of three basic areas, namely, individual characteristics which indicate vulnerability, beliefs about and perceptions of the threat present in the local environment, and knowledge about criminal events.

Individual characteristics, including age and sex, have been related to the fear of crime. The effect has been attributed to the vulnerability of women and the elderly. There is also evidence of a social vulnerability (Clemente & Kleiman 1977; Skogan & Maxfield 1981) which is indicated by income. Baumer (1985:241) acknowledges the social predicament of the poor who live in more dangerous neighbourhoods, cannot secure their homes and find it difficult to avoid dangerous areas. Their risk of victimisation and fear of crime is therefore high.

Neighbourhood conditions include variables such as incivility, cohesion, social support and perception of threat. Incivility is indicated by disorder, decay or disreputable behaviour. Information about criminal events comes from three sources, namely, personal experience, experiences of friends and neighbours, and news reports. Baumer (1985:242) mentions that various authors have shown that the victimisation experience affects both the victim and his or her friends (Baumer & Rosenbaum 1982; Skogan & Maxfield 1981).

Those people who perceive a threat, who are physically and socially vulnerable to attack, who have been victimised or who have friends/neighbours who have been victimised and who live in a neighbourhood they perceive as dangerous, are the most fearful.

Information concerning age, gender and income were obtained. Three measures of perceived neighbourhood conditions were used: the dangerousness of the respondents' own neighbourhoods compared to others in the city; the likelihood of personal attack and robbery within the next year; and the perceived adequacy of police protection in the respondents' neighbourhood.

Information concerning criminal events was obtained by two questions. The first, concerned previous victimisation of the respondent, and the second question referred to any member of the respondent's immediate family. Baumer (1985:245) noted that neither of these questions was considered adequate. A third question, "How safe do you feel or would you feel being out alone in our neighbourhood at night?" was also asked.

Baumer (1985:245) claims that all eight independent variables are significantly related to the measure of fear. The following particular results were obtained:

- ◆ Gender and age are both related to fear, i.e. women and the elderly are more fearful of crime than men and younger respondents.
- ◆ Although previous victimisation and the other items testing for victimisation do correlate with the fear of crime, their coefficients were extremely weak.

He concluded that overall fear of crime is a response to subjectively define risk and personal vulnerability. To intervene and attempt a reduction in the fear of crime could necessitate the following:

- ◆ Changing the character of the neighbourhood.
- ◆ Changing the perceived likelihood of robbery.
- ◆ Attempting a "community building" project.
- ◆ Increasing foot patrols by police.
- ◆ Supplying of informational programmes about precautionary measures that can be taken (Baumer 1985:251).

### 2.3.2.3 The Lifestyle Model of Hindelang, Gottfredson and Garofalo (1978)

The theoretical model proposed by Hindelang et al. (1978:241) proposes that the likelihood of an individual's becoming a victim depends on the concept of lifestyle. Lifestyle relates to the daily routine activities of a vocational (work) and leisure nature.

Hindelang et al. (1978:242) postulate that role expectations and social structure prescribe constraints to which people must adapt. Both these variables depend on the demographic characteristics of the individual (i.e. age, gender, race, income, marital status, education and occupation). Role expectations pertain to cultural norms which define behaviour. Structural constraints which arise within the social structure refer to the limitations on behaviour resulting from various institutional orders. An example would be economic factors which limit an individual's choice of area of residence, leisure activities, mode of transportation and access to educational opportunities, which in turn could affect his potential for victimisation. The role expectations and structural constraints are reciprocally related, and have similar effects for people who share the same demographic characteristics. Individuals continually adapt to structural constraint and role expectations, and the result is a regular behavioural pattern, i.e. routine activities or lifestyle. Variations in lifestyles occur which relate to the probability of being in a particular place at a particular time and coming into contact with persons who have particular characteristics. The implication is that lifestyle differences are associated with differences in exposure to situations that have high victimisation risk.

People with the same lifestyle interact. They share similar interests and associate with one another. Offenders have certain characteristics, and thus associating with people having these characteristics will increase exposure to personal victimisation.

Hindelang et al. (1978:247-250) discuss the following demographic variables affecting lifestyle:

- ◆ Age: Throughout one's lifetime, i.e. from early infancy to old age, role expectations and structural constraints affect individuals. For example, in

infancy the child's existence is structured and constrained by parental expectations, but as he/she grows older, he/she achieves greater autonomy. As age increases there is a shift in attitudes, including an increased fear of crime. The fear contributes to a change in lifestyle, e.g. a limiting of activities, mobility and contact with strangers.

- ◆ **Sex:** Sex role socialisation differs for males and females. For example, females spend a greater portion of their time inside the home, and as adults are more likely to assume household responsibilities. It is noted by the authors, however, that in pre-adolescent and post-retirement age groups, lifestyles tend to become less different.

It is during these years that the role expectations and structural constraints associated with age take precedence over those associated with gender. Fear of crime is related to the gender role differences. According to Hindelang et al. (1978:188), the traditional role specialisation of women is one of passivity and dependence, which could easily produce fear of victimisation. Men on the other hand, are socialised not to display fear, and this could result in their not reporting or expressing fear of crime. A further factor is the sheer physical differences which could result in women feeling more vulnerable.

- ◆ **Marital Status:** Among adults, the lifestyles of married and unmarried persons differ. People who are married (or cohabiting) are expected to spend more time within the home, and pursue an increased number of at-home responsibilities. Single persons are likely to spend their time outside the home, and are often unaccompanied.
- ◆ **Family Income and Race:** The position a family has in the economic structure also influences one's lifestyle. An increase in income allows an increase in flexibility to choose one's area in which to live, the mode of transportation, the time spent in private versus public surroundings, and the nature of leisure activities one engages in.

Income also determines patterns of association, i.e. income will determine whom one socialises with. Race is also related to income. Blacks tend to live in more economically heterogeneous areas than do whites.

According to Hindelang et al. (1978:250), for personal victimisation to occur, several conditions must be met. Firstly, the offender and victim must have an occasion to meet in time and space. Secondly, there must be some dispute between the offender and the victim for the victim to be viewed as the object of victimisation. Thirdly, the offender must be willing to use force, and fourthly, the circumstances must be advantageous to the offender.

In order to highlight just how lifestyles have implications for exposure to personal victimisation, Hindelang et al. (1978:251) formulate eight propositions.

Proposition One: The probability of suffering personal victimisation is directly related to the amount of time that a person spends in public places (e.g. on the streets, in parks, etc.), and particularly in public places at night.

Proposition Two: The probability of being in public places, particularly at night, varies as a function of lifestyle.

Proposition Three: Social contacts and interactions occur disproportionately among individuals who share similar lifestyles.

Proposition Four: An individual's chances of personal victimisation are dependent upon the extent to which the individual shares demographic characteristics with offenders.

Proposition Five: The proportion of time that an individual spends among non-family members varies as a function of lifestyle.

Proposition Six: The probability of personal victimisation, particularly personal theft, increases as a function of the proportion of time that an individual spends among non-family members.

Proposition Seven: Variations in lifestyle are associated with variations in the ability of individuals to isolate themselves from persons with offender

characteristics.

Proposition Eight: Variations in lifestyle are associated with variations in the convenience, the desirability and vulnerability of the person as a target for personal victimisation.

Hindelang et al. (1978:272) stated that the lifestyle/exposure model, as set out above, is a step towards explaining personal victimisation.

Garofalo (in Schurink et al. 1992:53) made certain modifications to the Lifestyle/Exposure model. He suggested the following:

- ◆ Factors such as constraints imposed by the economic system and the housing market must be taken into account. These factors often compel people to live in close proximity to offenders, which in turn increases their exposure to and risk of victimisation.
- ◆ Reactions to crime, which include fear of crime and beliefs about the nature and prevalence of crime, can have an effect on the individual's lifestyle and thus on his/her exposure to potential offenders.
- ◆ Target attractiveness and individual differences must be included since they have a direct effect on the risk of victimisation.

Garofalo (in Schurink et al. 1992:53) noted further that the model is capable of being modified and expanded further.

### **2.3.3 The social control model**

Glanz (1989:27) claims that the social control model proposed by Lewis and Salem (1981) could be considered to be one of the most recent theoretical developments in the field of fear of crime.

The social control model has its roots in the social control theory formulated by the Chicago school. Lewis and Salem (1986) argue that the irrational and rational models

fail to address all the anomalies that arise in research on the fear of crime. They propose that the models on victimisation "... fail to take account [of] the political and social structures within which (such) fears are shaped and nourished" (Lewis & Salem 1986:X111). Fear of crime is seen as a consequence of the perceived erosion of social control. This erosion of social control is based on the individuals' opinion that all is not well in their community. This opinion, in turn, is founded on the existence of

- ◆ rowdy teenagers
- ◆ physical deterioration of homes
- ◆ intrusion of "different" population groups into the area
- ◆ increase in criminal activity e.g. drug use and vandalism.

These conditions elicit concern on the part of residents that the mechanisms of social control are no longer effective. The order on which the residents had depended upon has been violated in some way, making the neighbourhood an unsafe place to live.

The work of Lewis and Maxfield (1980) is used to further the claims of the social control model.

#### 2.3.3.1 Lewis and Maxfield (1980)

Lewis and Maxfield (1980:161) opined that fear of crime was not evenly distributed throughout the city. Neighbourhood crime rates vary, as do the perceived risks of victimisation by neighbourhood residents. Following previous research (e.g. Garofalo 1978) the authors propose that the fear of crime is affected not only by the actual incidence of crime, but also by neighbourhood incivilities, i.e. signs of disorder, which include abandoned buildings, vandalism, gangs, and drug peddling. These incivilities create a sense of danger and decay, which increases individuals' perceived risk of victimisation.

Lewis and Maxfield (1980:161) explored the relationship between crime, perceptions of crime, and incivilities in four Chicago neighbourhoods. Their information was obtained from three sources, namely, field observations over a 14 - month period in



1976-1977, telephone surveys of random samples of respondents, and the official crime rate for each neighbourhood. Further to the above, interviews were conducted with residents, officials and community leaders to provide street-level knowledge of neighbourhood problems and characteristics. Apart from the qualitative information obtained, Lewis and Maxfield (1980:162) compared the demographic characteristics of the neighbourhood using data provided by residents during the telephone survey. These characteristics included income, employment, number of children in the household, race, age and ownership of home. Of the four neighbourhoods, Lincoln Park, Wicker Park, Woodlawn and Back of the Yard, Back of the Yard was a stable working-class community which included an ethnic mix of white, hispanic and black families. This area has the highest degree of home-ownership and a large percentage of the residents are young. Residents are aware of crime, but claim that it is a social problem everywhere. There is no serious crime problem in this area. Lincoln Park is considered to be a middle- to uppermiddle- class area. Residents and police agree that the crime problem is not serious, although daytime burglary and auto theft are a problem in the area. There is a low level of fear.

Wicker Park is a neighbourhood of lowerworking-class families, with a certain area becoming gentrified. Friction exists between the English- and Spanish-speaking residents. This area has many problems, including prostitution, drug-peddling, robbery and purse-snatching. Residents expressed fear regarding the crime problem, and their perceptions of the frequency of serious crime were accurate.

Woodlawn is a lower-class neighbourhood which was described by some residents as a ghetto slum. The residents are predominantly black, with a high rate of unemployment. A large percentage of residents are elderly (in comparison to the other areas), and although Woodlawn is considered to be a high crime rate area, residents did not agree with this. Police data show that Woodlawn has a high rate of crime, but that it is limited to certain areas.

In their comparative analysis of the four neighbourhoods, Lewis and Maxfield (1980) conclude as follows:

- ◆ Burglary: residents in Wicker Park and Woodlawn estimated that they have a higher chance of being burgled than did residents in other neighbourhoods. The actual crime rate in these areas was low.
- ◆ Robbery: residents view this form of crime as far more of a problem than burglary, as robbery is viewed as a personal crime involving direct confrontation. An interesting result was obtained as far as Lincoln Park and Back of the Yard were concerned. Although both these areas had a high robbery rate, their concern regarding this form of crime was low.
- ◆ Aggravated assault: few residents in Lincoln's Park and Back of the Yard saw assault as a problem, but many people in Wicker Park expressed concern about assault. Woodlawn residents also expressed concern about assault as a problem. The perceived risk for all the neighbourhoods reflects the frequency of actual assault.
- ◆ Rape and sexual assault: Woodlawn and Lincoln Park show the highest rape rate, yet few residents viewed it as a problem. Fewer women in Lincoln Park and Back of the Yard estimated that they would be victims of a sexual assault, despite the higher rate of rape in Lincoln Park.
- ◆ Residents of Wicker Park expressed more concern about all crime types than residents in other neighbourhoods.
- ◆ The conclusion drawn by Lewis and Maxfield (1980:179) was that "... official crime rates and perceived risk are not related in any simple way".

Many urban residents witness behaviour that can induce fear, e.g. loud noises being made by teenagers or skidrow citizens, abandoned buildings and empty streets. Lewis and Maxfield (1980:180) opine that the attitudes of residents to crime is affected by the ideas they have about what is going on in their community. One of the problems perceived by residents is neighbourhood incivility. Respondents were asked to gauge whether or not the list of incivilities, which included groups hanging around, abandoned buildings, vandalism, drug use and burned-out buildings, were a problem. Residents in Wicker Park scored higher than any of the other residents on each of the incivilities. This community also expressed the most concern in regard to each crime. Wicker Park has however a lower crime rate than the other neighbourhoods. Residents in Lincoln

*Park - who expressed little concern for problems of crime and incivility - have higher crime rates than the other neighbourhoods.*

The question asked is why these results have occurred. Lewis and Maxfield (1980:184) claim that Wicker Park and Back of the Yard are areas with the highest average of young people - and as drug and vandalism are youth-related, this could account for the high concern for crime. One of the most important findings is that people who are concerned about problems of incivility and social order are also concerned about crime.

Lewis and Maxfield (1980:187) conclude that it is important for policy-makers who are concerned about crime to focus on neighbourhood-level approaches to reduce the fear of crime. Most of the crime problems that concern people are problems over which the traditional criminal justice system has no control. Incivility is a problem that has to be solved by activities outside the criminal justice system.

Glanz (1989:27) noted that Lewis (1981) claimed that it was communities that produced fear, not criminals. Therefore, it is the community which must be involved in crime prevention strategies.

## **2.4 MEASUREMENT OF THE FEAR OF CRIME**

In order to clarify how fear of crime can be measured it is necessary to look at past measures of the fear of crime reported in previous research.

Ferraro and La Grange (1987:70) state that the purpose of their research is to critically review and assess the measurement procedures that have been employed by various researchers in the study of the fear of crime.

Fear of crime has been confused with risk of, or vulnerability to, crime. This confusion has often resulted in researchers giving the assurance that, when judgement of risk is measured, researchers' fear of crime is also being measured. The assumption is, however, according to Ferraro and La Grange (1987:73) "... invalid and obscures the

processes that generate these perceptions". Fear of crime refers, then, to "... a negative emotional reaction generated by crime or symbols associated with crime and is conceptually distinct from other judgements (risks) or concerns (values) about crime (Ferraro & La Grange 1987:73). With reference to crime *per se*, the necessity arises for the specification of the types of crime that the respondents fear. According to Ferraro and La Grange (1987:74), this would provide the most valid and reliable indicators of fear of crime. The authors reviewed the results of fifteen years of empirical research on fear of crime.

The conclusions they drew included the following:

- ◆ Fear of crime has frequently been measured and analysed as a single item indicator.
- ◆ This type of measurement strategy was questionable for certain types of analyses. Preference is given to the use of multiple item indices when studying the "... rather complex concept of fear of crime ...".
- ◆ When measuring fear for specific types of crime, there are two methods to follow. Firstly, a researcher may ask one question per type of crime, or secondly, use multiple indicators for a given type of crime.
- ◆ Little attention has been paid to the range of emotional reaction to different crimes.
- ◆ Most of the literature on fear of crime has been disqualified due to the distorted meaning of the fear of crime concept. In illustration Ferraro and La Grange (1987:76) analyse three of the major questions asked of respondents which have been accepted as the major indicators of fear.

Firstly, "How do you feel walking alone at night in your neighbourhood?" This question measures risk or the persons judgement about the likelihood of becoming a victim. It is not related to the feeling of fear.

Secondly, "How safe do you feel or would you feel being out alone in your neighbourhood at night?" According to Ferraro and La Grange (1987:76), this item is inherently flawed because the word crime is not mentioned; the word

neighbourhood means different things to different people; the respondents are asked about their perceived safety; and there is no differentiation between objective risk judgement and emotional reaction.

Thirdly, the question "Is there any area right around here - that is, within a mile - where you would be afraid to walk alone at night?" is a single item indicator, and is the most frequently used question. Although it is considered useful, Ferraro and La Grange (1987:77) noted that the "... lack of specificity in the remainder of the question overrides its apparent usefulness".

- ◆ Warr and Stafford (1983) provided the most useful measure of the fear of crime. Their question "How afraid are you of becoming the victim of (sixteen separate offences) in your everyday life?" involves a personal reference and a list of specific crimes. According to Ferraro and La Grange (1987:79), both the risk of victimisation and fear of victimisation are assessed for each of the sixteen offences.

Ferraro and La Grange (1987:81), although recognising the problems related to the measurement of the fear of crime, offer some suggestions for future research. Firstly, the state of fear of crime should be tapped: e.g. "How afraid are you ..." is a useful measurement to examine emotional reaction. Secondly, explicit references to crime should be made, for without them the respondents' fear reactions are unreliable and invalid. Thirdly, specific victimisation or categories of victimisation should be used to assess an individual's fear reactions. Fourthly, questions measuring fear of crime should be stated in non-hypothetical format. Avoid the word "would" in the formulation of the question. Lastly, bring a touch of reality to the questions regarding the fear of crime by specifying "in your everyday life".

Few of the studies reviewed by Ferraro and La Grange (1987) have succeeded in meeting all the criteria mentioned previously. The authors hope that the awareness of the problems experienced in the measurement of the fear of crime would lead to a better understanding of the etiology of the fear of crime.

## 2.5 SUMMARY

Victimology is the systematic study of victims and victimisation which only began in the USA in the 1940's.

Various typologies of victims exist, the most notable being those of Young-Rifai, Mannheim, Schafer and Van der Westhuizen.

The models or perspectives in victimology include the "Synthesis" Approach of Fattah (1976) the Opportunity Theory of Cohen et al. (1981), and Routine Activity Approach by Cohen and Felson (1979).

Three models of the fear of crime have been identified:

- ◆ Irrational model which viewed the fear of crime as an irrational response to a perceived threat of criminal victimisation.
- ◆ Cognitive model which opined that the fear of crime is based on rational response to a subjectively defined threat of criminal victimisation.
- ◆ Social control model which inferred that of people perceive their environment as unsafe, they are likely to fear crime.

In the analysis of the presented literature in substantiation of the three models, the following conclusion can be drawn on the basis of factors affecting the fear of crime:

- ◆ Demographic variables including age, gender, race, and socio-economic status (measured by income and education levels) are the most important factors to be used in measuring fear of crime.
- ◆ Neighbourhood variables, which include cohesion; incivilities and size are also often used in analysing the source of fear.
- ◆ Previous experience of victimisation is used by three out of the ten authors in their analysis of the factors affecting the fear of crime. Other factors of less importance, include the quality of life, routine activities, actual risk of victimisation, socialised vulnerability, the mass media, confidence in the police,

perceived risk of victimisation, number of persons residing with the respondent, marital status, ownership of home, and health.

- ◆ Is there any area right around here - that is within a mile - where you would be afraid to walk alone at night?
- ◆ How safe do you feel walking alone at night in your neighbourhood?
- ◆ How afraid are you of being alone in your neighbourhood at night?

However, Ferraro and La Grange (1987:75) believe that these questions are inappropriate for the measurement of fear of crime. They prefer the question posed by Warr and Stafford (1983): "How afraid are you of becoming a victim of (sixteen separate offences) in your everyday life?" This type of question not only refers to fear of specific types of crime, but also indicates the personal feelings of the respondent.

Ferraro and La Grange (1987:81) suggest that any attempt to measure fear, should make explicit reference to the types of crime. Fear reactions vary as to the type of crime. These reactions can vary from relatively diffuse states of anxiety to acute states such as trauma. Ferraro and La Grange (1987:75) pointed out that little attention has been paid to the range of reaction to fear, and this should be rectified.

In an attempt to bridge the gap between literature from the USA and South Africa, and under the aegis of the criticisms of existing literature by Ferraro and La Grange (1987), the present study will measure the fear of crime by using it as the dependent variable and including, among the independent variables affecting crime, the following: age, gender, household composition, type of housing, previous victimisation, concern about crime (based on the rating of crime as a social problem), role of the police and neighbourhood involvement. Specific questions relating to the fear of specific crimes will be indicated. This is the first comprehensive study of the fear of crime in Northern KwaZulu-Natal, which as a province has been exposed to crime and violence for several decades.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

Social research can be defined as a human activity through which a social phenomenon is studied in an objective manner in order to achieve an understanding of the social phenomena. The intention is then to discover something about the world in which we live and how the world is conceived in terms of basic concepts within the discipline. Research is about asserting a theory; (i.e. ontological claim) but also explaining by what procedures the theory was produced (i.e. epistemological questions); what other evidence supports the theory and how the evidence was assembled.

If the aim of research is to produce scientific knowledge then the researcher must master the methods and techniques of social research. Once the research problem has been identified, the particular research tool must be decided upon to provide the data required. But every research tool or procedure is intricately embedded in commitments to world views held by the researcher. The technique or method used is effective only if it has a philosophical justification i.e. research methods cannot be divorced from theory as they operate within a given set of assumptions about the nature of the world (Hughes 1980:12-14).

#### **3.2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Research methodology deals with the philosophy of the research process. This philosophy, according to Bailey (1987:33), includes firstly, the assumptions and values that serve as a rationale for the research; and secondly the standards the researcher uses for interpreting data and reading conclusions. There are basically two general approaches within the field of sociology and criminology, namely positivism and anti-positivism.



## ◆ Positivism

Positivism proposes a science characterised by "problem-solving" empirical research. Giddens (1993:234) claims that positivism can specifically refer to the development of a "positivist philosophy" propagated by Auguste Comte, or generally to the writings of philosophers who have adopted the following perspectives, namely

- \* the belief that reality consists of sense impressions
- \* the aversion to metaphysics
- \* the representation of philosophy as a method of analysis separable but dependent of the findings of science
- \* the belief that empirical knowledge is different from the pursuit of moral aims
- \* the notion that the natural and social science share a common logical methodological foundation.

Positivism is strongly in favour of knowledge concerning facts which have been systematically discovered, supported by evidence and which are theoretically significant. Knowledge can be empirical and logical. Empirical knowledge derives from the interpretation of facts as they exist in the external world and as they are made known to us by our actions and senses; i.e. there is no knowledge "a priori" experience (Hughes 1980:21).

Durkheim (in Hughes 1980:32) tried to demonstrate that society was a reality *sui generis*. The social world could be studied using natural science methods because science was a study of 'things'. These 'things' are external realities, not subject to human will and resist attempts to change them. Social science deals with social facts which take on the property of 'things'. The task of the social scientist then is to describe the characteristics of social facts, how they come into existence, how they relate to one another, how they act on each other and how they function to coordinate social wholes.

## ◆ Anti-positivism

The alternative to positivism has been labelled the humanistic approach. Hughes (1980:65) opines that this approach rejects the scientific method and stresses instead

the role of interpretation, understanding and moral commentary as the proper way of obtaining knowledge about subjective matters. The approach is adamant that social life cannot be studied in the same way as natural sciences and that different methods must be used. Max Weber (in Hughes 1980:69) proposed an "interpretative understanding" as a means toward objective knowledge. This method proposes to study human action on the basis of two principles, namely

- \* value neutrality (the refraining from passing off value judgements as scientific truths)
- \* method of the ideal type/development of a typology which is conceptually pure and according to which human behaviour can be judged.

The understanding becomes transformed into the construction of rational models.

The anti-positivist approach views the task of the social scientist as the development of some or other theoretical account of social life. This requires empirical research whereby data must be obtained from the lives of social actors. However, the meaning that actors give to their environment must also be taken into account.

The research methodology to be used in this study is positivistic in nature as the fear of crime is a reality which is perceived by the senses and these perceptions must be examined, processed and transformed into a valuable scientific explanation of the social phenomena.

### **3.3 RESEARCH METHODS**

Research is based on the assumption that all behaviour and events are orderly and have discoverable causes. In order to discover the facts influencing the fear of crime, a formal intensive and systematic application of research methods is a prerequisite. The aim of using research methods in the present study is to describe and explain the factors influencing fear of crime.

Criminological research authorities have varying views about methods that can be used in criminological research. Futrell and Roberson (1988:91-116) identify historical, descriptive, analytical and experimental methods. Fitzgerald and Cox (1987:44-64) emphasise descriptive, explanatory, and exploratory methods. Van der Walt et al. (1985:167) identify three methods open for criminological research, namely the method of case analysis, the method of mass observation and the analytical method. For the purposes of the present study these three methods are considered.

### **3.3.1 Method of case analysis**

The case analysis method in research is used when the researcher regards a phenomenon, like juvenile delinquency, as an individual-human phenomenon. In social science, generally, a "case" need not be an individual human being. A community may be taken as a case, whereupon a comprehensive description of its peculiar components may be studied with the aim of learning about its history, religious, political and racial make-up (Babbie 1990:32-33). Thus a case study could involve an individual, a single institution, community or social group.

The case analysis method in research wishes to demonstrate the structural or functional factors responsible for the existence of a social phenomenon; determinate its relation to other factors; gain new knowledge and test the validity of existing hypotheses. Case studies can also be used to produce typologies which define a social phenomenon.

### **3.3.2 The method of mass observation**

Otherwise known as the statistical method, the method of mass observation is used when the researcher regards a social phenomenon as a mass phenomenon. Within criminological research, the value of statistics lies in the following:

- ◆ Firstly, on the description and trends of crime.
- ◆ Secondly, it enables the researcher to undertake comparative studies
- ◆ Thirdly, through crime statistics, researchers can predict and symbolically control

crime, provide legislators with facts for policy formulations and provide a basis through which the courts, police and correctional institutions can upgrade their services.

The method of mass observation is also particularistic and involves designing research, describing collected data and making decisions upon collected data (Futrell & Roberson 1988:151).

### **3.3.3 The analytical method**

The analytical method is used when the researcher sees social phenomenon as a combination of individual-human and social factors. Under the analytical method the case analysis and statistical methods are synthesised and lose their status as methods and become techniques of the analytical method (Van der Walt et al. 1985:174-175). Whilst the method of mass observation is used to explain and apply the findings, in the analytical method inferences about a population are made from the analysed samples (Futrell & Roberson 1988:105).

Leedy (1985:173) says that in the analytical method, quantitative data is analysed by means of statistical tools for the purpose of probing so that researchers may infer certain meanings which lie hidden within the data. Further, in the analytical method, the researcher is concerned with problems of estimation and the testing of statistically based hypotheses.

In the analytical method statistics have the following functions, namely to

- ◆ determination of the centre of the data being measured
- ◆ determining the diversity of data
- ◆ determining how closely or distantly certain characteristics of the data are related
- ◆ determining the degree to which facts may have occurred by mere chance or if there is a probability of it being influenced by some other force (Futrell & Roberson 1988:106).

Van der Westhuizen (1982:3-4) identifies four general functions of the analytical methods:

- (i) **Goal-achievement function.** The analytical method is goal-directed, and through relevant techniques it provides for descriptive and explanatory investigations.
- (ii) **Adaptive function.** Through the use of the analytical method the researcher can lay down a meaningful relationship between a fact and a theory.
- (iii) **Integrative function.** The analytical method is non-particularistic in nature. It enables the researcher to be neutral and enables him to study crime phenomenon on both group and individual-human level.
- (iv) **Pattern-maintenance function.** The analytical method respects recognised methodological principles and yet leaves room for change, refinement and innovation.

Thus, in research, the social phenomenon to be studied must be recognised as an individual-human-social phenomenon where factors such as age, sex, socio-economic status, living conditions and perceptions of crime must be investigated. The social phenomenon must be regarded as a mass phenomenon which, through using statistical methods, can be described, measured and explained. The combination of the above implies that the social phenomenon can be described, explained, predicted and therefore controlled. It is in the analytical method that descriptive and inferential statistics will be used.

### 3.4 RESEARCH STRATEGY

The research strategy is basically the steps that are followed by any researcher in their attempt to describe, measure, explain, predict and control social phenomenon.

#### 3.4.1 Identification of the research problem

The identification of the topic of research, fear of crime was influenced by the following

factors, namely

- ◆ values and beliefs of the researcher
- ◆ the attempt to resolve key problems associated with the fear of crime
- ◆ attempt to explain fear of crime and its effects on society
- ◆ the availability of finance for the project
- ◆ the availability of existing data (Haralambos 1991:719).

### 3.4.2 The literature review

The literature review included the reading of documented material which is found in libraries or elsewhere. The documents included reports, articles, periodicals, books, diaries, biographies, autobiographies and unpublished material (Futrell & Roberson 1988:17 and Van der Walt et al. 1985:212-214).

According to Leedy (1985:69), reviewing literature has the following purposes:

- ◆ Literature of similar investigations helps to show how identical situations were handled
- ◆ Through literature, methods and techniques of handling problematic situations are revealed
- ◆ Through literature review sources of data, their advantages and disadvantages, are revealed
- ◆ It introduces the researcher to significant research personalities in the field of study
- ◆ Through literature survey the study may be seen in historical and associational perspective; and in relation to earlier and more primitive attacks to the problem
- ◆ Documents provide the researcher with new ideas and approaches
- ◆ It assists the researcher to evaluate his/her efforts by comparing them to related efforts of others.

The documented material utilised in this study is listed in alphabetical order in the bibliographical section of this thesis.

### **3.4.3 Conceptualisation of the research problem**

Any research problem is conveyed through the use of a set of concepts. These concepts are converted into variables. Scientific explanations and predictions involve relating the dependent variable to the independent variables, i.e. an attempt is made to establish a covariation.

The variable that a researcher wishes to explain is the dependent variable. In this research study it is the fear of crime. The variable(s) expected to produce change in the dependent variable is referred to as an independent variable. The independent variables include age, gender, household characteristics, previous victimisation, crime as a social problem and the role of the police.

A hypothesis becomes a tentative answer to a research problem which is expressed in the form of a relation between independent and dependent variables (Frankfort - Nachmias & Nachmias 1992:61). A hypothesis is proposed by a researcher and then it is tested. If it is not supported, then another is proposed. If it is supported, it becomes incorporated into the scientific body of knowledge. The hypotheses formulated for this study were presented in Chapter One as part of the introduction.

Once the research problem has been identified and conceptualised, the decision must then be taken on what techniques to use to obtain the necessary data for the testing of the hypotheses.

## **3.5 RESEARCH TECHNIQUES**

The techniques used in this investigation included the development of a questionnaire, sampling and the techniques used for the analysing and interpretation of the data.

### **3.5.1 Survey method**

Although the survey method includes mailed questionnaires, personal interviews and

telephonic interviews, for the purpose of this research it was decided to hand deliver the questionnaires to respondents and collect them in a similar way. The advantages of this method were that it was relatively cheap to administer, the absence of the interviewer provided greater anonymity to respondents, the respondents completed the questionnaire in their own time, and a wider range of possible respondents was available. The disadvantages were that no account could be obtained of the nonverbal behaviour of respondents; the researcher had no control over who filled the questionnaire in (although the request was made for both male and female residents of a household to each complete a questionnaire) and the response rate could not be controlled. (Although 800 questionnaires were distributed, the researcher only received 385 back).

Other problems associated with this method of research was that the researcher could not compromise the promised anonymity of respondents by sending a reminder postcard, nor could the researcher control for literacy and comprehension of the English language on the part of the respondents.

#### 3.5.1.1 The questionnaire

In the development of the questionnaire, use was made of closed-ended questions. The reasons for this include:

- ◆ Answers obtained make comparisons between respondents easier.
- ◆ Answers are easier to code and analyse.
- ◆ The meaning of closed-ended questions is clearer which minimises the chance of respondents not answering questions.
- ◆ Respondents have minimal writing to do which makes it easier to fill in the questionnaire (Bailey 1987:118).

The questionnaire was developed in order to obtain information about the following:



◆ Demographic characteristics of respondents

The demographic characteristics of respondents included gender (1 = male, 2 = female); marital status (1 = married, 2 = widowed, 3 = divorced, 4 = separated and 5 = single); age (1 = 18-24 years, 2 = 25-34 years, 3 = 35-44 years, 4 = 45-54 years, 5 = 55-64 years and 6 = over 65 years of age); ethnic group (1 = black, 2 = white); educational qualifications (1 = below standard 8, 2 = standard 8, 3 = standard 9, 4 = standard 10, 5 = diploma and 6 = degree); occupation (1 = unemployed, 2 = labourer, 3 = professional worker, 4 = technical and related worker, 5 = businessman, 6 = administrative worker, 7 = student, 8 = service worker, 9 = armed forces, 10 = agricultural worker, and 11 = self-employed); area of residence (1 = Empangeni, 2 = Richards Bay); type of housing (1 = brickhousing, 2 = connected housing, 3 = alternative housing forms); household composition (1 = single, 2 = two persons, 3 = three persons, 4 = 4 persons, 5 = five or more persons).

◆ Fear of crime (formless and concrete fear)

To measure formless fear the respondents were asked to indicate their answers (1 = very safe, 2 = fairly safe, 3 = fairly unsafe and 4 = very unsafe) to the following questions:

- ◆ How safe do you feel walking alone at night in your neighbourhood? (abridged to walking alone).
- ◆ How safe do you feel alone in your home or apartment at night? (abridged to home alone)
- ◆ How safe do you feel in your neighbourhood when leaving from or arriving at home? (abridged to leaving/arriving at home)

To measure concrete fear, the respondents were asked to indicate their fear (1 = not fearful at all, 2 = a little fearful, 3 = quite fearful and 4 = very fearful) of personal victimisation and property crimes. Personal victimisation included being raped while alone at home (abridged to rape at home); being raped while away from home

(abridged to rape - away); being killed while at home (abridged to killed at home), being killed away from home (abridged to killed - away) being robbed or mugged (abridged to robbed/mugged); being assaulted (abridged to physical assault); being abducted from your home (abridged to abduction); and being shot at with an AK47 or other firearm (abridged to shot at).

Property crimes included having your house broken into (abridged to housebreaking); having damage inflicted on your property (abridged to property damage); having your house set alight (abridged to arson); having your motor vehicle broken into and valuables stolen (abridged to vehicle broken into); and being ambushed while driving a motor vehicle (abridged to hijacking).

◆ Previous victimisation experience of respondents

The respondents were asked to indicate if they had experienced either personal victimisation or property crimes against them in the past year. The list of types of personal victimisation included sexual assault, robbery or mugging, being shot at while driving a vehicle (abridged to shot at); and being stoned while driving a vehicle (abridged to stoning). The list of property crimes included housebreaking, property damage, vehicle broken into and valuables stolen (abridged to vehicle broken into) and vehicle stolen.

- ◆ Respondents were asked to rate whether certain types of crime were a social problem in their area of residence. The list of crimes included statutory crimes (traffic violations, driving under the influence of alcohol); crimes of a personal nature (rape, robbery, assault, being killed and abduction) and property crimes (housebreaking, theft of or out of vehicles, other forms of theft, vandalism, hijacking or bag snatching). (Their responses were coded 1 = no problem at all, 2= less of a problem, 3 = more of a problem and 4 = very problematic).

◆ Respondents' views and opinions on the role of the police.

*The role of the police was divided into four categories, namely contact with the police; the reporting and non-reporting of crime to the police; the public's views on their obligation to help the police in combating crime; and the public's opinion of the service rendered by police. In the first category, the respondents were asked to indicate what type of contact they had had with the police (1 = accused and convicted, 2 = accused but acquitted, 3 = suspect in a criminal case, 4 = complainant or victim, 5 = witness in a criminal case, 6 = informant and 7 = no contact). The second category involved the respondent's reporting of crime to the police in which they had been a victim and those of which they had no knowledge. (The response categories were 1 = always, 2 = often, 3 = sometimes and 4 = never). The reasons for not reporting a crime to the police included: not wanting to bother the police (abridged to bother police), the case would not receive property attention (abridged to no proper attention); the police do not react promptly to emergency calls (abridged to not prompt); the case is unsolvable (abridged to unsolvable case); inability of the police to solve case (abridged to police unable to solve); not in the interest of society to report case (abridged to society uninterested); the case can be settled personally (abridged to settled personally); case is of a personal nature (abridged to personal nature); attending court is time consuming (abridged to time consuming); hate getting involved in court case (abridged to dislike of involvement); negative attitude and approach of the police when called out (abridged to negative attitude); you are treated as the guilty party by police (abridged to guilty party); partiality on the part of the police when crime is reported (abridged to partiality of police); and fear of retaliation (unabridged).*

In the third category, namely the public's opinion of their obligation in combating crime, the respondents were requested to indicate if they had a duty to combat crime (the response categories were 1 = undoubtedly, 2 = to a large extent; 3 = uncertain, 4 = to a lesser extent and 5 = not at all). The respondents were then asked to indicate their willingness to assist the police in combating crime (the response categories were 1 = always, 2 = often, 3 = uncertain, 4 = sometimes and 5 = never). The last question in this category was whether the respondent regarded himself/herself as an important link in the criminal justice system (the response categories were (1 = yes and 2 = no).

In the last category, the respondents were asked to indicate their agreement (the response categories were 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = disagree and 5 = strongly disagree) on the following statements:

- ◆ The local police are doing a good job to prevent crime (abridged to good job).
- ◆ The local police should be given more powers to arrest and prosecute criminals (abridged to more power).
- ◆ When called out to the scene, the local police are prompt, co-operative, friendly, helpful, courteous or uninterested in the case.

The final question pertained to the visibility of the police and involved asking respondents to indicate their opinion on how often the police actually patrol the residential area of the respondents (the responses included 1 = monthly, 2 = weekly; 3 = daily, 4 = seldom and 5 = never).

◆ Security measures taken by respondents

The respondents were requested to indicate what steps they had taken to protect their property and their person. The list of measures taken to protect property included locking doors of the house (abridged to locked doors); acquiring a guard-dog (abridged to guard dog); installing of an alarm system (abridged to alarm); adding extra outside lights (abridged to extra lights); fixing of deadlocks to doors (abridged to fixed locks); installing of burglar proofing (abridged to burglar proofing); engraving valuables (abridged to engraving); installing security warning lights (abridged to security lights); leaving the radio/TV and lights on when not at home (abridged to radio/TV and lights); erecting walls (abridged to walling) and acquiring a fire-arm (abridged to firearm).

The list of measures taken to protect the person included not going out alone during the night (abridged to not go out alone - night); not going out alone during the day (abridged to not go out alone - day); carrying a personal alarm (abridged to carry alarm); taking self defence classes (abridged to self defence classes); locking doors of vehicle while driving (abridged to lock doors of car); notifying others of your whereabouts (abridged to notify others); carrying a firearm on your person (abridged to carry firearm).

Since respondents do not live in a vacuum, they were asked to indicate their involvement with their neighbours in regard to protection of their property and person. The following questions were asked in this regard:

- ◆ During the past two (2) years have you asked a neighbour to keep a watchful eye on your property while you were away? (abridged to asked neighbour).
- ◆ During the past two (2) years, has a neighbour asked you to keep a watchful eye on their property while they were away? (abridged to asked by a neighbour)
- ◆ If you were being attacked at home, do you think your neighbour would come to your assistance? (abridged to neighbour come to your aid).

The respondents were also asked to indicate their knowledge of and involvement in a Neighbourhood Watch System in their residential area. Three questions were asked:

- ◆ Is there any Neighbourhood Watch system operating in the area where you live? (abridged to Neighbourhood Watch exists)
- ◆ Are you a member of Neighbourhood Watch? (abridged to present member)
- ◆ Would you be willing to participate in such a system? (abridged to willingness to be a member).

The response categories for all questions pertaining to precautionary measures was 1 = yes and 2 = no.

#### 3.5.1.2 Scales of measurement

Social scientists often measure indications of concepts e.g. the fear of crime cannot be observed directly but must be inferred from indicators such as feelings of safety, fear of specific crimes being committed, perceived risk of victimisation and responses to the fear of crime. These indicators must have numerals or numbers substituted for the value of the indicators, to allow quantitative analysis of responses. This promotes the different scales of measurement. Nominal scale implies a set of objects which can be classified into exhaustive and mutually exclusive categories, i.e. gender, language,

ethnic group, marital status and place of residence. Ordinal scales reflect a relationship between two variables and generates a ranking of objects. The ordinal scale is used when measuring attitudes, the most often utilised the Likert scale (Bailey 1982:362-363 and Frankfort Nachmias & Nachmias 1992:153).

The interval scale is used to measure constant distance between observations (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias 1992:155). The ratio scale exists when the variable has a neutral zero point e.g. weight, length and time (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias 1992:156).

To ensure that no errors in measurement occur, techniques can be used to measure the validity and reliability of the measuring instrument.

### 3.5.1.3 Validity and reliability of the measuring instrument

In order to ascertain if the measuring instrument used in this research study was valid, i.e. that a relationship exists between the concept - fear of crime and the theoretical assumptions surrounding that concept - a factor analysis was done to measure construct validity of the fear of crime measures. The results of the factor analysis are presented in table 3.1.

**TABLE 3.1 VALIDITY OF THE FEAR OF CRIME MEASURE (N = 385)**

<b>FACTOR ONE</b>	<b>SCORES</b>
Walking alone	0.84500
Home alone	0.84375
Leaving/arriving at home	0.87513

Since the scores are above 0,80, these measures of the fear of crime are deemed valid.

Reliability refers to the extent to which a measuring instrument contains variable errors i.e. errors that differ from observation during anyone measuring instance (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias 1993:163) Every measurement then consists of two elements; a true component and an error component. Reliability can then be defined as the ratio

of the true score variance to the total variance in the scores as measured. The reliability measure varies on a scale from 0 (measurement involves nothing but error), to 1 (no variable error in measurement).

Reliability of the measuring instrument can be assessed in one of four ways, namely test-retest method, alternative-form method, split-half method and internal consistency method.

The *test-retest method* obtains a correlation between two repeated applications of the same test to the same respondents. If a researcher obtains the same correlation result on two administrations of the test, then the test would be reliable (Carmines & Zeller 1979:38). The test-retest method is limited in that any retest may be affected by change of experience, reactivity and over-estimation by the respondent (Carmines & Zeller 1979:40).

The *alternative-form method* of assessing reliability of a measuring instrument is similar to the test-retest in that it also requires two testing situations and attainment of the same correlation result. It differs from the test-retest method in that an alternative form of test is administered. The advantage of the alternative-form method is that it reduces the extent to which the respondent's memory can inflate the reliability estimate. Its limitation lies in the practical difficulty of constructing alternative forms that are parallel (Carmines & Zeller 1979:40-41).

The *split-half method* differs from the test-retest and alternative-form methods in that the test or measurement is administered once. The total set of items is then divided into halves and the scores on each half are correlated to obtain an estimate reliability (Carmines & Zeller 1979:41).

The *internal consistency* of assessing reliability also requires a single measurement administration. It provides a unique estimate of reliability for a given test administration. The most popular internal consistency method is the so-called Cronbach's Alpha Individual Item Analysis (Carmines & Zeller 1979:44).

Item analysis attempts to find those items that form an internally consistent scale and to eliminate those that do not. Internal consistency is a measurable property of items (or statements) that implies that they measure the same construct. It reflects the extent to which such items inter-correlate with one another. The item analysis provides information on how well each item relates to the other items of analysis. This is reflected by the item-remainder coefficient calculated for each item. The item remainder co-efficient is the correlation of each item with the sum of the remaining items. Those items with the highest co-efficient are retained. Co-efficient Alpha is a measure then of the internal consistency of a scale. A widely acceptable rule of thumb accepted by most researchers (Spector 1992:32) is that the alpha should be 0.70 for a scale to demonstrate internal consistency. (The formula for co-efficient alpha is given in Annexure C).

The Cronbach Alpha Individual Item Analysis was applied to four scales, firstly the fear of crime scale, secondly the fear of specific types of crime scale, thirdly the respondents rating of specific crime as a social problem scale, and lastly the scale of the respondents opinion of the services rendered by local police respectively. The results are depicted in tables 3.2 to 3.5.

**TABLE 3.2: RELIABILITY OF THE MEASURES OF FEAR OF CRIME (N = 385)**

CONCEPT	RAW VARIABLES	STANDARD VARIABLES
Walking alone	0.765263	0.768235
Home alone	0.766350	0.766124
Leaving/arriving at home	0.709278	0.707115
<hr/>		
Cronbach Alpha Coefficient	=	0.815379
Standard Alpha	=	0.817066



**TABLE 3.3: RELIABILITY OF THE FEAR OF SPECIFIC CRIME SCALE (N = 385)**

CONCEPT	RAW	STANDARD
<b>PERSONAL VICTIMISATION</b>		
Rape (at home)	0.938407	0.941671
Rape (away from home)	0.937487	0.940927
Killed (at home)	0.927465	0.932167
Killed (away from home)	0.928178	0.932710
Robber/mugged	0.930498	0.934643
Physical assault	0.930834	0.935014
Abduction	0.931182	0.935944
Shot at	0.931477	0.936172
<b>PROPERTY CRIMES</b>		
Housebreaking	0.934997	0.939554
Property damage	0.932756	0.937043
Arson	0.930888	0.935608
Vehicle broken into	0.933061	0.937437
Hijacking	0.929943	0.934580

---

Cronbach Alpha Coefficient	=	0.993699
Standard Alpha	=	0.941070

**TABLE 3.4: RELIABILITY OF THE RATING SCALE OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS**

(N = 385)

CONCEPT	RAW	STANDARD
<b>STATUTORY CRIMES</b>		
Traffic violations	0.905708	0.906622
Drunken driving	0.901469	0.902471
<b>PERSONAL VICTIMISATION</b>		
Sexual assault	0.904984	0.905167
Robbery	0.897871	0.898547
Assault	0.897224	0.897596
Abduction	0.898477	0.899495
Being killed	0.896585	0.897784
<b>PROPERTY CRIMES</b>		
Housebreaking	0.902813	0.903651
Theft of/out of vehicle	0.900898	0.901592
Other theft	0.903374	0.904209
Vandalism	0.901469	0.902471
Hijacking	0.897408	0.898112
Bagsnatching	0.899269	0.900149
<hr/>		
Cronbach Alpha Coefficient	=	0.907201
Standard Alpha	=	0.907953

**TABLE 3.5: RELIABILITY OF THE MEASURE OF RESPONDENTS' VIEW OF POLICE SERVICE (N = 385)**

CONCEPT	RAW	STANDARD
Doing a good job	0.768406	0.752440
More powers	0.796398	0.800286
Prompt	0.744566	0.749529
Cooperative	0.723851	0.728628
Friendly	0.726965	0.731169
Helpful	0.727951	0.732220
Courteous	0.735843	0.736731
Uninterested	0.839500	0.837135
Patrolling of neighbourhood	0.778060	0.783763

Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient = 0.778593

Standard Alpha = 0.785522

In all instances, these measuring scales are over 0.70, which implies that the scales measuring fear of crime, fear of types of crime, crime as a social problem and the opinion of respondents of the service rendered by police are reliable.

The validity and reliability of any measurement instrument is important, as the results of the study can be directly affected by the quality of the measurement instrument. Of equal importance in any research, is the respondents who are chosen to complete the questionnaire.

### **3.5.2 Sampling Procedures**

In the selecting of a sampling technique, the researcher ensures that he/she will be able to make confident generalisations. Sampling techniques are divided into probability and non-probability sampling.

Probability sampling allows the researcher to specify the probability that a unit in the total population will be included in the sample. Probability sampling rests on the assumption that human populations are heterogeneous with variations such as age,

gender, socio-economic status, family structures etc. The selection of a sample by chance can lead to conscious and unconscious bias. The sample chosen should be limited to those characteristics that are relevant to the substantive interests of the study (Babbie 1990:70-71).

Non-probability sampling techniques are employed when precise representativeness is not necessary and also in situations in which sampling would be expensive. Non-probability sampling is non-random and is useful in pilot surveys. It is less expensive and can be carried out on a spur-of-the-moment basis (Bailey 1987:92). Its obvious disadvantage is that no representativeness of the sample can be claimed. The following are examples of non-probability sampling techniques:

- ◆ Convenience samples which are obtained when a researcher selects whatever sampling units are conveniently available.
- ◆ Purposive samples are where the sampling units are selected subjectively by the researcher who is attempting to make the sample appear representative of the population.
- ◆ Quota samples which involves the selection of a sample that is similar to the sampling population.

#### 3.5.2.1 Spatial delimitation of the sample group

For the purpose of sampling in the research, the following areas within the confines of the Lower Umfolozi area have been included:-

- ◆ Richards Bay Transitional Local Council. This area includes Richards Bay and the two large predominantly black townships situated south of Richards Bay, namely Esikhawini and Vulindlela.
- ◆ Empangeni Transitional Local Council. This area includes the large predominantly black residential township of Ngwelezane and the area of Empangeni.

The researcher obtained maps of the Richards Bay and Empangeni Municipal areas from the Technical Services of the respective councils. However, these council maps proved to be unreliable and incomplete as they did not reflect the position of informal settlements. For example, the researcher personally observed the existence of numerous alternative housing units not appearing on the street maps. These informal settlements were to be found close to the Richards Bay Harbour (the largest export harbour in South Africa) as well as next to Green Hills Police Station in Richards Bay. This influenced the sampling method, as Maxfield and Babbie (1995) issued a stern warning when they stated "... [that] in strictly zoned urban regions, illegal housing units are unlikely to appear on official records. As a result, such units would have no chance for selection, and sampling findings could not be representative of those units, which are often poorer and more overcrowded ... than the average" (Maxfield & Babbie 1995:196). Therefore it would be difficult, if not impossible, to eliminate bias resulting from utilising street directories to effect sample representativeness between properly zoned areas and informal settlements. On the basis of the abovementioned problems, the researcher arbitrarily decided to implement a purposive or judgmental sampling technique.

This approach enabled the researcher to eliminate research bias by including the informal settlements in the study, which would have been omitted or ignored if probability sampling procedures had been implemented.

Maxfield and Babbie (1995:206-207) opined that "... occasionally it may be appropriate to select a sample on the basis of [the researchers'] own knowledge of the population, its elements, and the nature of [the] research aims - in short, based on the [the researchers] judgement and the purpose of the study".

The research was conducted in March 1995.

### 3.5.2.2 Qualitative and quantitative delimitation of the sample group

Due to the inability to mail questionnaires to respondents, as certain residential areas did not have a home delivery service but made use of post boxes, the decision was made to hand deliver the questionnaires to households in the residential areas.

The original decision for the fieldwork to be done by the researcher was negated due to the work circumstances of said researcher. Field workers were then utilized. The field workers were Honours students in the Department of Sociology at the University of Zululand and numbered four. They were to distribute the questionnaires in Vulindlela, Esikhawini and Ngwelezane. Before the distribution of the questionnaire, the field workers underwent an instruction course which included the following:

- ◆ In mapped residential areas (streets) and informal settlement areas (fareways), every tenth dwelling was to be approached and the inhabitants asked to complete the questionnaire.
- ◆ Wherever possible, both male and female members of a household were to be asked to complete the questionnaire without undue consultation or influence from each other.
- ◆ There was to be limited participation from the field workers in the respondents' completion of the questionnaire. If approached to help translate the concepts into Zulu, the field workers could participate, but must not influence the respondent in any way.

Respondents, irrespective of race, residing in the abovementioned regions were included in the study. (The demographic characteristics of the respondents are represented in Annexure B). Although the attempt was made to ensure that both male and female residents of a household completed the questionnaire, due to the poor response from respondents, this attempt did not succeed.

The original number of respondents was not to exceed one thousand. Although 800 questionnaires were distributed to respondents by hand, only 385 were collected/returned, constituting a 48.13% response rate.

Problems associated with the sampling method included the following:

- ◆ The fieldworkers endeavoured to recover the questionnaires but they were met with an unwillingness to cooperate by the original respondents.
- ◆ Many respondents voiced concern about the confidentiality of the information, especially as the study was conducted by a student at the University of Zululand. Respondents feared disclosing physical security measures for fear of this knowledge being given to “undesirable elements” and used against them.
- ◆ The fieldworkers also feared being out at night in certain residential areas which were known to be unsafe after dark.

Against the backdrop of the abovementioned difficulties and the “less-than-perfect-conditions” for research, the existence of informal settlements added further problems to the chosen method of sampling as these informal settlements were not reflected in the street directories obtained from the respective town councils.

Thus, the findings of the present research can be taken as representing only the aggregation of respondents composing the sample group. The findings of this research should by no means be regarded as a generalisation in terms of the total population residing in the Lower Umfolozi area.

### **3.5.3 Statistical techniques**

In the interpretation of the data, statistics are used for descriptive purposes, i.e. percentages, means, standard deviation and correlation coefficients, and make it possible to reduce data to manageable proportions. Descriptive statistics are useful

when interrelationships between more than two variables are needed. The second purpose of statistics is to enable the researcher to infer properties of a population on the basis of sample results i.e. inferential statistics.

#### 3.5.3.1 Frequency distributions

The first task, after data has been coded, is to construct frequency distributions to examine the pattern of responses to each of the independent and dependent variables under investigation. Frequency distributions contain the number of responses (n) and their percentages. Percentages (%) are given to the nearest decimal and totals equal exactly 100.00.

(The frequency distributions of responses to the scales of fear of crime, fear of personal victimisation and property crimes, previous victimisation, precautionary measures, crime as a social problem and the role of the police are presented in Annexure B).

Frequency distribution is usually utilised in the summation of nominal scales. Interval scales, however, require the use of different measures. The first is the use of the arithmetic mean, which is the sum of the scores divided by the total number of cases involved. The symbol  $\bar{x}$  is used to indicate the mean. However, in research although it is necessary to compare the measures of control tendencies, it is also important to know about the dispersion in each group. For this purpose, the standard deviation is used. To arrive at the standard deviation, the duration of each score from the mean is taken, each difference is squared, the results are added up and divided by the number of cases, and then the square root is taken. The formula for the standard deviation is presented in Annexure C.)

#### 3.5.3.2 Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (rho)

Once the researcher has summarised single variables and described their pattern of distribution, the pattern of relationships between variables must be examined (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias 1992:369). The measure which allows a researcher to assess



the extent of the relationship between two variables is called the correlation coefficient. The correlation coefficient reflects the strength and the direction of the relationship between two variables as well as the degree to which one variable predicts another. The present research makes use of the Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient ( $\rho$ ) which measures two variables on an ordinal scale or compares the rankings on the two sets of scores by taking the differences of ranks, squaring these differences and then adding and finally multiplying the measure so that its value will be +1.0 whenever the rankings are in perfect agreement, -1.0 if they are in perfect disagreement and zero if there is no relationship between the variables. (The formula for  $\rho$  is presented in Annexure C).

The value of  $\rho$  gives information about the strength and the direction of the relationship. If  $\rho$  is significant it has to be reasonably far from zero and based on a reasonably large sample (Harris 1995:163).

(See Annexure B for the tables representing the use of Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient).

#### 3.5.3.3 Pearson's Correlation Coefficient ( $r$ )

The Pearson Correlation Coefficient or  $r$  is also utilised in this research to measure relationships between two interval or ratio level variables. (The formula used is presented in Annexure C).

The  $r$  statistic is interpreted in a similar way to the  $\rho$  of Spearman (Harris 1995:173). Vito, Latessa and Wilson (1988) noted the following with reference to the magnitude of the relationship between variables:-

- ◆ If the correlation coefficient is less than 0.20, the relationship is slight to negligible.

- ◆ If the correlation coefficient is between 0.20 and 0.40, the relationship is small but definite.
- ◆ If the correlation coefficient is between 0.40 and 0.70, the relationship is moderate and substantive.
- ◆ If the correlation coefficient is between 0.70 and 0.90 the relationship is high and strong.
- ◆ If the correlation coefficient is 0.90, the relationship is very high and dependable (Vito et al. 1985:36-37).

Wherever necessary the magnitude of both  $r$  and  $\rho$  will be discussed. (The composite tables of correlation coefficient where the Pearson Coefficient ( $r$ ) is used are presented in Annexure B).

#### 3.5.3.4 F distribution (f-test)

The F-test is the statistical procedure which is used to obtain the statistical significance of differences among means. It is assumed that the data measured is on an interval or ratio scale. (The formula used is presented in Annexure C).

The critical value at the 0.05 level is the value at the 0.025 level in the F-table with  $N_1 - 1$  and  $N_2 - 1$  degrees of freedom. If  $F$  equals or exceeds this value, the variances will differ significantly at the 0.05 level (Harris 1995:299).

(The composite tables of significant differences where the F-test was used as the measuring instrument are presented in Annexure B).

### 3.6 SUMMARY

The present study adopts as its research methodology, the analytical method. Use is made of both descriptive and inferential statistics.

To reach the desired goal, the following techniques were employed:

- ◆ Firstly, a literature review was made which assisted in the designing of the research method and establishing the theoretical foundation of the study.
- ◆ Secondly, a closed-ended questionnaire was developed and administered. This research instrument consisted of demographical information, a fear of crime scale (for both formless and concrete fear), a previous victimisation scale, a scale of the precautionary measures taken by respondents, a rating scale of crime as a social problem, and a scale on the role of the police. .
- ◆ Thirdly, a non probability sampling method was used to select respondents.
- ◆ Fourthly, statistical techniques were used to test the internal consistency of the items through the Cronbach's Correlation Coefficient Alpha. All the scales tested proved to be reliable. Further, frequency distributions were presented for purely descriptive purposes. The inferential statistical techniques used included Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient ( $\rho$ ), Pearson Correlation Coefficient ( $r$ ) and the F-test.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **AGE, GENDER AND HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS AND THE FEAR OF CRIME**

#### **4.1 INTRODUCTION**

Fear of crime is seen as a social problem affecting the life of the individual and the community. The most consistent findings have indicated that fear of crime is highest among those who are considered to be vulnerable; i.e. the elderly, females, the poor and those belonging to minority ethnic groups.

The vulnerability to criminal victimisation can be approached on two distinct levels, namely the physical and the social levels of vulnerability. Physical vulnerability refers to certain personal characteristics of the individual which render the individual incapable of protecting himself/herself physically and emotionally from victimisation and its consequences. Such characteristics include age and gender (Baumer 1978; Box et al. 1988 and Toseland 1982).

Social vulnerability refers to circumstances such as being poor, belonging to an ethnic minority group, and living in dangerous neighbourhoods which makes it difficult for an individual to prevent victimisation (Smith & Glanz 1989 and Toseland 1982). Although most of the literature (Baumer 1978; Box et al. 1988; Garofalo 1979 and Toseland 1982) focuses on the vulnerability factor, researchers such as Toseland (1982); Balkin and Holden (1983); Liska et al. (1988); Smith and Jarjoura (1989) and Parker and Ray (1990), to mention a few, include variables of an environmental nature.

Environmental characteristics refer to factors outside of the characteristics of the individual respondent; for example, area of residence; household size; neighbourhood conditions and type of dwelling.

Two specific variables that will be analysed in this chapter are household composition

and type of housing and their relationship to the fear of crime. Little information exists with respect to the influence of the type of housing on the fear of crime and thus mention will be made in the general discussion of findings related to this factor.

## **4.2 AGE AND THE FEAR OF CRIME**

Research on the effect of age on the fear of crime (Baumer 1985; Garofalo 1979; Keane 1992; La Grange & Ferraro 1991; Miethe et al. 1987; Ortega & Myles 1987; Smith & Glanz 1989; Stafford & Galle 1984; Toseland 1982 and Yin 1982) has produced interesting and inconsistent results. An overview of existing literature from the 1970s to the early 1990s, was regarded as necessary to outline the effect of age on the fear of crime. The findings of previous research pertaining specifically to age and fear of crime will be documented in chronological order and with specific reference to general findings, findings on the elderly and inconsistent findings.

### **4.2.1 General Findings on age and the fear of crime**

Age is often used as one of the demographic variables affecting the fear of crime. The following findings are the most important ones:

#### **Garofalo (1979)**

In his study on victimisation and the fear of crime, Garofalo (1979:82) sought to develop a working model of the determinants of fear of crime. Using the National Crime Survey (NCS) and information gathered through interviews on attitudes toward criminal victimisation, five general factors were identified to influence the fear of crime, namely: actual risk of victimisation; previous victimisation experience; the socialisation process; the media's representation of crime and the effectiveness of barriers to criminal victimisation.

Through analysis of the NCS data, Garofalo (1979:84) identifies four characteristics age, sex, race and income as also being related to the fear of crime. Using co-variance and multiple regression techniques he found that the fear of crime was related to

victimisation rates and the four demographic characteristics of age, sex, race and income. As far as age is concerned, Garofalo (1979:84) found a negative relationship between age and victimisation rates and a positive relationship between age and the fear of crime. In simpler terms, as age increases, victimisation rates decrease, but the fear of crime increases. With regard to previous victimisation experience and its relationship to fear of crime and age; non-victims expressed less fear than victims within all age groups. Garofalo (1979:87) proposes that role socialisation can produce the difference in expressed fear of crime. He maintains that: "Younger people and males might be disinclined to admit fear to interviewers whether or not they feel fear - because of the expectations associated with their roles".

When fear of crime, media representation of crime and age are studied, Garofalo (1979:89) points out that the level of fear in the older age groups can be due to the media's depiction of the elderly as helpless and vulnerable in the face of crime.

### **Toseland (1982)**

Through implementing discriminant analysis, Toseland (1982:203) found age to be an important factor affecting the fear of crime. Persons of advanced age and persons under the age of 24 years were found to be more fearful of crime than any other age group. The increased level of fear for the younger age group could be due to the following factors:

- ◆ Use of public transport by younger age group
- ◆ Spending more time away from home
- ◆ A high portion of offenders and victims being juveniles.

The abovementioned factors increase the likelihood of possible victimisation and indicate that previous victimisation or involvement in crime influences the level of fear.

### **Stafford and Galle (1984)**

Stafford and Galle (1984) use Pearson's correlation coefficient and the t-test to analyse the relationship between victimisation rates, exposure to risk and the fear of crime.

Their findings indicated that there is a positive relationship between fear of crime and age which was significant at the 0.01 level (Stafford & Galle 1984:174).

### **Baumer (1985)**

Baumer uses a multivariate regression model to analyse the interaction between fear of crime, age, size of place and gender. The effect of age on the fear of crime was found to be strongest in cities, less strong in suburbs and weakest in small towns and rural areas. The relationship between age and gender showed that the effect of age is stronger for males than females. Women tended to report higher levels of fear regardless of age, while men's fear of crime increased with age. In general, Baumer (1985:245) states that: "It appears that women and the elderly ... are more fearful than men or younger residents". These findings are consistent with the findings of other researchers (cf Garofalo 1979; Toseland 1982).

### **Miethe, Stafford and Long (1987)**

Miethe et al. (1987:186) were concerned with the relationship between different types of crime (violent or property crimes), demographic variables and type of activity (night-time activity or major daytime activity). Using a series of logit models, Miethe et al. (1987) predicted the likelihood of violent and property victimisation given the demographic variables. Their findings include the following:

- ◆ The risk of violent victimisation is higher among males, low income persons, the unmarried and the young.
- ◆ The risk of property victimisation is higher in households headed by persons who are male; black; unmarried; young and who have high incomes.
- ◆ Persons who stand the highest risk of violent victimisation are those who have high night-time activities and whose daily activities occur in or near the home, i.e. blacks, males, the unmarried and the young.
- ◆ Young persons have a high risk of property crimes as their daily activities and night-time activities generally occur outside the home (Miethe et al. 1987:188).

### **Ortega and Myles (1987)**

In their study, Ortega and Myles (1987) used multiple regression techniques to discover the interaction between race, gender, age and the fear of crime. Their findings included the following:

- ◆ Older persons are more fearful than younger persons.
- ◆ Whites are more fearful than blacks.
- ◆ Females are more fearful than males.
- ◆ Young black males are less fearful than older black females.
- ◆ Fear of crime increases with age for black men as it does for black females.
- ◆ Young black males are less fearful than young white males.
- ◆ Fear of crime decreases with age for white males (Ortega & Myles 1987:138).

To clarify their findings, Ortega and Myles (1987:138) postulated that blacks and younger persons tend to live in high crime neighbourhoods which could account for their higher levels of fear. Blacks and older persons tend to have less income and education than the other groups and thus have fewer resources to deal with the problem of crime (i.e. higher vulnerability).

### **Box, Hale and Andrews (1988)**

Box et al. (1988:344) used multivariate analysis to investigate the relationship between fear of crime, age and gender. In their findings on age, they reported that of the two groups (the under sixties and the over sixties), it was the over sixties who indicated a positive correlation with the fear of crime.

### **Warr (1990)**

Using regression analysis Warr (1990:895) investigated the relationship between age, gender and the fear of crime. This relationship is affected by cues from the environment, novel or unfamiliar environment and the absence/presence of others in the immediate vicinity.

The age variable was condensed into two groups persons under the age of 50 and



persons over 50 years of age. Gender was introduced into the age - fear correlation.

Warr (1990) found the following:

- ◆ Young males are the least fearful group.
- ◆ Older females are the most fearful group.
- ◆ The most fear producing experience for all age or gender groups was being in an unfamiliar environment.
- ◆ Being alone at night is also a fear producing experience for all age and gender groups, but especially for young females (Warr 1990:897).

### **Parker and Ray (1990)**

Parker and Ray (1990) using Pearson's correlation coefficient sought to establish if there was a relationship between the fear of crime and the variables of age, race, gender, marital status and prior victimisation. In the establishment of the relationship between the abovementioned variables they found the following:

- ◆ Younger person's fear of crime was increased if they had been previously victimised, were black and if they were female.
- ◆ Middle-aged people who were black, and had been previously victimised were fearful of crime.
- ◆ The highest level of fear occurred in the elderly, who were less educated, lived in rural area and who had been previously victimised (Parker & Ray 1990:30).

### **Smith and Hill (1991)**

Smith and Hill (1991) used multivariate analysis to examine the effects of gender, age, education, income and household composition on the fear of crime. Two intervening variables were introduced, namely victimisation experience and types of victimisation (personal and property). Age and income were viewed as the most significant predictor of victimisation, with younger and poorer respondents reporting more serious victimisation experiences. The most significant predictors of fear of personal and property crimes according to Smith and Hill (1991:233) are age and gender (both significant at the 0,05 level). Smith and Hill (1991:233) postulated that "... gender and

age effects are bound up in a sense of vulnerability ..." and that their findings are consistent with previous research.

### **Keane (1992)**

In his study on the fear of crime in Canada, Keane (1992:219) reported that young respondents were inclined to perceive themselves as becoming victims of personal and property crimes (concrete fear). As far as older respondents were concerned, they reported feelings of insecurity in their neighbourhood i.e. they expressed a more formless type of fear.

According to Baumer (1978:255) the effect of age on fear is inconsistent and considerably weaker than that for gender. However he notes that "... where a relationship has been observed it is almost totally due to the significantly higher fear of respondents over the age of 60". Therefore, the relationship between the elderly and the fear of crime will be briefly discussed.

### **4.2.2 Findings on the Elderly and Fear of Crime**

It must be stated that the present research study does not intend poaching on the reserves of Glanz (1991) and Pretorius (1994). Both these researchers have done extensive work in the field of fear of crime among the elderly in South Africa. Their findings will be briefly discussed chronologically, together with other research studies done in the United States of America.

### **Yin (1982)**

Using Multiple Classification Analysis, Yin (1982:242) investigated the relationship between fear of crime, satisfaction with neighbourhood and the impact of fear on an individual's sense of well being. Only 1% of Yin's (1982) respondents reported that fear of crime was a personal problem or a worry for them. However, fear of crime was related to the elderly's sense of well being, morale and could result in involuntary isolation.

### **Akers, La Greca; Sellers and Cochran (1987)**

Akers et al. (1987) looked at the relationship between fear of crime and the elderly. Using bi-variate analysis, they reported that in their research the elderly were not as fearful as was previously thought. According to Akers et al. (1987) what influenced levels of fear in the elderly was previous victimisation. The elderly, regardless of gender, who had been previously victimised, reported higher levels of fear (Akers et al. 1987:490-496).

### **Glanz (1991)**

In her study on the crime and victimisation of the elderly in the Cape Peninsula, Glanz (1991) reported on the differences in levels of fear for white, coloured and black elderly respondents. Higher levels of fear are associated with the following:

- ◆ Perceptions of neighbourhood deterioration (all sample groups).
- ◆ Views that the neighbourhood was dangerous (all sample groups).
- ◆ Perceptions of an increase in crime offences in the neighbourhood (all sample groups).
- ◆ Greater avoidance behaviour (all sample groups).
- ◆ Negative perceptions of the police (especially among coloured and white samples)(Glanz 1991:81).

### **Pretorius (1994)**

Pretorius (1994) attempted to devise an explanatory model to explain, on the basis of certain determinants, the fear of victimisation among the elderly.

This researcher's findings included the following:

- ◆ There is a significant relationship between fear of victimisation and personal knowledge of a victim among the elderly.
- ◆ The radio has an influence in fear of victimisation among the elderly.
- ◆ There is a limited relationship between actual victimisation and the fear of victimisation among the elderly.
- ◆ The aging experience, with its increase in physical, financial and psychological

vulnerability, is related to the fear of crime among the elderly.

- ◆ Learned helplessness is a reality among the elderly and is related to their fear of victimisation.
- ◆ There is no correlation between social support and fear of victimisation among the elderly.
- ◆ There is a relationship between neighbourhood safety and the fear of crime among the elderly.
- ◆ The elderly employ avoidance behaviour in an attempt to prevent victimisation (Pretorius 1994:188-192).

These findings are supported by a review of the literature referred to in this text. It must be noted that several of these findings hold true for various age groups.

#### **4.2.3 Inconsistent Findings**

Although these findings are referred to as being inconsistent, they should be regarded as presenting interesting opportunities to further investigate the relationship between age and fear of crime.

##### **La Grange and Ferraro (1989)**

La Grange and Ferraro (1989) devised an analytical plan to study the relationship between gender, age and the fear of crime. Firstly, they examined the bivariate relationship among 11 indicators of fear, the National Crime Survey measure, two risk measures (personal and property), and age and gender. Secondly, they used factor analysis to develop the best measurement model of fear of crime. Lastly, they tested the structural effects of age, gender and other co-variables, in a model of fear of crime (La Grange & Ferraro 1989:707).

Using Pearson's correlation coefficient, La Grange and Ferraro (1989:704) measured the risk of personal and property crimes and the fear of crime. They concluded that all persons who perceive themselves to be at risk of victimisation are more fearful. However, when age is added to the correlation, they reported that younger persons

reported having greater fear of victimisation than older persons. La Grange and Ferraro (1989:709) therefore concluded that "... the relationship between age and fear of crime is not consistently monotonic nor positive ... these data do not support the view that older adults have exceptionally high levels of fear".

### **Smith and Glanz (1989)**

In their study on the fear of crime among the South African public, Smith and Glanz (1989) used Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) to investigate the relationship between perceived likelihood of victimisation and various independent variables which included race, age, gender, education level and area of residence. Their results show little difference between the levels of fear for the different categories of the age variable (Smith & Glanz 1989:55).

In conclusion, the literature has indicated that multivariate statistical techniques are generally used to analyse the relationship between age and the fear of crime. These techniques include the use of Pearson's Correlation Coefficient, logistic regression, discriminant analysis, Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) and the t-test.

Fear of crime is in turn measured by variations of the question "How safe do you feel when you go out alone in your neighbourhood after dark?"

Some research studies have included specific reference to fear of personal and/or property crimes, as well as the analysis of victimisation rates.

### **4.2.4 Presentation and Analysis of Data**

In the present study, the existence of a relationship between age and the fear of crime was proposed in the following hypothesis -

Hypothesis 1:        There is a relationship between age and fear of crime.

(The frequency distribution of the various age categories is given in Annexure B). The

age categories included 18-24; 25-34; 35-44; 45-54; 55-64; and 65 years of age and over.

Fear of crime was based on the responses obtained to the following three questions:

- ◆ “How safe do you feel when walking alone at night in your neighbourhood?”  
(abridged to walking alone)
- ◆ “How safe do you feel when alone in your home or apartment at night?”  
(abridged to home alone)
- ◆ “How safe do you feel in your neighbourhood when leaving or arriving at home when it is dark?” (abridged to leaving/arriving at home).

Based on the recommendation by Ferraro and La Grange (1987:75) that fear of specific crimes be measured, a question relating to fear of personal and property crimes was asked. The respondents were asked to indicate four levels of fear (not fearful at all; a little fearful; quite fearful; very fearful) of personal victimisation (which included fear of rape at home or away from home; being killed at home or away from home; being robbed or mugged; being assaulted; being abducted; being shot at with an Ak47 rifle (abridged to being shot at); and property crimes (which included housebreaking; damage to property; arson; vehicles being broken into; being ambushed whilst driving a car (hijacked)(abridged to hijacking).

Since the variable age and fear of crime are both on the interval level, the most valuable measuring instrument is Pearson's Correlation Coefficient ( $r$ ). Using  $r$ , age was related to the three questions measuring fear of crime in general, and the fear of personal or property crimes. (For the purpose of this study, the level of significance was arbitrarily set at 0,05). The results of the correlations are presented in the following tables:

**TABLE 4.1: AGE AND FEAR OF CRIME (N = 385)**

FEAR OF CRIME	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	
	r	prob
Walking alone	0.07899	0.1218
Home alone	-0.04433	0.3857
Leaving/arriving at home	-0.08202	0.1081

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

Table 4.1 reveals that little or no relationship exists between age and how safe an individual feels when walking alone at night; when an individual is alone at home; when an individual arrives at or leaves home. In all instances the *r* statistics are very weak; namely 0.07899; - 0.04433 and -0.08202 respectively. Negative relationships are observed with being alone at home and leaving/arriving at home. Further, none of the *r*'s were significant at the 0.05 level.

These findings indicate that there is no definite relationship between age and the three measures of formless fear. The negative relationship between age and the last two measures of formless fear, would imply that older people are less fearful than younger persons. The reasons for this finding could include the following:

- ◆ Older persons feel more secure in their homes due to the protective measures they have taken to ensure their safety.
- ◆ Older persons tend to avoid situations which could lead to victimisation and therefore feel safer.

However, these correlations are weak.

**TABLE 4.2: AGE AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION (N = 385)**

PERSONAL CRIMES	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	
	r	prob
Rape (at home)	-0.10556	0.0384*
Rape (away from home)	-0.12127	0.0173*
Being killed (at home)	-0.14217	0.0052*
Being killed (away from home)	-0.11894	0.0196*
Being robbed or mugged	-0.01923	0.7068
Physical assault	0.01888	0.7119
Abducted	-0.14973	0.0032*
Shot at	-0.07385	0.1481

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

Table 4.2 reveals that little or no relationship exists between age and fear of personal victimisation. In all instances the apparent relationships are very weak and vary between 0.01 and 0.14. With the exception of fear of being robbed or mugged, fear of physical assault and fear of being shot at, all the other relationships are significant at the 0.05 level.

Although these relationships are weak, the findings indicate that as age increases, so fear of being raped, killed, robbed/mugged, abducted and shot at decreases. The relationship between age and fear of physical assault is positive (i.e. as age increases so does fear of physical assault). This finding is consistent with previous research (see par. 4.2.1 to 4.2.3) where it was postulated that increased physical fragility could account for fear among older persons. However these results are also weak, resulting in age having little or no influence on fear of personal victimisation.



**TABLE 4.3: AGE AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME (N = 385)**

PROPERTY CRIMES	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	
	r	prob
Housebreaking	0.04951	0.3326
Property damage	-0.00961	0.8509
Arson	-0.14693	0.0039*
Vehicles broken into	-0.00168	0.9738
Hijacked whilst driving	-0.10096	0.0478**

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

Table 4.3 reveals that there is little or no relationship between age and the fear of property crime. In all instances except for housebreaking (the latter having a positive relationship), the relationships are negative. With the exception of fear of housebreaking, fear of damage to property, fear of having one's vehicle broken into, the remaining two, namely arson and ambush whilst driving a car (hijacking), indicate a significant relationship at the 0.05 level.

These findings once again imply that age has little to no influence on the fear of various property crimes. Age was positively related to housebreaking, implying that as respondents got older, so their fear of housebreaking increased. This could be due to feelings of increased vulnerability on the part of the elderly, based on the premise that if they were at home during a housebreaking they could suffer physical injury. The relationships between age and fear of the other types of property crime were weak and negative in nature.

#### **4.3 GENDER AND THE FEAR OF CRIME**

Gender has emerged as the most powerful predictor of fear of personal crimes. Various authors (Clemente & Kleiman 1977; Conklin 1975 and Garofalo 1979) have found women to be considerably more fearful than men.

In the previous section, in which research on the relationship between age and fear of

crime was documented, gender featured in most of the findings. Therefore, in this section, only the findings pertaining to the relationship between gender and fear of crime *per se* will be briefly stated.

#### **4.3.1 General Findings on Gender and the Fear of Crime**

##### **Garofalo (1979)**

Garofalo (1979:87) reported that women have higher levels of fear because of passive sex role socialisation; i.e. women are taught to think of themselves as helpless and powerless. He further conjectured that it is role socialisation which makes men reluctant to admit to fear because of the expectations associated with the masculine role. Role socialisation is therefore the reason for the disparity between the level of fear reported and gender.

##### **Toseland (1982)**

According to Toseland (1982:203) gender is the single most important predictor affecting fear of crime.

"Females are more likely to be fearful than males as they feel powerless and lack self defence skills. The perception of vulnerability will lead females into avoidance behaviour, i.e. they will try to prevent getting involved in opportunities which could lead to victimisation".

##### **Stafford and Galle (1984)**

These researchers correlated age, gender and fear of crime. Their findings indicated that older females are more fearful of crime, which is in keeping with previous research (Stafford & Galle 1984:179).

##### **Box, Hale and Andrews (1988)**

In keeping with previous results, Box et al. (1988:349) claimed that gender is "... clearly the most important variable in explaining fear ...". It is viewed as having significant negative interactions with age and perceived likelihood of being a victim of crime. Their

general findings on the interaction of the three variables includes the following:

- ◆ women are more fearful than men in any age group
- ◆ as men age, the gender-fear gap tends to narrow. (Reasons put forward to explain this narrowing include increased physical fragility among men, less experience in avoidance techniques and increased feelings of vulnerability) (Box et al. 1988:349).

### **La Grange and Ferraro (1989)**

*In their analysis of the relationship between gender and the fear of crime, La Grange and Ferraro (1989:706) found that "regardless of how fear of crime is measured, women tend to be significantly more fearful than men ...".*

When looking at the gender differences in fear of specific crimes, women reported greater levels of fear for housebreaking, rape and physical assault. These findings, according to La Grange and Ferraro (1989), are not surprising as women perceive themselves as vulnerable and at greater risk than men. These researchers also suggest in conjunction with Warr (1984) that a high fear of crime for women may be fear of male violence.

What is interesting in La Grange and Ferraro's (1989) study is that men are more likely to be direct victims of crime than women. This implies that women's fear is largely of indirect victimisation (i.e. risk of crime). These findings were consistent with previous research.

### **Parker and Ray (1990)**

In their study on gender differences in the fear of crime, Parker and Ray (1990) stated that victimisation, age and community size had significant effects on fear of crime among women. The reasons for the higher level of fear amongst women included the following:

- ◆ Women are the targets for a large range of personal and life threatening offenses.

- ◆ Women feel less capable of defending themselves against criminals who tend to be physically stronger than them.
- ◆ Media gives more attention to crimes involving women - which tends to sensitise women to their vulnerability (Parker & Ray 1990:33).

### **Keane (1992)**

Keane (1992) reported that there is a clear relationship between gender and the fear of crime. Females see themselves as potential victims of property and personal crimes and also express more formless fear (feelings of insecurity/unsafety) than males (Keane 1992:219).

#### **4.3.2 Inconsistent Findings**

The only article in the literature reviewed for this study that indicated an inconsistent finding to all of the documented research was the study by Smith and Glanz (1988:56) of fear of crime among the South African public.

They reported little difference between levels of fear with regard to gender. Smith and Glanz (1988) claimed that the contrast in their findings was due to the disparity in *"measuring differences"* between the Americans and their own research. In South Africa, where crime is "... a salient feature of the environment personal characteristics such as age have little effect on fear of crime as everyone is more afraid" (Smith & Glanz 1988:58).

#### **4.3.3 The Presentation and Analysis of Data**

In the present study the relationship between gender and the fear of crime was proposed in the following hypothesis

Hypothesis 2:        There are significant differences between male and female respondents and the fear of crime.

Of the total sample, 151 (39.2%) were male and 234 (60.8%) were female. (The frequency distribution of gender is given in Table B1 in Annexure B). To establish if there were significant differences between male and female respondents, the F-test was used and the level of significance was set at the 0.05 level.

Fear of crime was measured by asking respondents about their feelings of safety when walking alone in the neighbourhood after dark; when they were alone in their homes or apartments; and when they were leaving or arriving at home. Previous research (Box et al. 1988; Garofalo 1979; La Grange & Ferraro 1989 and Toseland 1982) indicated that females are more fearful of personal crimes than males. The difference between responses of the female and male respondents was sought with regard to both personal and property crimes.

The results of the investigation into significant differences between males and females with regard to the fear of crime is presented in tables 4.4 - 4.6.

**TABLE 4.4: GENDER AND FEAR OF CRIME (N = 385)**

FEAR OF CRIME	MALES		FEMALES		F- VALUE
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Walking alone	2.48	0.98	2.95	0.97	20.96*
Home alone	2.30	0.92	2.54	1.00	5.68*
Leaving/arriving at home	2.40	0.84	2.74	0.93	11.75*

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

Table 4.4 reveals that there are significant differences between male and female as far as fear of crime was concerned. The F-value were 20.96 ( $p = 0.0001$ ); 5.68 ( $p = 0.0176$ ) and 11.75 ( $p = 0.0007$ ) respectively (all significant at the 0.05 level). The mean values for each of the measures of the fear of crime range between 2.30 and 2.48 for males and 2.54 and 2.95 for females. The mean scores for females indicate that they generally feel more afraid, in their neighbourhood than males.

It would appear that women are generally more fearful of criminal victimisation than their male counterparts. The reason for this fear could be due to the following:

- ♦ passive role socialisation
- ♦ physical vulnerability
- ♦ emotional vulnerability

These reasons were proposed by previous researchers (see par. 4.3.1 and 4.3.2).

**TABLE 4.5: GENDER AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION (N = 385)**

PERSONAL VICTIMISATION	MALES		FEMALES		F- VALUE
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Rape (at home)	1.42	0.95	3.49	0.95	432.61*
Rape (away from home)	1.50	1.06	3.47	0.98	347.15*
Killed (at home)	3.00	1.16	3.39	0.97	12.88*
Killed (away from home)	3.03	1.12	3.43	0.96	13.59*
Robbed or mugged	2.88	1.06	3.28	0.91	15.44*
Physical assault	2.92	1.03	3.15	0.95	4.80*
Abduction	2.73	1.23	3.12	1.11	10.32*
Shot at	3.11	1.11	3.38	1.06	5.71*

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

In table 4.5 a comparison between males and females and the fear of personal crimes is revealed. The F-values are 432.61 ( $p = 0.0001$ ); 347.15 ( $p = 0.0001$ ); 12.88 ( $p = 0.0004$ ); 13.59 ( $p = 0.0003$ ); 15.44 ( $p = 0.0001$ ); 4.80 ( $p = 0.0291$ ); 10.34 ( $p = 0.0014$ ) and 5.71 ( $p = 0.0174$ ) respectively (all significant at the 0.05 level). The mean value for each listed item ranges from 1.42 and 3.11 for males and 3.12 and 3.49 for females. The mean score for females indicates that they are generally more fearful of crimes against the person than males. The mean scores for the personal crime of rape show 1.42 and 1.50 for males and 3.49 and 3.47 for females - a significant difference.

These findings indicate that females are in general more fearful of personal victimisation

than males. This is in keeping with the findings of previous researchers (see par. 4.3.1 to 4.3.2).

Especially noticeable is the female respondents' fear of rape. Women tend to view themselves as vulnerable to male violence and thus report higher levels of fear of this type of crime.

However, male respondents reported high levels of fear of being killed and being shot at with a firearm. These responses could be due to men fearing death and the repercussions of their deaths on the remaining family members, i.e. it is not so much the ending of their own lives but the effects that their deaths would have on those left behind that could influence their fear of crime.

**TABLE 4.6: GENDER AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME (N = 385)**

PROPERTY CRIMES	MALES		FEMALES		F-VALUE
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Housebreaking	2.81	1.09	3.29	0.90	22.15*
Property damage	2.87	0.98	3.06	0.97	3.35
Arson	2.96	1.20	3.26	1.10	6.54*
Vehicle broken into	2.99	1.05	3.26	0.97	6.78*
Hijacked whilst driving	3.03	1.31	3.30	1.04	6.08*

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

Table 4.6 reveals a comparison between male and female respondents and their fear of property crime. The F-values are 20.15 ( $p = 0.0001$ ); 6.54 ( $p = 0.0110$ ); 6.78 ( $p = 0.0096$ ) and 6.08 ( $p = 0.0141$ ) respectively (all are significant except for the fear of damage to property whose F-value is 3.35).

The mean value for each listed item ranges from 2.81 and 3.03 for males, and 3.06 and 3.30 for females. The mean scores for females indicate that they are in general more fearful of property crimes than males.

Table 4.6 reveals that with the exception of damage to property ( $F$ -value = 3.38) there are significant differences between male and female respondents in the fear of property crime.

These findings once again show that females are generally more fearful than males of property crime.

Female respondents reported higher levels of fear than males on all listed property crimes. Especially noticeable is the difference between male and female respondents and fear of housebreaking. This fear on the part of females could be due to an anticipation on the part of females, that if they were at home at the time of the break in, they could have been physically harmed. Property damage, although feared, did not produce any significant difference between male and female respondents. Male respondents reported a high level of fear for hijacking. Hijacking is a crime which although motivated by the acquisition of property, namely the car, has increasingly come to include physical harm to the occupants of the car. Thus, the level of fear felt by male respondents once again could be due to the fear they feel for co-passengers (normally their families) in the car.

#### **4.4 HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS AND FEAR OF CRIME**

In a review of existing literature (Keane 1992; Miethe et al. 1987; Parker & Ray 1990; Smith & Jarjoura 1989 and Toseland 1982), the relationship of two environmental variables to the fear of crime were highlighted, namely household composition (how many persons reside with an individual) and type of housing. The general findings on these two variables will be discussed.

##### **4.4.1 General Findings on Household Characteristics and the Fear of Crime**

Warr (1990) considered the presence of other persons in the immediate environment to be a "... critical variable in determining individuals' sense of safety " (Warr 1990:894). Being alone is said to provoke fear because an isolated individual is viewed as an easy



target for victimisation; and individuals believe that if there are other people in the immediate vicinity, they will come to one's aid in the event of an attack. The characteristics of a household are therefore viewed as an important factor in determining the fear of crime.

### **Toseland (1982)**

Toseland (1982) used the number of persons living with the respondent as a demographic variable in his analysis of the fear of crime. In the discriminant analysis, this variable of household composition was found to be an important predictor of fear, especially when used in conjunction with marital status. Toseland (1982) noted that being unmarried or widowed and living alone are factors which contribute to the fear of criminal victimisation. He therefore suggested that "... social isolation increases respondents' fear of crime" (Toseland 1982:204).

### **Miethe, Stafford and Long (1987)**

Miethe et al. (1987) in their investigation into the influence of routine activities/lifestyle on the fear of crime, used marital status to indicate household density "... since few married persons lived alone". Using a series of logit models, Miethe et al. (1987) wished to assess the mediational effects of activity/lifestyle variables on the rest of victimisation. The findings related to marital status are as follows:

- ◆ Males, low-income persons, the unmarried and the young have a higher risk of violent victimisation.
- ◆ Households headed by persons who are male, black, unmarried, young and have high incomes have a high risk of property victimisation.

Miethe et al. (1987) concluded that the likelihood of victimisation taking place increases when "suitable targets who lack guardianship in proximity to motivated offenders" exist. Thus it is the lack of guardianship which could influence a person's level of fear (Miethe et al. 1987:192).

### **Smith and Jarjoura (1989)**

Smith and Jarjoura (1989) used households as their units of analysis as they believed that “respondents in victimisation surveys do not live in social vacuums” (Smith & Jarjoura 1989:623).

Using bivariate analysis of the data gathered from 9006 households in 57 residential neighbourhoods, Smith and Jarjoura (1989) hoped to establish an association between the risk of burglary and the attributes of individual households.

Their analysis of the data indicated the following, namely

- ◆ single parent households are at risk of burglary
- ◆ household occupied by two unrelated males have a higher risk of burglary
- ◆ the least likely households to be victimised as those occupied by couples, single females and two or more unrelated females
- ◆ as the number of persons living in a household increases so does the risk of burglary
- ◆ the older the household members the less the risk for victimisation
- ◆ the risk of burglary is greater for persons occupying multiple family housing

This study did not attempt to relate risk of victimisation to the fear of crime in any way. This is considered an oversight which will be remedied in the present study (Smith & Jarjoura 1989:623).

### **Parker and Ray (1990)**

Parker and Ray (1990) utilised data from a survey conducted by Department of Sociology and Rural Life in Mississippi. Using Pearson's correlation coefficient ( $r$ ), the relationship between fear of crime and the various independent variables was sought. The variable “living arrangement” was used to determine the relationship between household density and the fear of crime. Their findings indicated that living arrangements were not related to fear of crime (Parker & Ray 1990:31).

### **Smith and Hill (1991)**

Smith and Hill (1991) identified five exogenous variables, namely gender, age, education, family income and household composition which they used in their analysis of the fear of crime. Their findings reflect those of Parker and Ray (1990) in that no significant relationship was found between household composition and the fear of crime (Smith & Hill 1991:223).

### **Keane (1992)**

Keane (1992) used the variable "dwelling" as an independent variable. He coded single detached, semi detached, row house and duplex as "house" 1, and low rise and high rise apartments as "apartment" 2. Keane (1992) found that the relationship between type of dwelling and fear of crime was not significant. With regard to formless fear (feelings of safety), apartment dwellers were more likely to be fearful. Fear of specific personal or property crimes (measure of concrete fear) was also related to type of dwelling, and housedwellers expected more property damage and theft, while apartment dwellers expected to be unaffected (Keane 1992:219).

### **Neser, Geldenhuys, Stevens, Grobbelaar and Ladikos (1993)**

Neser et al. (1993) differentiated between houses and flats in their study on the fear of crime in Pretoria, South Africa. Using discriminant analysis to investigate the relationship between variables, they reported that people who reside in flats feel more unsafe than people who reside in houses. They concluded that flat residents show a higher general level of fear than house residents (Neser et al. 1993:35).

#### **4.4.2 Presentation and Analysis of Data**

Research studies (Keane 1992; Parker & Ray 1990 and Smith & Jarjoura 1989) have produced varying results in the analysis of the relationship between fear of crime and household composition. Further, there is an obvious dearth of such studies on the effects of household composition and type of housing on the fear of crime, both in South Africa and elsewhere.

4.4.2.1 Household composition and the fear of crime

In this study, respondents were requested to indicate the number of persons residing with them in the household. The frequency distribution of household composition is presented in the following table:

**TABLE 4.7: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION (N= 385)**

NUMBER OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION	
	N	%
1 person	40	10.40
2 persons	57	14.80
3 persons	69	17.90
4 persons	78	20.30
5 or more persons	141	36.60
TOTAL	385	100.00

In table 4.7, the number of persons residing with the respondent is indicated. Of the respondents, 40 (10.4%) lived on their own; 57 (14.8%) had one other person residing with them; 69 (17.9%) had two people living with them; 78 (20.3%) had three persons living with them and 141 (36.6%) had four or more persons residing with them in their household.

To measure the relationship between household composition and the fear of crime, correlations between household composition, fear of crime of safety and fear of personal and property crimes were computed.

To test the relationship between household composition and the fear of crime the following hypothesis was formulated.

Hypothesis 3:       There is a relationship between household composition and the fear of crime.

Using Spearman's Correlation Coefficient (rho) the variable of household composition was expressed as rank order number one and the variables of fear of crime, fear of personal and property crimes as rank order number two.

The findings of the correlations are presented in the following tables.

**TABLE 4 .8: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION AND THE FEAR OF CRIME (N= 385)**

FEAR OF CRIME	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	
	rho	prob
Walking alone	0.09317	0.0678
Home alone	0.17726	0.0005*
Leaving/arriving at home	0.11104	0.0294*

\*  $p \leq 0,05$

Table 4.8 reveals that a positive relationship exists between household composition and how safe an individual feels when walking alone in their neighbourhood (0.09317); how safe an individual feels when alone in their home or apartment (0.17726); and how safe an individual feels when arriving at or leaving home (0.11104) respectively. With regard to feeling safe when alone in the home or apartment and leaving/arriving at home, the relationship between household composition and fear of crime is significant at the 0.05 level. The relationship between household composition and walking alone at night is approaching the level of significance. The magnitude of the relationship between household composition and fear of crime varies from very weak for the relationship between household composition and how safe an individual feels when walking alone at night (0.09317) to a slight, negligible relationship between household composition and being home alone at night (0.17726) and leaving or arriving at home (0.11104) respectively.

These findings indicate that as the number of persons in the household increases, so does the level of formless fear felt by the respondents. Previous research (see par. 4.4.1) mentioned that being alone provoked fear, and thus the inference was that having more people in the surroundings should lesson fear. This was obviously not the

case in this study. Although the relationship is weak, the implication is that the more persons residing with the respondent, the higher the level of formless fear. The reason for this finding could be that the respondents feared for the safety of family members, especially their children and the elderly who reside with them.

**TABLE 4.9: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION (N = 385)**

FEAR OF PERSONAL CRIME	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	
	rho	probability
Raped (at home)	0.15479	0.0023*
Raped (away from home)	0.14810	0.0036*
Killed (at home)	0.15852	0.0018*
Killed (away from home)	0.16047	0.0016*
Robbed or mugged	0.10769	0.0347*
Physical assault	0.08814	0.0841
Abduction	0.08116	0.1118
Shot at	0.18667	0.0002*

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

Table 4.9 reveals a positive relationship between household composition and fear of being raped at home (0.15479); being raped away from home (0.14810); being killed at home (0.15852); being killed away from home (0.16047); being robbed or mugged (0.10739); being physically assaulted (0.08814); being abducted (0.08116) and being shot at with an AK47 or other firearms (0.18667). With the exception of being physically assaulted and being abducted, all other relationships are significant at the 0.05 level.

The magnitude of the relationship between household composition and fear of personal victimisation varies from 0.08814 (physical assault) to 0.18667 (being shot at with a firearm) indicating the correlation between the two variables is slight to negligible.

The findings reported in table 4.9 indicate that household composition does influence the fear respondents have for personal victimisation; especially rape, being killed and being shot at with a firearm. Once again, this fear could be influenced by the

respondents' feelings toward his/her family members, and that it is the fear of harm to *others* that they care about, which led them to fear personal victimisation.

**TABLE 4.10: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME (N = 385)**

FEAR OF PERSONAL CRIME	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	
	rho	prob.
Housebreaking	0.12779	0.0121*
Property damage	0.09452	0.0639
Arson	0.18183	0.0003*
Vehicle broken into	0.07692	0.1319
Hijacked	0.12197	0.0166*

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

Table 4.10 indicates a positive relationship between household composition and fear of property crimes. The rho's for fear of housebreaking, damage to property, arson, having your vehicle broken into and having your vehicle hijacked are 0.12779; 0.09452; 0.18183; 0.07692 and 0.12197 respectively. Except for fear of damage to property (which is approaching the level of significance) and fear of having one's vehicle broken into, all other relationships are significant at the 0.05 level. The magnitude of the relationship between fear of property crimes and household composition varies from 0.09452 (property damage) to 0.18183 (arson), indicating that the correlation between the two variables is slight and negligible.

Smith and Jarjoura (1989:623) investigated the relationship between household composition and the risk of burglary. They found that as the number of persons in the household increased, so did the risk of burglary. The findings of this study imply that as the number of persons living in the household increased, so did the fear of housebreaking, arson and being hijacked.

The respondents' level of fear could be influenced by the risk of harm to their families if the listed property crimes should occur.

#### 4.4.2.2 Type of housing and fear of crime

Information on the relationship between the type of housing of respondents and the fear of crime is scanty. Of all the literature reviewed, only Smith and Jarjoura (1989), Keane (1992) and Neser et al. (1993) actually tried to investigate the relationship between these two variables.

The type of housing was originally listed as brick house, flat, duplex, simplex, room attached, tent, caravan, rondawel, shack or other. These categories were collapsed and coded as follows; 1 = brick house; 2 = connected households (flat, duplex, simplex and attached room) and 3 = alternative housing (tent, caravan, rondawel, shack and other).

**TABLE 4.11 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF TYPE OF HOUSING (N = 385)**

TYPE OF HOUSING	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION	
	N	%
Brick housing	290	75.30
Connected households	58	15.10
Alternative housing	37	9.60
TOTAL	385	100

Table 4.11 presents the frequency distribution of type of housing of respondents. Although the attempt was made to ensure that residents of all types of housing were included in the study, two hundred and ninety respondents (75.30%) live in brick houses; 58 (15.10%) live in connected households and 37 (9.60%) live in alternative forms of housing.

The differences between the respondents' type of housing and fear of crime and fear of personal and property crimes was computed. The following hypothesis was formulated to test the differences.

Hypothesis 4: "There is a significant difference between type of housing of a respondent and fear of crime".



The F-test was used to establish if significant differences did exist.

TABLE 4.12: TYPE OF HOUSING AND THE FEAR OF CRIME (N = 385)

FEAR OF CRIME	TYPE OF HOUSING						F-VALUE
	BRICK		CONNECTED		ALTERNATIVE		
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Walking alone	2.76	0.97	2.86	1.05	2.65	1.14	0.52
Home alone	2.43	0.93	2.55	1.16	2.38	1.04	0.46
Leaving/arriving at home	2.60	0.92	2.66	0.97	2.46	0.73	0.54

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

From table 4.12 it can be observed that there are no significant differences between respondents who reside in brick houses, connected houses or alternative housing and the fear of crime. In all instances the F-values are 0.52, 0.46 and 0.54 respectively, none are significant at the 0.05 level. The mean scores for each of the items on the fear of crime range between 2.60 and 2.76 for respondents living in brick houses; 2.55 and 2.86 for respondents residing in connected housing; and 2.38 and 2.65 for respondents living in alternative housing. These mean scores reveal no significant differences between the three types of housing.

On average, residents of brick housing, connected housing and alternative housing units did not report high levels of formless fear. Thus the type of housing that a person lives in does not seem to affect the levels of fear felt by respondents.

**TABLE 4.13: TYPE OF HOUSING AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION (N = 385)**

PERSONAL VICTIMISATION	TYPE OF HOUSING						F-VALUE
	BRICK		CONNECTED		ALTERNATIVE		
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Rape (at home)	2.66	1.40	2.66	1.14	2.87	1.32	0.36
Rape (away from home)	2.70	1.39	2.59	1.48	2.86	1.29	0.45
Killed (at home)	3.23	1.05	3.21	1.20	3.35	0.95	0.24
Killed (away from home)	3.26	1.03	3.26	1.15	3.43	0.93	0.48
Robbed or mugged	3.13	0.96	3.09	1.14	3.14	0.98	0.05
Physical assault	3.06	0.97	3.02	1.12	3.14	0.98	0.16
Abduction	2.97	1.17	2.93	1.24	3.05	1.13	0.13
Shot at	3.26	1.07	3.31	1.13	3.27	1.15	0.05

\*  $p \leq 0,05$

Table 4.13 indicates no significant differences between residents of brick houses, connected housing or alternative forms of housing and the fear of personal crimes. In all instances the F-values are 0.36; 0.45; 0.24; 0.48; 0.05; 0.16; 0.13 and 0.05 respectively - none are significant at the 0.05 level. The mean scores for the items referring to personal crimes range from 2.66 to 3.26 for resident of brick houses; 2.59 to 3.31 for residents of connected housing and 2.86 to 3.43 for residents of alternative housing forms. These mean scores reveal no significant difference.

The findings of table 4.13 show that regardless of where the respondents live, they are quite fearful of being killed (at home and away from home), being robbed/mugged, physically assaulted and shot at with a firearm. These forms of personal victimisation are a threat to the physical well-being of the respondents and although no significant differences were found, the fear of personal victimisation exists. It is noteworthy that residents of alternative housing units reported high levels of fear of being killed at home or away from home, being robbed/mugged and being abducted. Lives and property lost for residents of alternative housing would seem to be irreplaceable.

**TABLE 4.14: TYPE OF HOUSING AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME  
(N = 385)**

PROPERTY CRIMES	TYPE OF HOUSING						F- VALUE
	BRICK		CONNECTED		ALTERNATIVE		
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Housebreaking	3.12	0.99	3.02	1.08	3.11	1.07	0.24
Property damage	3.00	0.95	2.90	1.13	3.02	0.90	0.31
Arson	3.13	1.14	3.16	1.24	3.24	1.12	0.16
Vehicle broken into	3.17	0.99	3.20	1.08	3.00	1.05	0.51
Hijacking	3.20	1.07	3.16	1.17	3.22	1.08	0.05

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

Table 4.14 reveals that there are no significant differences between residents living in brick houses, connected houses or alternative forms of housing, and the fear of property crimes. In all instances the F-values are 0.24; 0.31; 0.16; 0.51 and 0.05 respectively - none are significant at the 0.05 level. The mean scores for the items on property crimes range from 3.00 to 3.20 for residents of brick houses to 2.90 to 3.20 for residents of connected housing and 3.00 to 3.24 for residents of alternative forms of housing. The mean scores indicate no significant differences between the groups.

Although there are no significant differences between respondents, the mean scores are indicative of a general fear of property crime on the part of respondents, regardless of the type of housing in which they reside.

Residents of alternative housing are quite fearful of having their goods stolen (housebreaking) arson and hijacking. Considering the number of fires in informal settlements, it is no wonder they are more fearful of arson. Residents of alternative housing also do not have the resources to replace that which is lost due to property victimisation, which explains why their level of fear is quite high.

## 4.5 SUMMARY

The chapter has sought to establish whether or not certain demographic variables, namely age, gender, household composition and types of housing are related to or influence the fear of crime.

The findings of previous research studies (Balkin & Houlden 1983; Baumer 1985; Box et al. 1988; Garofalo 1979; Parker & Ray 1990; Pretorius 1994; Smith & Glanz 1989; Smith & Jarjoura 1989 and Toseland 1982) were presented with regard to the abovementioned demographic variables.

With regard to the present research, the following relationships were tested:

- ◆ Firstly, age and fear of crime. Using Pearson's Correlation Coefficient ( $r$ ), age was correlated with the three measures of fear of crime and the fear of personal victimisation and property crimes respectively.
- ◆ Secondly, gender and fear of crime. Using the F-test, significant differences were sought between male and female respondents and their fear of crime and their fear of personal victimisation and property crimes respectively.
- ◆ Thirdly, household composition and the fear of crime. Using Spearman's Rank Ordered Correlation Coefficient ( $\rho$ ), household composition was expressed as rank order number one, and the variables of fear of crime and fear of personal victimisation and property crimes as rank order number two.
- ◆ Lastly, type of housing and the fear of crime. Using the F-test, significant differences were sought between type of housing and the fear of crime, and the fear of personal victimisation and property crimes.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **PREVIOUS VICTIMISATION**

#### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

Knowledge of crime whether directly or indirectly obtained can and does affect people's fear of crime. Various authors (Baumer 1985; Garofalo 1979 and Skogan 1987) agreed that a simplistic relationship between previous victimisation and fear of crime does not exist. Factors which tend to affect the relationship between previous victimisation and fear of crime include the following:

- ◆ the time lapse between the victimisation itself and the research study
- ◆ the types of victimisation (whether it is personal in nature or directed at property)
- ◆ the precautionary measures instituted by the victim after the victimisation process.

The findings on the relationship between previous victimisation and fear of crime have proved inconsistent. The format of this chapter will include a review of some of the research undertaken, the presentation of the data and the analysis thereof and a summary of the findings of this study.

#### **5.2 GENERAL FINDINGS ON PREVIOUS VICTIMISATION AND FEAR OF CRIME**

The general findings on the relationship between previous victimisation and fear of crime are discussed below.

##### **Garofalo (1979)**

In his study on victimisation and the fear of crime Garofalo (1979) reports that being victimised is related to the fear of crime, "... within each age/sex group, non-victims express less fear than do victims" (Garofalo 1979:87). However Garofalo (1979) also notes that the actual number of victims is relatively small compared to the number of

non-victims, and therefore the higher level of fear exhibited by previous victims of criminal victimisation does not affect the overall fear of the general population. A possible limitation of this study is that Garofalo (1979) only used personal victimisation experience which had occurred over a twelve month period preceding his study. He therefore assumed that "... victimization that occurred more than twelve months before the interview - unless they were extremely serious - would have little effect on fear of crime at the time of the interview" (Garofalo 1979:87).

### **Baumer (1985)**

In his striving for a general model on the fear of crime, Baumer (1985) utilises the cognitive model on fear of crime which views fear as a rational response to a perceived threat of harm. One of the components of this model is the knowledge of criminal events which is obtained either through personal experience, vicarious experiences of friends and neighbours or by media representations. Baumer (1985:242) opines that "... the victimization experience seems to affect both the victim and his or her friends".

In the study done by Baumer (1985) respondents were asked to indicate if they had been a victim of a crime during the past year and if any member of their immediate family had been victimised during the past year. According to Baumer (1985:245) "The weakest correlations are between the victimization items and fear". Therefore, although previous victimisation and knowledge of victimisation of others were related to fear, the strength of the relationship was weak and meaningless. Baumer (1985) notes however that the time lapse between actual victimisation experience and the research study may influence the relationship, and that his research does not differentiate between personal and property crimes.

### **Box, Hale and Andrews (1988)**

Box et al. (1988) identify personal knowledge of crime and victimisation as a factor that would appear to contribute to the fear of crime. They warn however that a simplistic *victimisation leads to fear* hypothesis is questionable, as victims tend to neutralise their experience either through accepting their own culpability or by learning effective ways to avoid further victimisation. In their study they found the following:

- ◆ The effect of knowing someone who has been victimised in the same area will increase the probability of fear of crime.
- ◆ Victims who live in residential areas which are “safe” have a smaller probability of fear than non-victims. Victims in these areas have engaged in the process of neutralisation of their victimisation experience which reduces their level of fear.
- ◆ Victims living in residential areas which are regarded as “unsafe” will have a higher probability of fear. Victims in these areas perceive their environment as dangerous and this keeps them worried and apprehensive about the safety of their neighbourhood (Box et al. 1988:351).

### **Smith and Glanz (1989)**

In a nationwide study in South Africa, Smith and Glanz (1989) assessed the fear of crime of all population groups. They measured the variable - experience of victimisation - by asking respondents whether they or a close relative living with them had been a victim of a property crime or a personal crime within the previous 18 months to the date of their study. The variable experience of victimisation was dichotomised into those who had experienced victimisation (either directly or indirectly) and those who had not. Unfortunately, because the rate of personal victimisation was too low to yield statistically meaningful results, the distinction between property and personal crimes was not maintained.

Smith and Glanz (1989:56) reported that the sample of white respondents was the most victimised subgroup with regard to property crime (47%) while the percentages were 31% for blacks; 27% for coloureds and 26% for indians. As far as personal crimes were concerned, blacks reported the most personal victimisation (32,5%) followed by 18% for coloureds; 10% for indians and 4% for whites. They concluded that “... overall extent of victimization, according to the data, was greatest among Blacks” (Smith & Glanz 1989:56).

Applying Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) Smith and Glanz (1989:58) found that the respondents who had been victims of crime or who had had contact with a victim, were substantially more fearful than those who had no direct experience with crime.

### **Parker and Ray (1990)**

Parker and Ray (1990) in their study on the fear of crime utilised the variable of previous victimisation. Respondents were asked to indicate if they or a member of their household had been a victim of vandalism, theft, violent crimes or had been threatened with victimisation during a twelve month period prior to their study. Their results indicated the following:

- ◆ Victimization was the strongest predictor of fear of crime followed by age, marital status, race and gender.
- ◆ High levels of fear of crime were found among the elderly, blacks and single females who had been previously victimised (Parker & Ray 1990:33).

Although their findings confirmed gender, age and race as powerful predictors of fear of crime, they concluded that "... victimization proved to be the most significant and consistent predictor of fear of crime for the total sample and each subsample" (Parker & Ray 1990:38).

### **Smith and Hill (1991)**

Smith and Hill (1991) researched victimisation and the fear of crime in North Carolina, USA. They sought to establish whether the victimisation experience affects fear of crime and whether personal or property victimisation experiences have similar effects on the fear of crime.

Using age, gender, education, family income and household composition as control variables, Smith and Hill (1991) reported the following results:

- ◆ More serious forms of victimisation are reported by younger and poorer respondents.
- ◆ Victimization experience is significantly related to fear of crime. The greater the degree of victimisation, the more fearful are the respondents.
- ◆ Being a victim of a property crime or of both property and personal crime is positively associated with fear of crime (Smith & Hill 1991:232).



However, Smith and Hill (1991) noted that the methodological problem of not distinguishing between individual victimisation and household victimisation could have influenced their results, especially with reference to personal victimisation having no measurable effect on fear levels.

### **Neser, Geldenhuys, Stevens, Grobbelaar and Ladikos (1993)**

In their study on fear of criminal victimisation in Sunnyside area in Pretoria (South Africa), Neser et al. (1993:34) used previous victimisation as a variable which could influence levels of fear. The respondents were asked to indicate whether they or any member of their household had been a victim of a crime, in the previous five years, which was of a serious nature and which had been reported to the police. Neser et al. (1993) reported the following results:

- ◆ Of the 530 respondents, 244 had previous experience of victimisation and 286 had no such experience.
- ◆ Higher levels of fear existed for those who formed part of a household that had been previously victimised (39.35%) compared to (34.61%) those who had no victimisation experience (Neser et al. 1993:35).

Based on the review of the findings on the influence of previous victimisation on the fear of crime, it was thus deemed necessary to study this relationship.

## **5.3 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA**

In order to establish the relationship between previous victimisation and the fear of crime, the following hypothesis was formulated:

**Hypothesis 5:**        *There are significant differences in the fear of crime between respondents who have been previously victimised (victims) and those who have not (non-victims).*

In order to ascertain if the respondents had any previous victimisation experience, the

following question was asked: "Have you during the past year experienced a crime committed against you?" (precoded 1 = yes and 2 = no). In keeping with previous research, the respondents were then asked to indicate if the crime committed against them was of a personal nature (sexually assaulted, robbed or mugged, shot at while driving a car or being stoned while driving a car); or aimed at their property (housebreaking, property damage, vehicle broken into and vehicle stolen). The responses were coded (1) for yes and (2) for no. The percentages and frequencies of responses of the respondents are presented in table 5.1 to 5.3.

**TABLE 5.1: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PREVIOUS VICTIMISATION (N=385)**

PREVIOUS VICTIMISATION	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION	
	N	%
Yes	132	34.30
No	253	65.70
TOTAL	385	100

From table 5.1, it can be seen that 132 (34.3%) of the respondents had been previously victimised and 253 (65.7) had had no such experience. Thus the majority of respondents have had no victimisation experience.

**TABLE 5.2: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PREVIOUS PERSONAL VICTIMISATION (N = 385)**

PREVIOUS VICTIMISATION	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION	
	N	%
<b>Sexual Assault</b>		
Yes	22	5.7
No	363	94.3
<b>Robbery</b>		
Yes	57	14.8
No	328	85.2
<b>Vehicle shot at</b>		
Yes	10	2.6
No	375	97.4
<b>Vehicle stoned</b>		
Yes	31	8.1
No	354	91.9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100</b>

In table 5.2 the percentages and frequency distribution of respondents pertaining to previous victimisation of a personal nature are presented. Of the respondents 22 (5.7%) had been sexually assaulted in the past year while 363 (94.3%) had no such experience; 57 (14.8%) had been robbed or mugged while 328 (85.2%) had not; 10 (2.6%) had been shot at while driving a motor vehicle and 375 (97.4%) had not; and 31 (8.1%) had been stoned while driving a motor vehicle and 354 (91.9%) had no such experience. Thus very few respondents have experienced personal victimisation.

**TABLE 5.3: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PREVIOUS PROPERTY VICTIMISATION (N = 385)**

PREVIOUS VICTIMISATION	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION	
	N	%
<b>Housebreaking</b>		
Yes	92	23.9
No	293	76.1
<b>Property damage</b>		
Yes	89	23.1
No	296	76.9
<b>Vehicle broken into</b>		
Yes	70	18.2
No	315	81.8
<b>Vehicle stolen</b>		
Yes	35	9.1
No	350	90.9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100</b>

In table 5.3 the percentage and frequency of responses pertaining to previous property victimisation of respondents is revealed. Of the respondents, 92 (23.9%) reported having experienced a housebreaking in the previous year while 293 (76.1%) had no such experience; 89 (23.1%) of the respondents had experienced property damaged; 70 (18.2%) had had their vehicles broken into and valuables stolen and 35 (9.1%) reported having had their vehicles stolen. Less than a quarter of the respondents have experienced any form of property victimisation.

Having discussed the general responses pertaining to the previous victimisation of respondents, it now becomes necessary to analyse the relationship between previous victimisation and the fear of crime. Since the present study seeks to establish if there are significant differences in the level of fear felt by respondents who have been previously victimised (abridged to victims) and those who have not (abridged to non-victims) the F-test was used.

The variable "previous victimisation" is divided into previous personal victimisation, which indicates if the respondents had previously been sexually assaulted,

robbed/mugged, shot at while driving a vehicle (abridged to shot at) and been stoned while driving a vehicle (abridged to stoned); and previous property victimisation, which indicates if the respondents has experienced a housebreaking, property damage, having his/her vehicle broken into and valuables stolen (abridged to vehicle broken into) and having a vehicle stolen.

The three fear of crime measures "How safe do you feel walking alone at night in your neighbourhood?" (abridged to walking alone); "How safe do you feel alone in your home at night?" (abridged to home alone); and "How safe do you feel in your neighbourhood when leaving or arriving at home?" (abridged to leaving/arrived home) were used to test for significant differences between those respondents who had experienced property and personal victimisation. It was also hypothesised that if a respondent had been previously victimised it would influence his/her fear of personal victimisation (rape; murder; robbery; physical assault; abduction and being shot at) and property crimes (housebreaking; property damage; arson; vehicle theft and hijacking). Therefore significant differences were also sought between previous victimisation and fear of personal victimisation and property crimes.

TABLE 5.4: SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PREVIOUS PERSONAL VICTIMISATION EXPERIENCE AND FEAR OF CRIME (N = 385)

	Sexual Assault					Robbed/Mugged					Being Shot At					Being Stoned				
	Victims		Non-victims		F-value	Victims		Non-victims		F-value	Victims		Non-victims		F-value	Victims		Non-victims		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Walking alone	3.00	1.07	2.75	0.99	1.28	3.21	0.96	2.69	0.99	13.68*	2.10	0.99	2.78	0.99	4.61*	2.64	0.98	2.78	1.00	0.49
Home alone	2.73	1.08	2.43	0.96	1.98	2.88	1.05	2.37	0.94	13.71*	2.30	1.06	2.45	0.97	0.23	2.48	0.89	2.44	0.98	0.06
Leaving/ arriving at home	2.73	0.94	2.58	0.91	0.52	3.07	0.90	2.51	0.89	19.40*	2.30	0.95	2.60	0.91	1.06	2.45	0.85	2.66	0.91	0.81

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

In table 5.4 the significant differences between respondents who have experienced personal victimisation (victims) and those who have not (non-victims) and their fear of crime is revealed. There are no significant differences in the level of fear between respondents who have been sexually assaulted and those who have not. The fear of crime was measured by feelings of safety when walking alone, being alone at home and leaving/arriving at home). The F-values were 1.28; 1.98; and 0.52 respectively. The mean scores for those who have been sexually assaulted are 3.00; 2.73 and 2.73 and for those who have not been victimised, the mean scores are 2.75; 2.43 and 2.58 respectively.

Significant differences were found in the level of fear between those respondents who had previously been robbed or mugged and those who had not. The F-values were 13.68 ( $p = 0.0002$ ); 13.71 ( $p = 0.0002$ ) and 19.40 ( $p = 0.0001$ ) respectively (all being significant at the 0.05 level). The mean scores for those who had been previously robbed/mugged were 3.21; 2.88 and 3.07 and for those who had no victimisation experience were 2.69; 2.37 and 2.51 respectively. Except for the first measure of fear (walking alone) no significant differences were found between those respondents who had previously been shot at while driving a vehicle and those who had not experienced this form of victimisation and the remaining measures of fear. The F-values were 4.61 ( $p = 0.0320$ ) (significant at the 0.05 level), 0.23 and 1.06 respectively. The mean scores for those respondents who have been previously victimised were 2.10; 2.30 and 2.30 and for those who had not been victimised 2.78; 2.45 and 2.60 respectively. There were no significant differences in the fear of crime displayed by respondents who had been previously stoned while driving a vehicle and those who had not. The F-values were 0.49, 0.06 and 0.81 respectively. The mean scores for those who had been stoned were 2.64, 2.48 and 2.45, and for those who had not been victimised the mean scores were 2.78, 2.44 and 2.60 respectively.

These findings indicate that having been a victim of a robbery or a mugging, makes respondents more fearful for their safety when walking alone, when they are alone at home and when they leave or arrive at home. It could be postulated that what makes this form of victimisation so harrowing is that it only involves a loss of property, but also

a physical attack. The victim is made aware of his/her vulnerability, and the feelings of safety will diminish.

Non-victims of being shot at with a firearm are significantly more afraid than victims on the first measure of formless fear. This is interesting, as it shows that the respondents who had not been previously victimised were more afraid of walking alone in their neighbourhoods, than victims of this form of personal victimisation. It can be assumed that non-victims' fear reflects their general fear of possible victimisation.

In tables 5.5 and 5.6, the significant differences between respondents who have previously experienced personal victimisation and those who have had no such experience and their fear of personal crimes and various property crimes are depicted. These tables were included to show respondents' concrete fear of criminal victimisation.



**TABLE 5.5: SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PREVIOUS PERSONAL VICTIMISATION EXPERIENCE AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION (N = 385)**

Fear of Personal Victimisation	Sexual Assault					Robbed/Mugged					Being Shot At					Being Stoned				
	Victims		Non- victims		F- value	Victims		Non- victims		F- value	Victims		Non- victims		F- value	Victims		Non- victims		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Rape (home)	2.84	1.44	2.67	1.39	0.23	2.74	1.40	2.67	1.39	0.11	2.20	1.32	2.69	1.39	1.23	2.39	1.41	2.71	1.39	1.51
Rape (away)	3.05	1.36	2.67	1.39	1.47	2.82	1.40	2.67	1.39	0.57	2.80	1.40	2.69	1.39	0.06	2.65	1.43	2.70	1.39	0.05
Killed (home)	2.64	0.66	3.21	1.08	3.26	3.54	0.83	3.18	1.09	5.54*	3.40	0.97	3.23	1.07	0.23	3.39	0.84	3.23	1.08	0.65
Robbery	3.68	0.78	3.25	1.05	3.63	3.49	0.89	3.23	1.06	2.96	3.40	1.07	3.27	1.04	0.15	3.32	0.98	3.27	1.05	0.08
Physical assault	3.36	0.95	3.11	0.99	1.40	3.49	0.83	3.06	1.00	9.56*	2.80	1.14	3.13	0.98	1.10	3.13	1.02	3.12	0.98	0.00
Abduction	3.14	1.13	2.96	1.18	0.46	3.21	1.05	2.93	1.19	2.79	3.00	1.25	2.97	1.73	0.01	3.13	0.96	2.96	1.19	0.61
Shot at	3.50	1.06	3.26	1.09	1.04	3.51	0.91	3.23	1.11	3.23	3.50	0.85	3.26	1.10	0.46	3.32	1.05	3.27	1.09	0.08

\* $p \leq 0.05$

In table 5.5 the significant differences in the fear of personal victimisation and the respondents' previous victimisation is revealed.

There are no significant differences between respondents who have been sexually assaulted and those who have not and their fear of personal victimisation which includes rape (at home), rape (away from home) being killed (at home), robbery, physical assault, abduction and being shot at with a firearm. The F-values are 0.23, 1.47, 3.26, 2.63, 1.40, 0.46 and 1.04 respectively. The mean scores for respondents who have been victimised range from 2.64 to 3.68 and from 2.67 to 3.26 for those who have not been sexually assaulted.

Significant differences (at the 0.05 level) do exist between respondents who have been robbed or mugged and those who have not and the fear of being killed at home (F-value 5.54,  $p = 0.0191$ ) and fear of physical assault (F-value 9.56,  $p = 0.0021$ ). No other significant differences were found between respondents who have previously been robbed or mugged and those who have not and the fear of personal crimes. The mean scores for respondents range from 2.74 to 3.54 for those who have been victimised and 2.67 to 3.23 for those who have not.

No significant differences were found in the fear of personal crimes between respondents who had been shot at while driving a car and those who had not been victimised in such a way. The F-values were 1.23, 0.06, 0.23, 0.15, 1.10, 0.01, 0.46 respectively. The mean scores ranged from 2.20 to 3.40 for respondents who had been shot at while driving a vehicle, and 2.69 to 3.27 for those who had not been victimised.

A similar result was obtained for respondents who had been stoned while driving a car and those who had not. The F-values were 1.51, 0.05, 0.65, 0.08, 0.00, 0.61 and 0.08 respectively. This indicates no significant differences in the fear of personal victimisation for respondents who have been stoned and those who have not been victimised in this manner.

In general victims of personal victimisation are more fearful of future personal victimisation than non-victims. These findings are consistent with previous research (see par. 5.2). Victims who have been robbed/mugged are significantly more fearful of being killed (at home) and being physically assaulted. This could be due to past experiences of injury which make the victim feel more vulnerable to future victimisation.

**TABLE 5.6: SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PREVIOUS PERSONAL VICTIM VICTIMISATION EXPERIENCE AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME (N = 385)**

Fear of Property Crimes	Sexual Assault					Robbed/Mugged					Being Shot At					Being Stoned				
	Victims		Non-victims		F-value	Victims		Non-victims		F-value	Victims		Non-victims		F-value	Victims		Non-victims		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Housebreaking	3.50	0.74	3.01	1.02	3.67	3.42	0.94	3.05	1.01	6.82*	2.40	1.17	3.12	1.00	5.01*	2.94	1.12	3.12	1.00	0.91
Property damage	3.18	1.01	2.98	0.97	0.93	3.42	0.84	2.91	0.98	13.70*	2.60	1.17	3.00	0.97	1.62	2.77	0.96	3.01	0.98	1.61
Arson	3.41	1.10	3.13	1.15	1.23	3.35	0.94	3.11	1.18	2.14	3.20	1.14	3.14	1.15	0.02	3.13	0.99	3.15	1.16	0.01
Vehicle broken into	3.32	0.89	3.15	1.01	0.59	3.49	0.80	3.10	1.03	7.43*	3.20	0.92	3.16	1.01	0.02	3.00	0.89	3.17	1.02	0.83
Hijacking	3.50	0.96	3.18	1.09	1.86	3.52	0.91	3.14	1.10	6.36*	3.70	0.92	3.19	1.09	0.00	3.42	0.92	3.18	1.09	1.45

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

In table 5.6 the significant differences in fear of property crimes between respondents who have experienced personal victimisation and those who have not are depicted.

No significant differences exist between respondents who have experienced sexual assault and those who have not and the fear of housebreaking. The F-values are 3.67, 0.93, 1.23, 0.59 and 1.86 respectively. The mean scores range from 3.18 to 3.50 for those who have been previously victimised and from 2.98 to 3.18 for those who have not been previously victimised.

Significant differences exist between respondents who have been robbed or mugged and those who have not and the fear of housebreaking (F-value 6.82,  $p = 0.0094$ ), property damage (F-value 13.70,  $p = 0.0002$ ); vehicle broken into and valuables stolen (F-value 7.43,  $p = 0.0067$ ), and being hijacked (F-value 6.36,  $p = 0.0121$ ) respectively. No significant difference was obtained for the respondents' fear of arson (F-value 2.14). The mean scores range from 3.35 to 3.52 for respondents who have been previously victimised, and from 2.91 to 3.14 for those who have had no victimisation experience.

Respondents who have been shot at while driving a vehicle, displayed no significant difference in their fear of property crimes (except for fear of housebreaking of which the F-value was 5.01,  $p = 0.0258$ ) than those who have not been victimised in this way. The F-values are 1.62, 0.02, 0.02 and 0.00 respectively. The mean scores range from 2.40 to 3.70 for respondents who have been victimised, and from 3.00 to 3.19 for those who have not had any victimisation experience.

There are no significant differences between respondents who have been stoned while driving a vehicle and those who have not and fear of property crimes. The F-values are 0.91, 1.61, 0.01, 0.83 and 1.45 respectively. The mean scores range from 2.77 to 3.42 for respondents who have been victimised, and from 3.01 to 3.18 for those who have not been shot at while driving a vehicle.

Victims of personal victimisation are in general more fearful of property crime than non-victims. These findings are also consistent with previous research (see par. 5.2).

Victims of a robbery/mugging are significantly more fearful of housebreaking, property damage, having their vehicle broken into and hijacking than non-victims. This could be due to a sensitizing process, in which victims who have been hurt in a previous experience with crime, generally fear any further criminal victimisation experience because they are aware of the aftermath of victimisation.

Respondents who had not been shot at with a firearm were more afraid of housebreaking than victims. This finding is interesting because it implies that being a victim of a shooting lessens the fear of housebreaking, i.e. having experienced a form of personal victimisation, property crime is less scary.

TABLE 5.7: SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PREVIOUS PROPERTY VICTIMISATION AND FEAR OF CRIME (N = 385)

Fear of Crime	Housebreaking					Property Damage					Vehicle Broken Into					Vehicle Stolen				
	Victims		Non-victims			Victims		Non-victims			Victims		Non-victims			Victims		Non-victims		
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	F-value	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	F-value	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	F-value	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	F-value
Walking alone	2.97	1.03	2.70	0.98	4.96*	2.85	1.10	2.74	1.00	0.89	3.01	0.92	2.71	1.00	5.34*	2.97	0.86	2.75	1.01	1.63
Home alone	2.79	0.99	2.33	0.94	16.22*	2.67	1.00	2.38	0.96	6.75*	2.61	1.01	2.41	0.96	2.63	2.83	0.92	2.41	0.97	6.10*
Leaving/arriving at home	2.85	0.90	2.51	0.90	9.79*	2.70	0.93	2.56	0.90	1.53	2.69	0.89	2.58	0.91	0.91	2.71	0.86	2.58	0.91	0.69

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

In table 5.7 the significant differences between respondents who have experienced property victimisation and those who have not and the fear of crime are revealed. There are significant differences between the respondents who have experienced housebreaking and those who have not and the three measures of fear of crime. The F-values are 4.96 ( $p = 0.0001$ ), 16.22 ( $p = 0.0001$ ) and 9.79 ( $p = 0.0019$ ) respectively. All are significant at the 0.05 level. The mean scores are 2.97, 2.79 and 2.85 respectively for respondents who have previous victimisation experience, and 2.70, 2.33 and 2.51 respectively for those that have not experienced a housebreaking.

Respondents who have experienced damage to their property do not display significantly different levels of fear (except for the second measure of fear which has a F-value of 6.75 and  $p = 0.0107$ ) than those who have not. The F-value for the first measure of fear is 0.89 and for the last measure is 1.53. The mean scores range from 2.67 to 2.85 for respondents who have been victimised in this way, and 2.38 to 2.56 for those who have not.

The only significant difference found between respondents who have had their vehicles broken into and valuables stolen and those who have not experienced this form of victimisation is to be found for the first measure of fear (walking alone). The F-value was 5.34 ( $p = 0.0214$ ) which is significant at the 0.05 level. For none of the other measures of fear of crime were significant differences found between respondents who had been victimised in this manner and those that had not. The F-values were 2.63 and 0.91 respectively with mean scores ranging from 2.01 to 3.01 for respondents who had been victimised, and from 2.41 to 2.71 for those who had not had their vehicles broken into and valuables stolen.

A significant difference exists between respondents who have had their vehicle stolen and those who have not and the second measure of fear (being home alone). The F-value was 6.10 ( $p = 0.0140$ ) which is significant at the 0.05 level. For none of the other measures of fear of crime were there significant differences between respondents who had been victimised and those that had not. The F-values were 1.63 and 0.69 respectively. The mean scores ranged from 2.71 to 2.97 for those respondents who had



been victimised, and from 2.41 to 2.75 for those who had not had their vehicles stolen.

These findings indicate that victims of a housebreaking are afraid for their safety, whether it is in their neighbourhood or in their homes. Victims who have had their property damaged, are more fearful than non-victims of being alone in their homes. Victims who have had their vehicle broken into are more afraid than non-victims who are walking alone in their neighbourhood, and victims of vehicle theft are more afraid of being home alone than non-victims. This implies that having been a victim of a property crime, makes the victim cautious of his/her safety in and around his/her home.

**TABLE 5.8: SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PROPERTY VICTIMISATION EXPERIENCE AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION (N = 385)**

Fear of Personal Victimisation	Housebreaking					Property Damage					Vehicle broken into					Vehicle Stolen				
	Victims		Non-victims		F-value	Victims		Non-victims		F-value	Victims		Non-victims		F-value	Victims		Non-victims		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Rape (home)	2.92	1.36	2.60	1.39	3.74	2.57	1.43	2.71	1.38	0.69	2.37	1.43	2.75	1.37	4.28*	2.34	1.39	2.71	1.38	2.29
Rape (away)	2.96	1.33	2.61	1.40	4.27*	2.63	1.43	2.72	1.38	0.27	2.37	1.43	2.77	1.38	4.70*	2.63	1.42	2.70	1.39	0.09
Killed (home)	3.51	0.87	3.15	1.10	8.02*	3.43	0.96	3.18	1.09	3.63	3.27	1.10	3.23	1.06	0.08	3.26	1.01	3.24	1.07	0.01
Robbery	3.49	0.92	3.20	1.07	5.28*	3.52	0.93	3.20	1.06	6.45*	3.14	1.12	3.30	1.02	1.33	3.26	0.98	3.27	1.05	0.01
Physical assault	3.32	0.96	3.06	0.99	4.68*	3.29	0.92	3.07	1.00	3.47	3.03	1.08	3.14	0.97	0.77	3.20	1.05	3.11	0.98	0.24
Abduction	3.16	1.05	2.91	1.20	3.24	3.16	1.05	2.92	1.20	2.92	2.94	1.18	2.98	1.74	0.05	2.86	1.14	2.98	1.18	0.36
Shot at	3.46	0.97	3.21	1.12	3.56	3.43	0.96	3.22	1.12	2.41	3.31	1.06	3.26	1.10	0.43	3.40	0.95	3.26	1.10	0.55

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

Table 5.8 depicts the significant differences between respondents who have experienced property victimisation and those who have not and the fear of personal victimisation.

Respondents who have experienced a housebreaking are significantly more fearful of being raped away from home, being killed at home, being robbed and being physically assaulted than those who have not been previously victimised. The F-values are 4.27 ( $p = 0.0394$ ); 8.02 ( $p = 0.0049$ ); 5.28 ( $p = 0.0221$ ) and 4.68 ( $p = 0.0311$ ) respectively (all are significant at the 0.05 level). There are no significant differences between previously victimised respondents and non-victims in their fear of being raped at home, being abducted and being shot at with a firearm. The mean scores ranged from 2.92 to 3.51 for victimised respondents and from 2.60 to 3.21 for non-victimised respondents.

Respondents who had experienced damage done to their property were significantly more fearful of robbery than those who had not been victimised in this way. The F-value was 6.45 ( $p = 0.0115$ ) which is significant at the 0.05 level. There are no significant differences between victims and non-victims of property damage and their fear of rape (away or at home), being killed (home) being assaulted, abducted or shot at with a firearm. The F-values were 0.69, 0.27, 3.63, 3.47 2.92 and 2.41 respectively. The mean scores ranged from 2.57 to 3.52 for victimised respondents, and from 2.71 to 3.22 for non-victimised respondents.

Significant differences were found between respondents who had their vehicles broken into and valuables stolen and those who had not been victimised in this way and the respondents' fear of rape both at home and away from home. The F-values were 4.28 ( $p = 0.0392$ ) and 4.70 ( $p = 0.0307$ ) respectively. No other significant differences were found between victims and non-victims and the fear of being killed, robbed, assaulted, abducted and shot at with a firearm. The F-values were 0.08, 1.33, 0.77, 0.05 and 0.43 respectively. The mean scores ranged from 2.37 to 3.31 for victims, and from 2.75 to 3.30 for non-victims respectively.

No significant differences were found between previous victims and non-victims of vehicle theft and the fear of personal victimisation. The F-values were 2.29, 0.09, 0.01, 0.01, 0.24, 0.36 and 0.55 respectively. The mean scores ranged from 2.34 to 3.40 for victims and from 2.70 to 3.27 for non-victims of vehicle theft.

The findings of table 5.8 would seem to indicate that in general, victims of property victimisation are more fearful of personal victimisation than non-victims. Victims of a housebreaking are significantly more fearful of rape, being killed, being robbed and being physically assaulted than non-victims. Victims of property damage are more fearful of being robbed than non-victims. Being a victim of a property crime can make the victim aware of his/her own vulnerability, especially with regard to physical injury.

Respondents who have never experienced having their vehicle broken into, are generally more fearful of rape than victims. This could be because victims of this type of property crime have experienced the violation of private space/property and thus are less fearful of something happening to them than non-victims.

**TABLE 5.9: SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PREVIOUS PROPERTY VICTIMISATION EXPERIENCE AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIMES (N = 385)**

Fear of Property Crimes	Housebreaking					Property damage					Vehicle broken into					Vehicle theft				
	Victims		Non-victims		F-value	Victims		Non-victims		F-value	Victims		Non-victims		F-value	Victims		Non-victims		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
House breaking	3.25	1.04	3.05	0.99	2.64	3.19	0.98	3.07	1.02	0.91	2.94	1.21	3.14	0.96	2.12	3.17	1.17	3.09	0.99	0.91
Property damage	3.11	0.94	2.95	0.98	1.89	3.16	0.88	2.93	1.00	3.56	2.94	1.00	3.00	0.97	0.18	3.20	0.93	2.97	0.98	1.84
Arson	3.41	0.95	3.06	1.19	6.64*	3.40	0.93	3.07	1.20	5.95*	3.20	1.15	3.13	1.15	0.19	3.17	1.18	3.14	1.15	0.02
Theft from vehicle	3.32	0.90	3.11	1.03	3.37	3.25	0.87	3.13	1.04	0.90	3.31	0.92	3.23	1.02	2.06	3.40	0.85	3.13	1.02	2.22
Hijacking	3.50	0.92	3.10	1.11	9.82*	3.37	0.99	3.14	1.11	3.07	3.27	1.05	3.18	1.09	0.14	3.25	0.98	3.19	1.09	0.13

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

Table 5.9 depicts the significant differences between respondents who have experienced property victimisation and those who have not, and the fear of property crimes.

Significant differences exist between previous victims of housebreaking and non-victims and the fear of arson (F-value 6.64,  $p = 0.0103$ ) and the fear of hijacking (F-value 9.82,  $p = 0.0019$ ). No other significant differences were obtained between victims and non-victims of a housebreaking and fear of housebreaking, damage to property and vehicles being broken into and valuables stolen. The F-values were 2.64, 1.89 and 3.37 respectively. The mean scores ranged from 3.11 to 3.50 for victims and from 2.95 to 3.11 for non-victims of a housebreaking.

The only significant difference found between previous victims of property damage and non-victims was in their fear of arson. The F-value was 5.95 ( $p = 0.0152$  which is significant at the 0.05 level). No other differences were found between victims and non-victims and the fear of other property crimes. The F-values were 0.91, 3.56, 0.90 and 3.07 respectively. The mean scores ranged from 3.16 to 3.40 victims and from 2.93 to 3.14 for non-victims of property damage.

No significant differences exist between respondents who have had their vehicles broken into and valuables stolen and those who have not been victimised in such a way and the fear of property crimes. None of the F-values were significant at the 0.05 level. The mean scores ranged from 2.94 to 3.31 for victims and 3.40 to 3.23 for non-victims of this type of property crime.

A similar finding occurred for previous victims and non-victims of vehicle theft. No significant differences were found in the fear of property crimes between victims and non-victims of vehicle theft. The F-values were 0.19, 1.84, 0.02, 2.22 and 0.13 respectively. The mean scores ranged from 3.17 to 3.40 for previous victims and from 2.97 to 3.19 for non-victims.

The findings in table 5.9 would seem to indicate that victims of housebreaking are more

fearful of arson and hijacking than non-victims. A possible reason is that victims fear injuries which could be sustained in a fire and fear the loss of property and possible physical injury from a hijacking.

Victims of property damage reported a significantly higher level of fear of arson than non-victims. This could be due to fear of the destruction of property which would result from arson. Having already experienced property damage, victims are fearful of the results of arson.

In general it can be said that victims of either personal victimisation and property crimes are more fearful than non-victims.

#### **5.4 SUMMARY**

Although authors such as Garofalo (1979) and Baumer (1985) found little evidence to support a relationship between previous victimisation and fear of crime, the review of existing literature presented in this chapter indicates that there is a relationship between these two variables. Box et al. (1988), Smith and Glanz (1989), Parker and Ray (1990), Smith and Hill (1991) and Naser et al. (1993) all indicated that in their research, previous victimisation was indeed a factor that influenced the fear of crime.

In the present study the hypothesis was that significant differences would be found between respondents who had been previously victimised (victims) and those that had no such experience (non-victims) and the fear of crime. In order to test the hypothesis, previous personal victimisation (sexual assault, robbery, vehicle shot at while driving and vehicle stoned while driving) and property victimisation (housebreaking, property damage, vehicle broken into and valuables stolen and vehicle theft) were tested against the measures of fear of crime (which test for formless fear) and fear of personal and property crimes (which test for concrete fear). The findings were presented in tables 5.1 to 5.9 and each table was briefly discussed.

## **CHAPTER 6**

### **CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM**

#### **6.1 INTRODUCTION**

In South Africa, crime touches the lives of citizens either directly or indirectly every day. Viewing the problem of crime, researchers have used two concepts, namely, the fear of crime and concern about crime. The former refers to the perceived likelihood of being victimised and the latter to the individuals perception of the seriousness of the problem of crime in their residential area or in the country as a whole (Glanz 1989:9). Using this distinction, it can be noted that an individual may be concerned about crime but does not fear criminal victimisation and the inverse holds true, i.e. that a person may fear criminal victimisation without considering crime to be a social problem.

In order to ascertain the relationship between fear of crime and concern about crime, the general findings on crime as a social problem will be reviewed, the responses of the respondents will be highlighted in frequency distribution tables and the correlation between fear of crime and crime as a social problem will be sought by using Spearman's correlation coefficient. The data obtained will be presented in tabular form.

#### **6.2 GENERAL FINDINGS ON CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND FEAR OF CRIME**

Literature on the relationship between fear of crime and crime as a social problem is limited. The studies related below indicate some of the major findings on the relationship between the two variables.

##### **Garofalo (1981)**

In his article on the causes and consequences of the fear of crime, Garofalo (1981) indicates that fear of crime is linked to the image the individual has of crime. The image of crime held by the individual contains the following elements, namely



- ◆ the extent of crime (current and changed)
- ◆ the nature of crime (types of crime)
- ◆ characteristics of victims and offenders
- ◆ consequences of crime (Garofalo 1981:844).

These images inform the individual about the environment and the threat of crime to the individual can then be inferred. Simply put, the existence of crime is likely to influence the individual's assessment of the risk of criminal victimisation and influence the level of fear felt by the individual.

### **Baumer (1985)**

*In his research, Baumer (1985) does not propose a direct link between crime as a social problem and fear of crime. However, he does link knowledge of crime and fear, when reporting that people who have knowledge of crime in their neighbourhood are more fearful. He concludes that people rely on visible indicators in their neighbourhoods to identify potential threats. Signs of disorder and decay become synonymous with crime e.g. abandoned buildings, groups of teenagers and disorderly behaviour; and therefore become fear provoking (Baumer 1985:260).*

### **Smith and Glanz (1989)**

*Smith and Glanz (1989) in their study on the fear of crime measured the perceived seriousness of crime in the community by asking the individuals to rate crime as a problem in their community and to indicate whether crime has increased, decreased or remained the same over the past year.*

The frequency and percentage distribution of the data was presented and the following results were obtained for the four population groups in the nationwide study on the fear of crime:

- ◆ Out of 1500 black respondents, 1151 (76.3%) saw crime as a serious problem, and 349 (23.3%) claimed that it was not a serious problem. With regard to the crime rate, 911 (60.7%) indicated that in their opinion crime had increased, 436

(29.1%) said it had decreased and 153 (10.2%) that it had remained the same.

- ◆ Of the 904 white respondents, 434 (48.0%) said that crime was a serious problem and 470 (52%) said that it was not a serious problem. When asked to indicate their perception of the crime rate, 517 (57.2%) said that crime had increased, 30 (3.3%) claimed it had decreased, and 356 (39.4%) said it had stayed the same.
- ◆ With coloureds, out of 1265 respondents, 872 (68.9%) reported that they viewed crime as a serious problem in their community, while 393 (31.1%) said it was not a serious problem. Four hundred and ninety two respondents (38.9%) claimed that crime had increased, 281 (22.2%) that it had decreased and 492 (38.9%) that it had remained the same.
- ◆ Out of 1418 indian respondents, 924 (65.2%) viewed crime as a serious problem and 494 (35.8%) said it was not a serious problem in their community. When asked to indicate the perception of the crime rate, 479 (33.8%) of the indian respondents said it had increased; 279 (19.7%) that it had decreased and 660 (46.6%) that it had remained the same (Smith and Glanz 1989:57).

Smith and Glanz (1989) presented a table of the abovementioned data. The findings of their study show that blacks rate crime as a serious social problem and are least fearful. The reason for this according to Smith and Glanz (1989:58), can be found in the work of Conklin (1975) who argued that people who live in areas with a very high crime rate, deny their high risk of victimisation in order to preserve their sense of security. Whites saw crime as having increased in their area of residence and this tallies with the increasing rate of property crimes in White residential areas.

### **Glanz (1989)**

Glanz (1989) opined that the South African public has become concerned about the crime rate. In the survey done in 1985/1986 to establish the respondents views on the seriousness of crime, the respondents were asked "How serious is the crime problem in your neighbourhood?" The responses ranged from very serious, fairly serious, not really serious, not at all serious, to do not know/uncertain.

In her discussion Glanz (1989:11) noted that "... a mere 6% of the white sample were of the opinion that crime was a serious problem in their community ... [and] for the blacks was 42%". Of the remaining two population groups 20% of the coloureds and 10% of the Indians reported that crime was a very serious problem. A multiple linear regression analysis was performed in order to determine which factors were significant in explaining the differences in the responses of the various population groups. The most important findings are the following:

- ◆ Respondents of all population groups who had a negative view of the quality of the service rendered by police tended to view crime as a serious problem.
- ◆ The area in which respondents live was an important predictor of differences in views on the seriousness of crime. (*More urban dwellers perceived crime as a serious problem than did non-urban residents*).
- ◆ Respondents who were White and married tended not to view crime as a serious problem.
- ◆ For the coloured sample, males tended to view crime as a serious problem in the community; and the higher the education level of the respondents the more they tended to view crime as a serious problem (Glanz 1989:14-17).

Glanz (1989:17) then requested respondents to indicate whether the problem of crime had increased, decreased or remained the same over the past year in the respondents' residential area. The findings of the survey indicate that as far as the crime rate was concerned, 39.3% of the black respondents 23.1% of the indian respondents, 30.8% of the coloureds and 34.8% of the white respondents indicated that in their view crime had increased. Of the black respondents 39.4% held the view that crime had decreased, while 16.4% of the indians, 18.1% of the coloureds and 3.9% of the white respondents held similar views. On whether or not the crime rate had stayed the same, 15.2% of the black respondents indicated that it had, 42.4% of the indians, 41.6% of the coloureds and 43.0% of the white respondents held similar views.

The following results were obtained for the first remaining category 3.3% black respondents 3.3% indian, 5.5% coloured and 12.6% white respondents claimed to be

uncertain; and for the second category 2.8% of the black respondents, 14.8% indian, 3.9% coloured and 5.7% of the white respondents claimed to have no crime problem at all.

Glanz (1989:20) once again used multiple linear regression analysis to determine which independent variable is significant in predicting differences in views in the crime rate. The findings of the analysis are presented as follows:

- ◆ All population groups view crime as increasing.
- ◆ All population groups who were of the opinion that the service rendered by the police was poor, were of the opinion that crime had increased in their *neighbourhood over the past twelve months*.
- ◆ The coloured respondents who felt that conditions in their neighbourhood had deteriorated held the opinion that crime had increased.
- ◆ Indians who had lived in an area for a long period were of the opinion that crime had decreased in their neighbourhood.
- ◆ Blacks who had lived in an area for a long period of time indicated that crime had increased over the past year.
- ◆ Whites who were living together regarded crime as having increased in their neighbourhood (Glanz 1989:20-22).

In general, the work of Glanz (1989) and Smith and Glanz (1989) is descriptive and substantive in its analysis of crime as a social problem.

### **6.3 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA**

For the purpose of this study, the relationship between respondents' view of crime as a social problem in their area of residence and the fear of crime was deemed important. The following hypothesis was formulated to test the relationship:

Hypothesis 6:        There is a relationship between respondents' view of crime as a social problem and their fear of crime.

In order to test the hypothesis, Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was used with rank order one being fear of crime and rank order two, the types of crime viewed as social problems by the respondents.

The types of crime viewed by respondents as social problems have been divided into statutory crimes (traffic violations and driving under the influence of alcohol); crimes against the person (designated personal victimisation and including rape, robbery, physical assault, being shot and killed by firearms and abduction); and property crimes (housebreaking, theft out of and of vehicles, other forms of theft, vandalism, hijacking and bag snatching) respectively. The fear of crime was measured by responses to the questions "How safe do you feel walking alone at night in your neighbourhood?" (abridged to walking alone), "How safe do you feel when alone in your house or apartment at night?" (abridged to home alone) and "How safe do you feel in your neighbourhood when leaving or arriving at home when its dark?" (abridged to leaving/arriving at home) respectively.

None of the previous research findings have indicated the differences in types of crime as a social problem. In this study, the respondents were asked to rate a list of statutory crimes, personal crimes and property crimes as being no problem at all, less of a problem, more of a problem or very problematic in their area of residence. The responses of the respondents are presented in table 6.1.

TABLE 6.1: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS RATING OF TYPES OF CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM IN THEIR AREA OF RESIDENCE (N = 385)

Types of crime	Categories of Responses									
	No Problem at all		Less of a Problem		More of a Problem		Very Problematic		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Statutory Crime</b>										
Traffic violations	83	21.60	126	32.70	96	24.90	80	20.80	385	100.00
Driving under the influence of alcohol	38	9.90	1087	28.10	110	28.60	129	33.50	385	100.00
<b>Personal Crimes</b>										
Rape	144	37.40	87	2.60	66	17.10	88	22.90	385	100.00
Robbery	32	8.30	87	2.60	122	31.70	144	37.40	385	100.00
Assault	45	11.70	109	28.30	111	28.80	120	31.20	385	100.00
Killed	69	17.90	109	28.30	79	20.50	128	33.20	385	100.00
Abduction	99	25.70	141	36.60	67	17.40	78	20.30	385	100.00
<b>Property Crimes</b>										
Housebreaking	28	7.30	78	20.30	106	27.50	173	44.90	385	100.00
Theft of/out of vehicle	36	9.40	78	20.30	95	24.70	176	45.70	385	100.00
Other forms of theft	34	8.80	70	18.20	93	24.20	188	48.80	385	100.00
Vandalism	55	14.30	128	33.20	109	28.30	93	24.20	385	100.00
Hijacking	90	23.40	85	22.10	82	21.30	128	33.20	385	100.00
Bag snatching	69	17.90	109	28.30	79	20.50	128	33.20	385	100.00

In table 6.1, the percentage and frequency distribution of statutory crime as a social problem is depicted. Of interest is that 83 (21.6%) of the respondents view traffic violations as no problem at all, while 126 (32.77%) view it as less of a problem. As far as driving under the influence of alcohol is concerned, 110 (28.6%) of the respondents view it as more of a problem, and 129 (33.5%) as very problematic in their residential areas.

Table 6.1 also reveals the response rate of the personal crimes rated by respondents as a social problem. Of interest are the responses to rape where 144 (37.4%) of the respondents indicated that it was no problem at all and 87 (22.6%) that it was less of a problem in their residential areas. Robbery was regarded by over 60% of the respondents as a problem in their area of residence. Assault was regarded as more of a problem by 111 (28.8%) of the respondents and as very problematic by 120 (31.2%) of the respondents. Being shot at by a firearm was regarded as less of a problem by 109 (28.3%) and as very problematic by 128 (33.2%) of the respondents. Abduction was regarded as a problem by 99 (25.7%) and as less of a problem by 141 (36.6%) of the respondents.

Table 6.1 also shows the percentage and frequency distribution of the respondents' rating of property crimes as a social problem in their area of residence. The most noteworthy results obtained include those of housebreaking (27.5% of the respondents view it as more of a problem and 44.9% as very problematic); theft of or from a vehicle (24.7% of the respondents viewed it as more a problem and 45.6% as very problematic); other forms of theft (24.2% of the respondents viewed it as more of a problem and 48.8% as very problematic); robbery (in which 31.7% viewed it as more of a problem and 37.4% as very problematic); and hijacking (21.3% of the respondents viewed it as more of a problem and 33.2% viewed it as very problematic). Vandalism and bag snatching did not obtain great differences between those who viewed this type of a crime as problematic or as non problematic in their residential areas.

In general, the types of crime viewed as social problems include driving under the influence of alcohol, robbery, assault, being killed, housebreaking, theft of/out of a

vehicle, other forms of theft, hijacking and bagsnatching.

The respondents in this survey were requested to indicate whether or not they believed that the crime rate had increased over the past year in their area of residence.

**TABLE 6.2: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF INCREASE IN CRIME RATE (N=385)**

	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION	
	N	%
Yes	266	69.1
No	64	16.6
Don't know	55	14.3
TOTAL	385	100

In table 6.2, 266 (69.1%) of the respondents were of the opinion that crime had increased in their residential area; 64 (16.6%) felt that there had been no increase; and 55 (14.3%) were unsure about the increase in crime in their residential area.

### **6.3.1 Fear of crime and crime as a social problem**

Having discussed the percentages and frequencies of responses of the respondents' rating of types of crime as social problems in their area of residence, the relationship between the respondents' rating of types of crime as a social problem and their fear of crime was investigated.

Using Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient ( $\rho$ ) the three measures of fear of crime, namely "How safe do you feel when walking alone in your neighbourhood?" (abridged to walking alone); "How safe do you feel when alone at home or in your apartment at night?" (abridged to home alone) and "How safe do you feel when leaving or arriving at home at night?" (abridged to leaving/arriving at home) were correlated with the types of crime rated as social problems, namely statutory crimes (traffic violations and drunken driving); personal crimes (rape, robbery, assault, being shot at and abduction) and property crimes (housebreaking, theft of or from vehicles, other forms of theft, vandalism, robbery, hijacking and bag snatching).



The findings of the above analysis are presented in the following three tables.

**TABLE 6.3: STATUTORY CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND FEAR OF CRIME  
(N = 385)**

Statutory Crime	Walking alone		Home alone		Leaving/arriving home	
	rho	prob	rho	prob	rho	prob
Traffic violations	0.11352	0.0259*	0.04119	0.4203	0.19062	0.0002*
Driving under the influence of alcohol	0.03842	0.4519	0.08280	0.1048	0.09481	0.0631

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

In table 6.3 the three measures of fear of crime are correlated with the rating of statutory crime as a social problem in the respondents' area of residence. For all three measures of fear, the correlations with traffic violations are positive but the relationship is weak. The rho's are 0.11352; 0.04119 and 0.19062 respectively. The relationship between traffic violations and walking alone at night and leaving/arriving home are significant at the 0.05 level.

The correlations between driving under the influence of alcohol as a social problem and the three measures of fear elicited weak positive relationships (0.03842, 0.08280 and 0.09481 respectively). None of the relationships are significant at the 0.05 level.

These findings indicate that where traffic violations are viewed as a problem in residential areas, respondents are more fearful of walking alone and leaving and arriving at home. Drivers who violate speed limits in residential areas and do not observe the road signs place the lives of respondents and that of their families in jeopardy, and this could account for the level of formless fear reported by some residents.

**TABLE 6.4: PERSONAL VICTIMISATION AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND FEAR OF CRIME (N = 385)**

Personal victimisation	Walking alone		Home alone		Leaving/ arriving home	
	rho	prob	rho	prob	rho	prob
Rape	0.25440	0.0001*	0.25726	0.0001*	0.26826	0.0001*
Robbery	0.16797	0.0009*	0.16578	0.0011*	0.24935	0.0001*
Assault	0.14882	0.0034*	0.21097	0.0001*	0.18562	0.0003*
Shot at	0.27399	0.0001*	0.28481	0.0001*	0.19313	0.0001*
Abduction	0.15067	0.0037*	0.20354	0.0001*	0.22341	0.0001*

$p \leq 0.05$

In table 6.4 the correlation between the three fear of crime measures and personal victimisation as a social problem are depicted.

The relationship between rape as a social problem and the fear of crime is small but definite in magnitude with rho's of 0.25440, 0.25726 and 0.26826 respectively. All are significant at the 0.05 level. The relationship between robbery as a social problem and the three measures of fear was weak but positive in nature. The rho's were 0.16797; 0.16578 and 0.24935 respectively. All are significant at the 0.05 level. The relationship between the respondents' rating of assault as a social problem and the three measures of fear produced a weak positive relationship for the first measure (0.14882); a small but positive relationship for the second measure (0.21097) and a weak positive relationship for the last measure (0.18562). All are significant at the 0.05 level. Being shot at with a firearm is viewed as a social problem by 5.37% of the respondents but produces a small positive correlation with the first two measures of fear (0.27399 and 0.28481 respectively) but a weak positive relationship with the last measure (0.19313). All are significant at the 0.05 level. The correlation between abduction as a social problem and fear of crime produced a weak positive relationship for the first measure of fear (0.15067) and a small positive relationship for the last two measures of fear (0.20354 and 0.22341 respectively). All are significant at the 0.05 level.

The findings in table 6.4 indicate that the rating of types of personal victimisation as a social problem in the respondents' area of residence does influence their levels of formless fear.

The more problematic respondents viewed various types of personal victimisation, the higher were their levels of formless fear. When respondents indicate high levels of concern for criminal victimisation, this concern stimulates fear for the safety of respondents. Thus concern and fear would seem to be related issues.

**TABLE 6.5: PROPERTY CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND FEAR OF CRIME  
(N = 385)**

PROPERTY CRIME	WALKING ALONE		BEING ALONE		LEAVING/ ARRIVING HOME	
	rho	prob	rho	prob	rho	prob
Housebreaking	0.22980	0.0001*	0.26259	0.0001*	0.28845	0.0001*
Theft of/from vehicle	0.13176	0.0096*	0.19103	0.0002*	0.22744	0.0001*
Other theft	0.17861	0.0004*	0.17211	0.0007*	0.23267	0.0001*
Vandalism	0.17342	0.0006*	0.18051	0.0004*	0.23185	0.0001*
Hijacking	0.13115	0.0100*	0.13759	0.0069*	0.19313	0.0001*
Bagsnatching	0.17668	0.0005*	0.19994	0.0001*	0.28301	0.0001*

$p \leq 0.05$

In table 6.5, the relationship between the three measures of the fear of crime and the respondents' rating of property crimes as social problems in their residential area is given.

There is a small but positive relationship between the three measures of fear and housebreaking as a social problem (0.22980; 0.26259 and 0.28845 respectively). All are significant at the 0.05 level. The relationship between theft of or from a vehicle and fear of crime ranges from 0.13176 (walking alone) 0.9103 (being alone at home) and 0.22746 (leaving or arriving at home) respectively. The first two rho's indicate a weak but positive relationship between the variables and the last rho (0.22744) indicates a

small but positive relationship between feelings of safety when leaving or arriving at home and theft of or from a vehicle. All relationships are significant at the 0.05 level. Similar relationships were found between the three measures of fear and other forms of theft (0.17861, 0.17211 and 0.23267 respectively); vandalism (0.17342; 0.18051; 0.23185 respectively); bag snatching (0.17668, 0.19994 and 0.28301 respectively). All relationships were significant at the 0.05 level. The relationship between the three measures of fear of crime and hijacking as a social problem produced weak positive relationships (0.13115; 0.13759 and 0.19313 respectively) which were all significant at the 0.05 level.

The findings of table 6.5 indicate that the rating of property crime as a social problem in the area of residence by the respondents and the fear of crime are positively related. As respondents began to become more concerned about property crime so their fear increased.

### **6.3.2 Crime as a social problem and respondents opinion of police performance**

For the purpose of this investigation it was deemed necessary to investigate the link between crime as a social problem and the opinion that respondents have of the performance of their local police. In order to test this link, the following hypothesis was formulated.

Hypothesis 7:       The opinion respondents have of the service rendered by the police will influence how they rate crime as a social problem in their area of residence.

Using the Spearman Correlation Coefficient ( $\rho$ ) the relationship between crime as a social problem and the opinion of respondents toward police performance was measured.

The findings are depicted in the following tables:

**TABLE 6.6: STATUTORY CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND POLICE PERFORMANCE (N = 385)**

	Good job rho	More powers rho	Prompt rho	Co-opera- tive rho	Friendly rho	Helpful rho	Cour- teous rho	Not interested rho
Traffic violation	0.05378	0.06079	0.07199	0.06827	0.04769	0.01545	0.03476	0.00533
Driving under the influence of alcohol	0.19800*	0.00716	0.15434*	0.14829*	0.14819*	0.04397	0.08853*	-0.05113

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

In table 6.6 the relationship between the respondents' ratings of statutory crimes as social problem in their area of residence, and the respondents' opinion of the performance of local police is depicted. There is a very weak positive relationship between traffic violations and opinions on police performance, with rho's ranging from 0.00533 (police not interested in the case) to 0.07199 (local police were prompt in response to a call). The correlation between driving under the influence of alcohol as a social problem and opinion on performance of the local police indicates a weak positive relationship. The rho's range from 0.00716 (police should have more powers) to 0.19800 (police are doing a good job). Significant relationships (at 0.05 level) were found between driving under the influence of alcohol and the opinion of respondents that the police are doing a good job (0.19800) police were prompt when called out to an emergency (0.15434); police were cooperative (0.14829) and police were friendly (0.14819) respectively.

These weak rho's indicate that the respondents' rating of statutory crime as a social problem in their area of residence has little to no influence on their opinion of the services rendered by the police. The positive nature of the relationship implies that if statutory crime becomes more problematic in the respondents' area of residence, the rating of police services would become increasingly negative. This increase in negativity toward the police could be based on the feeling that if traffic violations and driving under the influence of alcohol cannot be controlled by the police, then the police

have become ineffective in combating crime in general and traffic violations in particular.

**TABLE 6.7: PERSONAL VICTIMISATION AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND POLICE PERFORMANCE (N = 385)**

	<b>Good job  rho</b>	<b>More powers  rho</b>	<b>Prompt  rho</b>	<b>Co-opera- tive  rho</b>	<b>Friendly  rho</b>	<b>Helpful  rho</b>	<b>Cour- teous  rho</b>	<b>Not interested  rho</b>
Rape	0.18041*	0.12111*	0.11428*	0.10988*	0.12899*	0.08101	0.14194*	-0.03201
Robbery	0.29260*	0.07736	0.18421*	0.17781*	0.16127*	0.14324*	0.18911*	-0.01158
Assault	0.27881*	0.09831	0.19308*	0.18825*	0.14142*	0.14312*	0.18317*	0.00432
Shot at	0.19515*	0.11970*	0.12213*	0.16206*	0.10722*	0.13865*	0.17759*	-0.10720*
Abduction	0.17496*	0.09137	0.11228*	0.22135*	0.21522*	0.14340*	0.22312*	-0.07503

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

Table 6.7 reflects the correlation between respondents' ratings of personal victimisation as a social problem in their area of residence and the respondents' opinion of the performance of the local police.

There are weak positive relationships between the respondents' rating of rape as a social problem in their area of residence and their opinion of the performance of the local police. The rho's for the first variable of police performance was 0.18041; for police needing more powers 0.12111; for promptness 0.11428; for co-operation 0.10988; for friendliness 0.12899; for helpfulness 0.08101 and for courteousness 0.14194. The rho for the last variable on police performance, namely that the police were uninterested in the case was -0.03201, indicating a very weak negative relationship.

Similar rho's were obtained for the correlation between robbery as a social problem and the eight measures of police performance (0.29260; 0.07736; 0.18421; 0.17781; 0.16127; 0.14324; 0.18911, -0.01158 respectively). These rho's indicate a weak positive relationship between respondents' rating of robbery as a social problem in their area of residence and residents' opinion that police needed more powers; local police were prompt, cooperative, friendly, helpful and courteous. A small to definite positive

relationship was to be found between robbery and the respondents view that the local police are doing a good job at combating crime. A very weak negative relationship (-0.01158) was revealed when robbery as a social problem was correlated with the opinions of respondents that local police were uninterested in the case.

The rho's obtained for the correlation between assault as a social problem and the eight measures of police performance were 0.27881 (police doing a good job); 0.09831 (police need more powers); 0.19308 (police were prompt); 0.18825 (police were co-operative); 0.14142 (police were friendly); 0.14312 (police were helpful); 0.18317 (police were courteous) and 0.00432 (police were uninterested in the case). Except for the correlation between assault and the opinion of the respondents that the police were doing a good job at combating crime (small positive relationship) the relationships between the remaining variables were positive but weak.

The relationship between the respondents' rating of being shot at with a firearm as a social problem in their area of residence and their opinion of police performance presented weak but positive correlation's for seven variables of police performance. The rho's ranged from 0.10722 (police were friendly) to 0.19515 (police were doing a good job at combating crime). The rho for the last variable of police performance (police were uninterested in the case) was -0.10720 which although significant at the 0.05 level, is nevertheless a weak negative relationship.

The rho's obtained for the correlation between the respondents' rating of abduction as a social problem and their opinion of the performance of the local police were 0.17496 (police were doing a good job); 0.09137 (the police need more powers); 0.11228 (the police were prompt); 0.22135 (the police were co-operative); 0.21522 (the police were friendly); 0.14340 (the police were helpful); 0.22312 (the police were courteous) and -0.07503 (police were uninterested). The relationship of the first seven variables varies from weak to small but is positive. The relationships for the last variable is very weak and negative.

Except for the correlations between rape, robbery, shot at and abduction and the

police's lack of interest in the case, the remaining correlations were positive. This would imply that as the respondents came to rate these types of crimes as a social problem in their area of residence, their opinion of police becomes increasingly negative. The police, in other words, will be viewed as incapable of doing their job, not prompt in their reactions, uncooperative, unfriendly, unhelpful and discourteous. The respondents will also feel that police do not deserve to get more powers as they cannot utilize those they already have. The interest shown by the police in the case will be viewed by respondents as being minimal. However, these relationships are somewhat weak.

**TABLE 6.8: RATING OF PROPERTY CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND POLICE PERFORMANCE (N = 283)**

	Good job	More powers	Prompt	Co- opera- tive	Friendly	Helpful	Cour- teous	Not Interested
	rho	rho	rho	rho	rho	rho	rho	rho
Housebreaking	0.17101*	0.09358	0.18153*	0.18114*	0.20718*	0.19628*	0.17160	-0.06952
Theft of/out of vehicle	0.23073*	0.11954*	0.16717*	0.16782*	0.18245*	0.14774*	0.15226*	-0.04741
Other theft	0.20007*	0.11458*	0.17880*	0.20710*	0.22495*	0.23597*	0.20277*	-0.10796*
Vandalism	0.25387*	0.04739	0.21108*	0.24480*	0.25955*	0.17810*	0.20750*	-0.12298*
Hijacking	0.22255*	0.12518*	0.20806*	0.20252*	0.21453*	0.16757*	0.15731*	-0.08562
Bag snatching	0.17158*	0.04450	0.09614	0.11658*	0.14600*	0.08604	0.17175*	-0.06329

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

In table 6.8 the correlation coefficient of the rating of property crimes as a social problem and police performance is revealed.

The rho's for the correlation between housebreaking as a social problem and the eight variables of police performance were 0.17101 (police were doing a good job); 0.09358 (police need more power); 0.18153 (police were prompt); 0.18114 (police were co-operative); 0.20718 (police were friendly); 0.19628 (police were helpful); 0.17160 (police were courteous); and -0.06952 (police were uninterested). Except for the last correlation, the previous seven indicate a weak but positive relationship between the two variables.



The relationship between theft of or out of a vehicle as a social problem and police performance produced weak but positive relationships. The rho's ranged from 0.23073 (police were doing a good job); 0.119564 (police need more powers); 0.16717 (police were prompt); 0.16782 (police were co-operative); 0.18245 (police were friendly); 0.14774 (police were helpful); 0.15226 (police were courteous); to -0.04741 (police were uninterested) which indicated a very weak negative relationship.

The correlation between the rating of other forms of theft as a social problem by respondents and the opinion respondents have of the local police produced small positive relationships between seven of the measures of police performance and a weak negative relationship for the last measure of police performance. (The rho's were 0.20007; 0.11458; 0.17880; 0.20710; 0.22495; 0.23597; 0.20277 and -0.10796 respectively).

In the correlation between vandalism as a social problem and the performance of local police the following rho's were obtained: 0.25387 (police were doing a good job); 0.04739 (police needed more power); 0.21108 (police were prompt); 0.24480 (police were co-operative); 0.25955 (police were friendly); 0.17810 (police were helpful) and 0.20750 (police were courteous). These rho's indicate weak positive relationships between the two variables. The last rho for vandalism was -0.12298 (police were uninterested) which indicated a weak negative relationship.

When hijacking was correlated to the eight measures of police performance, the following results were obtained: 0.22255 (police were doing a good job); 0.12518 (police needed more power); 0.20806 (police were prompt); 0.20252 (police were co-operative); 0.21453 (police were friendly); 0.16757 (police were helpful); and 0.15731 (police were courteous). These rho's indicate a weak positive relationship between the two variables. The rho for hijacking and the last measure of police performance was -0.08562 (police were uninterested) which indicated a very weak negative relationship.

Similar results were obtained for the respondents' rating of bag snatching as a social problem and the opinion of respondents on the performance of local police. The rho's

were 0.17158 (police were doing a good job); 0.04450 (police needed more powers); 0.09614 (police were prompt); 0.11658 (police were co-operative); 0.14600 (police were friendly); 0.08604 (police were helpful); 0.17175 (police were courteous) and -0.06329 (police were uninterested). The relationship is thus weak and positive for bagsnatching and the first seven measures of police performance; and very weak and negative for the last measure of police performance and bagsnatching as a social problem.

Except for the correlation between types of property crimes and the police's lack of interest, all the correlations are positive.

This would imply that as respondents come to rate property crime as social problems in their area of residence, so their opinion of police performance declines. If crime becomes a reality for respondents, the police will be seen to be losing control of the crime situation and this will definitely influence the way respondents feel about the police. However, these relationships are also somewhat weak.

#### **6.4 SUMMARY**

The general findings on the relationship between crime as a social problem, fear of crime, and the role of the police is limited. Although extensive work has been done by Glanz (1989) and Smith and Glanz (1989) it was felt that this research study should also pursue the relationship between the three variables.

Firstly, the percentages and frequency distribution of responses pertaining to the respondents' rating of statutory crimes (traffic violations and drunken driving), personal victimisation (rape, robbery, assault, shot at with AK47 and abduction); and property crimes (housebreaking, theft of or from vehicle; other forms of theft, vandalism, hijacking and bag snatching) were given. The percentage and frequency distribution of the responses pertaining to the respondents opinion on whether crime has increased over the past year in their area of residence was also presented.

Secondly, the correlation between fear of crime and the respondents' rating of statutory

crimes, personal victimisation and property crimes as social problems was depicted in tabular form.

Thirdly, using gender as a control variable, the three measures of fear of crime were correlated with the three types of crime rated by respondents as social problems in their area of residence.

Lastly, the respondents' opinion of the service rendered by their local police was correlated with their rating of types of crime as a social problem in their area of residence.

All the data was presented in tabular form with the discussion of findings following each table.

## CHAPTER 7

### ROLE OF THE POLICE AND THE FEAR OF CRIME

#### 7.1 INTRODUCTION

In 1651 Hobbes wrote that the fundamental aim of civil government was to establish order and protect citizens from criminal attack that causes continual fear and danger of violent death (Peak & Glensor 1996:36). In general, crime weakens the fabric of social life and reduces the public's support for the law, their willingness to report crime and increases the criticisms of the police and their ability to combat crime.

The findings of various authors (Baumer 1985; Box et al. 1988 and Conklin 1975) indicate that individuals who have confidence in the functioning of their local police have lower levels of fear than individuals who lack confidence in the police. When people lack confidence in the police and the criminal justice system as a whole, they will be unwilling to report crime or assist the police in any way. This lack of confidence on the part of public can also ensure a perpetuation of crime as the perception develops that the risk of apprehension of criminals is low.

The image the public has of the police is based on the public's perception of police performance, i.e. the delivery of a service. Although the majority of the public never come into direct contact with the police, their perceptions are based on personal observation at street level and mass media representation of police performance.

Factors which influence the perception of the public include

- ◆ effectiveness of police at crime prevention
- ◆ honesty
- ◆ abuse of power and authority by police
- ◆ impartiality (or lack thereof)
- ◆ show of interest in the crime
- ◆ friendliness and courteousness

- ◆ cooperation
- ◆ helpfulness
- ◆ bossiness and aggression (Van Heerden 1976:140-156).

On the basis of these factors, the police are judged and the image of the police is formed in the minds of the public.

In this chapter the general findings of previous studies will be briefly discussed before an analysis of the frequency distributions of responses to questions pertaining to the role of the police is given. This chapter will also seek to discover if there is a correlation between fear of crime and the role of the police; and if differences exist between male and female respondents with regard to their image of the police.

## **7.2 GENERAL FINDINGS**

The role of the police has seldom been used in research as a factor influencing the fear of crime. However, since the police are intimately involved in the management of crime and are most definitely part of the solution to crime and the fear of criminal victimisation, an assessment of their performance and attitude toward the police is necessary.

### **Garofalo (1978)**

In his research on victimisation and fear of crime Garofalo (1978) notes that in a modern, impersonal urban environment, the police are relied upon to protect people from criminal victimisation. His findings on the relationship between fear of crime and the evaluation of police performance indicated a weak relationship between these two variables. Garofalo (1978:95) opines that further research on the influence of the police on the fear of crime was needed.

### **Balken and Houlden (1983)**

These researchers speculated that three major cues associated with occupational groupings will evoke an image of a non-threatening individual willing to intervene in a crime, namely the presence or absence of a uniform; employment in public versus

private sector and a commitment to working environment. According to Balken and Houlden (1983:17) persons in uniform are judged as trustworthy, reliable, helpful and willing to intervene in case of a physical attack. Their findings indicated that persons in uniform affected the respondents' feelings of safety positively. Thus a person's fear of crime will be reduced when persons in uniform are in the environment.

### **Baumer (1985)**

In his analysis of data obtained from a national sample of 1 454 non-institutionalized adults in 1980, Baumer (1985:245) includes an item on the perceived adequacy of police protection in the neighbourhood. Using a multivariate regression model, the relationship between the fear of crime and adequate policing was investigated. A significant interaction was recorded between perceived adequacy of police protection and the subjective likelihood of being robbed in the next year. He concludes that "... under conditions of high subjective risk the police have the greatest potential impact on fear of crime" (Baumer, 1985:248). He also notes that various policing strategies can also influence the level of fear, e.g. increased motorised patrols or foot patrols can reduce levels of fear.

### **Box, Hale and Andrews (1988)**

Box et al. (1988) propose that if the police are believed to be effective and efficient in their handling of crime, then fear of crime is likely to be less. Confidence in the police thus can influence the fear of crime. In the analysis of their data, Box et al. (1988:351) reported that "... individuals who have confidence in the functioning of their local constabulary have a lower probability of fear than similar respondents who do not". They concluded that the police could become a crucial ally in the battle for order.

### **Klein, Luxenburg and King (1989)**

Klein et al. (1989) state that the law enforcement agencies are normally delegated the responsibility for protecting the general populace. The average citizen expects the police to have a presence in the community. When the police are unable to maintain a presence due to constraints of various natures, the solution to crime and the fear of criminal victimisation must be sought elsewhere. This has led to a proliferation of

private policing companies, and alternative methods of policing, e.g. community policing.

### **Glanz (1989)**

In her research done on coping with crime, Glanz (1989:34) identifies the quality of police services as an important factor that influences the South African public's perception and reaction to crime. Making use of frequency and percentage-distribution of responses and multiple linear regression analysis, Glanz (1989) reported the following:

- ◆ Whites tended to have the most positive attitude toward the police; followed by blacks; coloureds and lastly indians.
- ◆ Indians living in urban areas had a more negative attitude toward police than those living in rural areas.
- ◆ For the coloured group, older respondents tended to have a more positive attitude toward the police than younger respondents.
- ◆ For the black respondents, married respondents had a less positive attitude toward the police than respondents of other marital status. Education levels also influenced attitude toward the police in so far as the higher the education level of the respondent the more negative the attitude toward the police.
- ◆ White respondents who viewed conditions in their neighbourhood as having improved, tended to have a negative attitude toward the police; while blacks who held similar views of neighbourhood conditions, had a positive attitude toward the police (Glanz 1989:34-40).

### **Maree (1993)**

In her study on residents' concern about crime and crime prevention, Maree (1993:56) attempts to establish the respondents' respect for and quality of services rendered by the police. Data from 150 households in Elardus Park was analysed. Fifty two per cent of the respondents were positive about the quality of service rendered by the police in protecting their residential area against crime; while 44.7% were uncertain about the service rendered by the police. The issues raised by those who were uncertain

included uncertainty about whether or not the police had enough time and manpower to carry out a proactive service. The visibility of the police was also questioned as 9.3 per cent of the respondents claimed to see the police daily, 40 per cent once a week, 5.3 per cent monthly, 39.4 per cent seldom and 6.0 per cent never. Maree (1993:58) however does report that respondents who see police seldom or never ascribed it to the fact that they work.

The delivery of a reactive service, was according to the majority of respondents in Maree's (1993) study satisfactory.

In general Elardus Park residents were respectful of the police and valued the service rendered by the police.

#### **Neser, Geldenhuys, Stevens, Grobbelaar and Ladikos (1993)**

In their study on fear of crime in the Sunnyside area of Pretoria, Neser et al. (1993) utilize confidence in the police and courts as a measure of fear of crime. The following questions were used to determine the degree of confidence in the police and courts:

- ◆ How confident are you of the police in your own residential area?
- ◆ How confident are you of the courts (Supreme court; Regional court and Magistrate's court)?

The findings of Neser et al. (1993) indicate that 43.05 per cent of the respondents who have little confidence in the police, feel unsafe in their residential area at night. The respondents who have confidence in the police indicated less fear of crime. When looking at fear of crime and confidence in the courts, similar results were obtained.

### **7.3 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA**

For the purpose of this study, the role of the police is viewed as an important factor influencing the fear of crime.



In order to establish a clear statistical pattern of responses to the role of the police, frequency distributions of the type of contact respondents have had with the police, the respondents' willingness to report crime to the police, the reasons why respondents do not report crime to the police, the respondents' opinion with regard to their obligation to assist in crime prevention, and the respondents' opinion on the services rendered by the local police and the visibility of the local police is presented. The pattern of responses reveal the experience that the respondents have had, whether directly or indirectly, with police activities.

**TABLE 7.1 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF TYPE OF CONTACT WITH THE POLICE**

Type of Contact	Frequency Distribution	
	N	%
Accused/convicted	19	4.90
Accused/acquitted	38	9.90
Suspect	31	8.10
Victim	62	16.10
Witness	37	9.60
Informant	16	4.20
No contact	182	47.30
TOTAL	385	100.00

Table 7.1 shows that of the 385 respondents 19 (4.9%) had been accused of a crime and convicted; 30 (9.9%) had been accused and acquitted of any crime; 31 (8.1%) had been a suspect in a criminal investigation. Sixty-two (16.1%) of the respondents had been a victim of a criminal attack; 37 (9.6%) had been a witness to a crime; 16 (4.2%) had been an informant and 182 (47.3%) had not contact with the police. Less than half of the respondents thus had no contact with the police, and less than one fifth had been victims of a crime.

The respondents were then asked whether they reported all crimes in which they had been involved as a victim, or those that they had knowledge of to the police. If they had decided not to report a crime the respondents were to indicate their reasons. The

following tables represents a frequency distribution of their responses.

**TABLE 7.2 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE REPORTING OF CRIMES BY RESPONDENTS (N = 385)**

Reporting of crime	Always		Often		Sometimes		Never		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Victim	134	34.80	30	7.80	103	26.80	118	30.60	385	100.00
Knowledge	104	27.00	35	9.10	109	28.30	137	35.60	385	100.00

In table 7.2, 134 (34.8%) of the respondents indicated that they always report a crime in which they have been a victim, 30 (7.8%) said often, 103 (26.8%) said sometimes and 118 (30.6%) said that they had never reported a crime in which they had been a victim. In answer to the questions on if they had reported a crime of which they had knowledge of, 104 (27.0%) said always; 35 (9.1%) said often; 109 (28.3%) said sometimes and 137 (35.6%) said that they had never reported to the police that they had knowledge of a criminal offence. In general, respondents did not report crime as often as one would expect, especially when they had been a victim.

**TABLE 7.3: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING  
CRIME (N = 385)**

Reasons	Yes		No		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bother Police	131	34.00	254	66.00	385	100.00
No proper attention	210	54.50	175	45.50	385	100.00
Not prompt	216	56.10	169	43.90	385	100.00
Unsolvable case	198	51.40	187	48.60	385	100.00
Police unable to solve	207	53.80	178	46.20	385	100.00
Society uninterested	92	24.00	293	76.00	385	100.00
Settled personally	118	30.60	267	69.40	385	100.00
Personal nature	132	34.30	253	65.70	385	100.00
Time consuming	119	30.90	266	69.10	385	100.00
Dislike of involvement	153	39.70	232	60.30	385	100.00
Negative attitude	186	48.30	199	51.70	385	100.00
Guilty party	155	40.30	230	59.70	385	100.00
Partiality of police	168	43.60	217	56.40	385	100.00
Fear of retaliation	173	44.90	212	55.10	385	100.00

From table 7.3 it can be ascertained that the main reasons for individuals not reporting crimes to the police appear to be the belief that the police will not give the case the proper attention it deserves (54.5%); the police did not react promptly when called out to emergencies (56.1%); the case is viewed as unsolvable (51.4%); police are viewed as unable to solve the crime by 207 (53.8%) of the respondents.

**TABLE 7.4: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS' ATTITUDE TOWARD COMBATING CRIME (N = 385)**

Attitude Toward Combating Crime		Frequency	
		N	%
B.	Duty to combat crime		
	Undoubtedly	86	22.30
	To a large extent	93	24.20
	Uncertain	49	12.70
	To a lesser extent	50	13.00
	Not at all	107	27.80
	Total	385	100.00
C.	Willingness to assist police		
	Always	160	41.60
	Often	57	14.80
	Uncertain	42	10.90
	Sometimes	86	22.30
	Never	40	10.40
	Total	385	100.00
D.	Important link in the Criminal Justice System		
	Yes	229	59.50
	No	156	40.50
	Total	385	100.00

In table 7.4 the respondents attitude toward helping to combat crime is measured. Their responses are as follows:

◆ *Duty to combat crime:*

Of the respondents, 86 (22.3%) said that they had a definite duty to combat crime; 93 (24.2%) felt that to a large extent they had a duty to combat crime; 49 (12.7%) were uncertain; 50 (13.8%) claimed that they had less of a duty to combat crime; 107 (27.8%) said it was not their duty at all to combat crime.

◆ *Willingness to assist police:*

In answer to the question of the respondents' willingness to assist police 160 (41.6%) indicated that they were always willing to assist police; 57 (14.8%) were

often willing; 42 (10.9%) were uncertain; 86 (22.3%) were sometimes willing and 40 (10.4%) were never willing to assist police to combat crime.

♦ *Important link in Criminal Justice System:*

Of the respondents, 229 (59.5%) said they viewed themselves as being an important link in the criminal justice system, and 156 (40.5%) indicated no such responsibility.

From table 7.4 it is clear that only 46 percent of the respondents were of the opinion that they as members of society should help in the fight against crime. Only 56 percent of the respondents were willing to assist police in the fight against crime. These figures do not imply an outright willingness on the part of respondents to be part of crime prevention.

**TABLE 7.5: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF FEELINGS TOWARD CONTACT WITH THE POLICE (N = 385)**

Feelings toward contact	Yes		No		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Call on police	207	53.80	178	46.20	385	100.00
Great a policeman	217	56.40	168	43.60	385	100.00
Lodge a complaint	222	57.70	163	42.30	385	100.00

In table 7.5 the frequency distribution of responses to the feelings respondents have toward contact with the police was revealed. Of the respondents 207 (53.80%) said they would call on a policeman in time of a threat, and 178 (46.20%) said they would not do so; 217 (56.40%) claimed they would openly great a policeman and 168 (43.60%) said they would not; and 222 (57.70%) said they would feel free to lodge a complaint at a police station while 163 (42.30%) said they would not feel free to do so.

**TABLE 7.6: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS' FEAR OF POLICEMAN (N = 385)**

Fear of Policeman	Yes		No		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Fear of policeman (uniform)	74	19.20	311	80.80	385	100.00
Fear of policeman (plain clothes)	82	21.30	303	78.70	385	100.00

In table 7.6 the frequency distribution of respondents toward their fear of policeman is revealed. Of the 385 respondents, 74 (19.20%) fear a policeman in uniform and 82 (21.30%) fear a policeman in plain clothes. The majority of the respondents held no fear of a policeman in or out of uniform.

TABLE 7.7: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLIC'S OPINION OF POLICE PERFORMANCE (N = 385)

Opinion	Strongly Agree		Agree		Uncertain		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Good Job	58	15.00	75	19.50	120	31.20	67	17.40	65	16.90	385	100.00
More power	160	41.60	118	30.60	60	15.60	28	7.30	19	4.90	385	100.00
Prompt	67	17.40	78	20.30	137	35.60	54	14.00	49	12.70	385	100.00
Co-operate	53	13.80	100	26.00	129	33.50	59	15.30	44	11.40	385	100.00
Friendly	48	12.50	89	23.10	146	37.90	57	14.80	45	11.70	385	100.00
Helpful	47	12.20	104	27.00	134	34.80	51	13.30	49	12.70	385	100.00
Courteous	40	10.40	102	26.40	167	43.40	43	11.20	33	8.60	385	100.00
Uninterested	45	11.70	61	15.80	140	36.40	65	16.90	74	19.20	385	100.00

In table 7.7 the extent of police cooperation in combatting and solving crime is measured. Each respondent was asked to state, whether or not they were in strong agreement, agreement, uncertain, in disagreement or strong disagreement with various aspects pertaining to police performance.

◆ *Promptness in response to a call*

Of the respondents 67 (17.4%) strongly agreed that the police were prompt to arrive when called out to a case; 78 (20.3%) agreed; 137 (35.6%) were uncertain; 54 (14.0%) disagreed; and 49 (12.7%) strongly disagreed with this statement.

◆ *Police are co-operative*

Fifty three (13.8%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement in regard to co-operativeness of the police; 100 (26%) were in agreement; 129 (33.5%) were uncertain; 59 (15.3%) disagreed; and 44 (11.4%) strongly disagreed and therefore viewed the police as unco-operative.

◆ *Police are friendly*

In response to this statement, 48 (12.5%) strongly agreed; 89 (23.1%) agreed; 146 (37.0%) were uncertain; 57 (14.8%) disagreed and 45 (11.7%) strongly disagreed that the police are friendly.

◆ *Police are helpful*

Of the respondents, 47 (12.2%) strongly agreed with this statement, 104 (34.8%) agreed; 134 (34.8%) were uncertain; 51 (13.2%) disagreed and 49 (12.7%) obviously viewed the police as unhelpful.

◆ *Police are courteous*

Only 40 (10.4%) of the respondents were in strong agreement with this statement, 102 (26.5%) agreed; 167 (43.4%) were uncertain; 43 (11.2%) disagreed and 33 (8.6%) strongly disagreed and viewed the police as discourteous.



♦ *Police are uninterested in the case*

In response to this statement, 45 (11.7%) of the respondents strongly agreed with it; 61 (15.8%) agreed; 140 (36.4%) were uncertain; 65 (16.9%) disagreed and 74 (19.2%) of the respondents were in strong disagreement.

Of major concern is the number of uncertain responses obtained for most categories. In some instances, over a third of the respondents were unsure as to the performance of the police in their areas. This uncertainty could be based on media reports of police activity (or lack thereof), actual experience of the police's services or an hearsay. Whatever the reason, to have one third of a sample unsure, is cause for concern.

**TABLE 7.8 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE PATROLLING OF THE RESIDENTIAL AREAS (N = 385)**

Actual Policing	Frequency Distribution	
	N	%
Monthly	9	2.30
Weekly	16	4.20
Daily	48	12.50
Seldom	141	36.60
Never	171	44.40
TOTAL	385	100.00

In table 7.8, the respondents were asked to indicate how often the police patrolled their neighbourhoods. Of the respondents 9 (2.3%) said that the police patrolled monthly; 16 (4.2%) said weekly; 48 (12.5%) said daily; 141 (36.6%) said seldom and 171 (44.4%) indicated that the police never patrolled their residential areas. The respondents were not asked to indicate their reasons for not seeing the police, which is a problem as many work during the day. However, without an effective police presence the residents will not feel safe in their neighbourhoods, thus increasing the fear of criminal victimisation.

These findings imply weak correlations between the three measures of formless fear and contact with the police.

### **7.3.1 Fear of crime and the role of the police**

In order to establish the relationship between the fear of crime and the role of the police, the following hypothesis was formulated:

Hypothesis 8:       The role of the police influences the fear of crime.

The three fear of crime measures, namely: "How safe do you feel walking alone at night in your neighbourhood?"; "How safe do you feel in your home or apartment at night?" and "How safe do you feel when leaving or arriving at home after dark?" were correlated with variables pertaining to contact with the police, willingness of respondents to report crime to the police, the reasons why respondents don't report crime to the police, the respondents' opinion on their obligation to assist in crime prevention, and the respondents' opinion of the service rendered by police and the visibility of the local police.

Using the Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient, the correlation between the role of the police and the fear of crime was sought. The findings of the correlations are represented in tables 7.9 to 7.14 respectively.

**TABLE 7.9 FEAR OF CRIME, CONTACT WITH THE POLICE AND CRIME REPORTING (N = 385)**

	Contact with police and crime reporting		Walking alone		Home alone		Leaving/arriving at home	
	rho	prob	rho	prob	rho	prob	rho	prob
Contact with police	-0.02410	0.6373	-0.10325	0.0429*	-0.04088	0.4238		
Report crime (victim)	-0.06071	0.2347	0.00302	0.9529	0.01110	0.8281		
Report crime (knowledge)	0.00503	0.9216	-0.00585	0.9090	0.04297	0.4004		
<u>Reasons for not reporting crime</u>								
Bother police	0.08879	0.0819	0.08671	0.0893	0.11808	0.0205*		
No proper attention	0.02290	0.6542	0.08780	0.0853	0.05968	0.2427		
Not prompt	0.13738	0.0069*	0.06913	0.1759	0.08707	0.0880		
Unsolvable case	0.12738	0.0124*	0.11254	0.0272*	0.13351	0.0087*		
Police unable to solve	0.07618	0.1357	0.07862	0.1236	0.08503	0.0957		
Society uninterested	0.08384	0.1005	0.04190	0.4124	0.03021	0.5545		
Settled personally	0.05073	0.3208	0.07082	0.1655	0.00314	0.9510		
Personal nature	-0.02641	0.6054	-0.02222	0.6638	-0.03659	0.4741		
Time consuming	0.07948	0.1195	-0.00669	0.8959	0.02437	0.6335		
Dislike-involvement	0.04465	0.3823	-0.01355	0.7910	0.01361	0.7901		
Negative attitude	0.10117	0.0473*	0.09474	0.0633	0.12097	0.0176*		
Guilt party	0.06263	0.2201	0.15711	0.0020*	0.13066	0.0103*		
Partiality of the police	0.11603	0.0228*	0.12537	0.0138*	0.13066	0.0103*		
Fear of retaliation	0.08680	0.0890	0.09564	0.0608	0.10279	0.0438*		

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

In table 7.9 the relationship between the three measures of fear and contact with the police is depicted.

When correlating juridical contact with the police and fear of crime, the rho for feelings of safety when walking alone, being alone at home and leaving/arriving at home are -0.02410, -0.10325 and -0.04088 respectively. These rho's indicate a very slight negative relationship between the variables.

These negative correlations between the type of contact with the police and the respondents' fear of crime could point to a breakdown in the confidence respondents have in the operational methods of the police.

When correlating actual reporting of crime in which the respondent had been a victim and the fear of crime measures, the rho's were -0.06071 (walking alone); 0.00302 (home alone) and 0.01110 (leaving or arriving at home) respectively. This indicates a slight to negligible negative relationship between the reporting of crime and walking alone; a slight positive relationship between the reporting of crime and being home alone; and a weak positive relationship between leaving or coming from home and reporting crime in which the respondent had been a victim. The relationship between reporting a crime of which the respondent had knowledge and the measures of the fear of crime produced the following rho's: 0.00503 (walking alone); -0.00585 (home alone) and 0.04297 (leaving or arriving at home) respectively. The relationships are weak and negative for the first two variables; slight and negative for the second; and weak and positive for the final correlation.

Previously (see Table 7.2) it was noted that over half of the respondents were not willing to report crime (either as a victim/or those they have knowledge of) to the police. The correlation between the reporting of crime and fear of crime is, in general, positive which implies that the less the persons reports crime, the more fear of crime they display. These findings could be based on negative media reports (lack of police transport, improper forms of address, lack of interest in crime and a lack of community policing efforts) which influence how respondents view the police.

The correlations between the three measures of the fear of crime and the reasons for not reporting crime produced interesting results.

The rho's for the correlation of fear of crime and not reporting crime as the respondent had no wish to bother the police were 0.08879 (walking alone); 0.08671 (home alone) and 0.11808 (leaving or arriving at home) respectively. These rho's indicate a slight to negligible positive relationship. A similar relationship exists for not reporting crime because the case would not receive proper attention (0.02290; 0.08780 and 0.05968); the police did not react promptly to emergency calls (0.13738; 0.06913 and 0.08707); the case is unsolvable (0.12738; 0.11254 and 0.13351); police do not have the ability to solve the case (0.07618; 0.07862 and 0.08503); the crime is no threat to the social order (0.08384; 0.04190 and 0.03021); and case can be settled out of court (0.05073; 0.07082 and 0.00314) respectively.

The rho's for the correlation of fear of crime and not reporting crime as the crime itself is of a personal nature are -0.02641 (walking alone), -0.02222 (home alone) and -0.03659 (leaving or arriving at home) respectively. Those rho's indicate a slight negative relationship.

The relationship between the fear of crime measures and not reporting a crime because involvement in the criminal justice system is time consuming produced a slight positive relationship (0.07948) for walking alone at night; a slight negative relationship (-0.00669) for being alone at home and a slight positive relationship (0.02437) for leaving and arriving at home. Similar results were obtained for the measures of fear of crime and the respondents not reporting crime as they did not want to get involved in a court case (0.04465; -0.01355 and 0.01361) respectively.

A slight positive relationship was obtained in the correlation between the three measures of fear of crime and the non-reporting of crime because the police had a negative attitude and approach to the case (0.10117; 0.09474 and 0.12097); police make the victim feel guilty (0.06263; 0.15711 and 0.13066); police are not impartial (0.11603; 0.12537 and 0.13066); and the respondents feared retaliation (0.08680;

0.09564 and 0.10279) respectively.

In a previous table (Table 7.3) the reasons why respondents do not report crime were listed. The most obvious reasons, included that the respondents felt that the police would be *unable to solve the case*, *the police would not give the case proper attention* and the police were not prompt in their reaction. The findings in table 7.9 would seem to indicate that these reasons for non reporting of crime to the police did influence the level of fear felt by respondents. The negative attitude of the police, police partiality and the police's ability to make the respondent feel like the guilty party (criminal instead of victim) are also noteworthy influences on fear.

**TABLE 7.10 FEAR OF CRIME AND THE RESPONDENTS' FEELINGS TOWARD CONTACT WITH THE POLICE (N = 385)**

Feelings towards contact	Walking alone		Home alone		Leaving/arriving at home	
	rho	prob	rho	prob	rho	prob
Call on police	0.10972	0.0314*	0.08558	0.0936	0.12140	0.0172*
Greet a policeman	0.06658	0.1923	0.02224	0.6636	0.10058	0.0486*
Lodge a complaint	0.04914	0.3363	0.01117	0.8270	0.06994	0.1709

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

In table 7.10 the three fear of crime measures are correlated with the respondents' feelings towards contact with the police.

For the first measure of fear (walking alone) the rho obtained for the correlation with respondents willingness to call upon the police in a time of threat was 0.10972 (significant at the 0.05 level); the rho for willingness to a greet policeman was 0.06658 and the willingness to lodge a complaint was 0.04914. There is a weak positive relationship between the first measure of fear and feelings towards contact with the police.

Similar results were obtained for the second measure of fear but none of the relationships were significant at the 0.05 level.

The last measure of fear (leaving/arriving at home) produced weak positive relationships with the respondents feelings towards contact with the police. The rho's were 0.12140 and 0.10058 (significant at the 0.05 level) for willingness to call on the police again and willingness to greet a policeman respectively, and 0.06994 for willingness to lodge a complaint at a police station.

The rho's are all weak and positive in nature which implies that as fear of crime increases, so the respondents feel more at liberty to have contact with the police. This willingness to have contact with the police could be based on the perception respondents have that the police can help them in time of need. Having observed that there is a negative attitude toward crime reporting (Table 7.2 and 7.9) this finding is a clear indication that the police are indeed looked upon as a last resource in combating crime.

In support of these findings, Radelet and Carter (1994) proposed that if the police are viewed as guardians of the community, their image would suffer if crime is seen as rampant. But the public's opinion on the association between police activities and crime varies. Radelet and Carter (1994) state that "... sometimes crime influences public's opinion of police and sometimes it does not ... [C] certainly the public recognizes that the police have crime prevention responsibilities but there is some tendency to give a much stronger association to detecting and solving crime" (Radelet & Carter 1994:209). This possibly explains why respondents do not report crime to the police, but when in danger they would do so because they are aware that the case may be solved and the perpetrators brought to justice.

**TABLE 7.11 FEAR OF CRIME AND THE PUBLIC'S OBLIGATION TOWARDS  
CRIME PREVENTION (N = 385)**

Public's Opinion	Walking alone		Home alone		Leaving/arriving at home	
	rho	prob	rho	prob	rho	prob
Duty to combat crime	-0.06629	0.1943	0.02826	0.5803	-0.04231	0.4077
Willing to assist	0.00861	0.4325	0.00192	0.9700	-0.00962	0.8507
Important link	-0.04789	0.3487	0.03413	0.5043	-0.02514	0.6229

In table 7.11 the three measures of fear of crime are correlated with three variables relating to the opinion the public have of its obligation to assist police in the combating of crime.

The first variable relating to the public's duty to combat crime and the three fear of crime measures resulted in rho's that indicate a slight negative relationship (-0.06629) for the first measure of fear of crime; a slight positive relationship (0.02826) for the second measure and a slight negative relationship (-0.04231) for the third measure of fear of crime.

When correlating the second variable, namely the public's willingness to assist the police in the combating of crime and the three fear measures, the following rho's were produced 0.00861; 0.00192 and -0.00962 which indicate a very weak positive relationship between the first two measures and a weak negative relationship for the last measure of fear of crime.

Correlating the last variable, namely that the public are an important link in the criminal justice system and the three measures of fear, produced a weak negative relationship (-0.04789) for the first measure; a weak positive relationship (0.03413) for the second measure; and a weak negative relationship (-0.02514) for the last measure of fear. None of these relationships were significant at the 0.05 level.



The findings of this correlation are interesting. It would imply that as fear of crime (as measured by the three measures of formless fear) increases, so the respondents become more duty bound to combat crime, and view themselves as being an important link in the criminal justice system. The respondents seemed to be relatively willing to assist the police in combating crime. However, the correlations are weak.

**TABLE 7.12 FEAR OF CRIME AND THE PUBLIC'S OPINION OF POLICE PERFORMANCE (N = 385)**

Public's opinion	Walking alone		Home alone		Leaving/arriving at home	
	rho	prob	rho	prob	rho	prob
Local police do a good job	0.17356	0.0006*	0.16950	0.0008*	0.20747	0.0001*
Local police should have more power	0.10395	0.0415*	0.11397	0.0253*	0.09342	0.0671
Local police are prompt	0.09999	0.0499*	0.07077	0.1658	0.13257	0.0092*
Local police are co-operative	0.13296	0.0090*	0.12375	0.0151*	0.15151	0.0029*
Local police are friendly	0.09191	0.0716	0.07202	0.1584	0.11908	0.0194*
Local police are helpful	0.14260	0.0051*	0.17639	0.0005*	0.12149	0.0171*
Local police are courteous	0.18945	0.0002*	0.19466	0.0001*	0.18383	0.0003*
Local police are not interested in the case	-0.04838	0.3438	-0.11066	0.0299*	-0.03290	0.5198

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

In table 7.12 the fear of crime as measured by the feelings of safety when walking alone, being alone at home and arriving or leaving home were correlated with the respondents' opinion of the performance of local police.

*In the correlation between the three measures of fear and the opinion that the local police are doing a good job the rho's obtained were 0.17356; 0.16950 and 0.20747 respectively. This indicates a slight positive relationship between the two variables. A similar relationship was obtained for the following variables, namely the local police need more power (0.10395; 0.11397 and 0.09342); the local police are prompt (0.0999; 0.07077 and 0.13257); the local police are cooperative (0.13296; 0.12375 and 0.15151); the local police are friendly (0.09191; 0.07202 and 0.11098); the local police are helpful (0.14260; 0.17639 and 0.11098); and the local police are courteous (0.18945; 0.19466 and 0.12149) respectively. A slight negative relationship exists between the fear of crime measures and the opinion that the local police are not interested in the case (-0.04838; -0.11066 and -0.03290) respectively.*

The findings in table 7.12 would seem to indicate that as fear of crime increases so peoples opinion of police performance declines. The correlations are weak which replicates the findings of Garofalo (1979). The opinion that respondents have of the police are important as confidence in the police is closely connected to the fear of crime (see par. 7.2). Therefore although these correlations are weak, they do promote further investigation of the link between opinion and fear.

TABLE 7.13 FEAR OF CRIME AND POLICE VISIBILITY (N = 385)

Police Visibility	Walking alone		Home alone		Leaving/arriving at home	
	rho	prob	rho	prob	rho	prob
Fear of policeman (uniform)	-0.04035	0.4298*	-0.07618	0.1357	-0.09003	0.0777
Fear of policeman (plain clothes)	-0.03645	0.4757	-0.09580	0.0604	-0.07788	0.1272
Patrolling of neighbourhood	0.04332	0.3966	0.27792	0.0001*	0.04225	0.4084

\* $p \leq 0.05$

From table 7.13 it can be inferred that there is a slight negative relationship between the three measures of the fear of crime and police visibility as measured by fear of policeman in uniform (-0.04035; -0.07618 and -0.09003) and fear of policeman in plain cloths (-0.03645; -0.09580 and -0.07788) respectively. A slight to negligible positive relationship between exists between actual patrolling of the neighbourhood and the measures of fear (0.04332; 0.27792 and 0.04225) respectively.

The rho's for these correlations would imply that people who fear criminal victimisation do not fear a policeman in or out of uniform. However, fear of crime is influenced by police visibility. The lack of police omnipresence influenced the respondents' fear of crime.

### **7.3.2 Gender Differences and the Role of the Police**

As has already been established by research, gender influences the fear of crime. The role of the police in combating crime has been investigated in the previous section and it is now deemed necessary to establish to what extent gender differences exist in the respondents' contact with the police, their reporting of crime to the police, their reasons for not reporting crime to the police, their opinions on their obligation to combat crime, and their opinions on the services rendered by the police (including police visibility).

The following hypothesis was formulated to test for significant differences:

Hypothesis 9:        There are significant differences between male and female respondents with regard to their experiences with the police.

The F-test will be used in order to establish whether significant differences do exist between males and females and their view of the role of the police. The findings are reflected in the tables 7.14 to 7.18.

**TABLE 7.14 GENDER AND CONTACT WITH THE POLICE (N = 385)**

Contact	Males		Females		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Juridical contact	4.77	2.08	5.43	1.94	9.81*
Report crime (victim)	2.12	1.16	2.48	1.27	8.23*
Report crime (knowledge)	2.30	1.17	2.68	1.24	9.27*
Bother police	1.28	0.45	1.38	0.48	3.42
No proper attention	1.56	0.50	1.53	0.50	0.30
Not prompt	1.60	0.49	1.54	0.50	1.23
Unsolvable case	1.54	0.50	1.50	0.50	0.49
Police unable to solve	1.56	0.50	1.52	0.50	0.64
Society uninterested	1.23	0.42	1.25	0.43	0.26
Settled personally	1.25	0.43	1.35	0.48	4.44*
Personal nature	1.32	0.47	1.36	0.48	0.69
Time consuming	1.28	0.45	1.32	0.47	0.69
Dislike involvement	1.37	0.49	1.41	0.49	0.73
Negative attitude	1.49	0.50	1.48	0.50	0.05
Guilty party	1.36	0.48	1.43	0.50	2.09
Partiality of police	1.40	0.49	1.46	0.50	1.06
Fear of retaliation	1.42	0.50	1.47	0.50	0.65

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

In table 7.14, significant differences between male and female respondents have been found for only four items.

The first item involves male and female differences pertaining to contact with the police. The mean score for males was 4.77 and for females 5.43 and the F-value 9.81 ( $p = 0.0019$ ) which was significant at the 0.05 level. This implies that females have generally had less contact with the police than males.

The second item showing a significant difference involves the reporting of a crime to the police as a victim. The mean scores for males was 2.12 and for females 2.48 and the F-value 8.23 ( $p = 0.0043$ ) which was significant at the 0.05 level. The third item pertained to the reporting of crime of which the respondent had knowledge. The mean scores for males was 2.30 and for females 2.68 and the F-value 9.27 ( $p = 0.0025$ )

which was significant at the 0.05 level. The responses then show that females are less likely to report crime to the police than males.

The last item recording a significant difference involved a reason why respondents did not report crime to the police. Females (mean score 1.35) indicated that they did not prefer to settle the case personally in comparison to men (mean score 1.25). The F-value was 4.44 ( $p = 0.0357$ ) which was significant at the 0.05 level.

For the rest of the items, no significant difference were obtained. The range of scores for males was 1.23 to 4.77 and 1.25 to 5.43 for females.

These findings imply that females are generally less likely to have contact with police than males. Reasons for this could be that females have developed a distrust of police (especially a policeman).

Media reports and "general knowledge" have shown that females when they have been victims of a personal crime are not handled carefully or differently to other victims. This lack of care is what could influence females to view contact with police more negatively than males.

**TABLE 7.15 GENDER AND FEELINGS TOWARDS CONTACT WITH POLICE**  
(N = 385)

Feelings towards contact	Males		Females		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Call upon police	1.43	0.80	1.48	0.50	1.01
Greet a policeman	1.40	0.49	1.46	0.50	1.54
Lodge a complaint	1.36	0.48	1.47	0.50	4.43*

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

Table 7.15 reflects the differences between males and females in their willingness to have contact with the police.

The mean score for females range from 1.46 to 1.48 and those for males from 1.36 to 1.43 respectively. There is a significant difference between males (1.36) and females (1.47) in their willingness to lodge a complaint at a police station. The F-value was 4.43 ( $p = 0.0360$ ) which was significant at the 0.05 level.

Females are more unwilling to go to a police station to lodge a complaint than males. This could be due to

- ◆ lack of policewomen at charge offices
- ◆ unwillingness to talk to a male after victimisation
- ◆ impersonal atmosphere at police stations.

Radelet and Carter (1994:211) say that walking into a police station will influence the persons perception of the police. A dirty cluttered station creates the impression that the police do not care for their clientele. Impersonality of the police exacerbates the public's perception that the police station is a cold and sterile place.

**TABLE 7.16 GENDER AND OBLIGATION TO COMBAT CRIME (N = 385)**

Obligation to combat crime	Males		Females		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Duty to combat crime	2.74	1.55	3.16	1.52	6.92*
Willing to assist	2.17	1.37	2.63	1.50	9.22*
Important link	1.35	0.48	1.44	0.50	3.04

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

In table 7.16 gender differences pertaining to the public's obligation towards crime prevention is depicted. Significant differences exist between males and females with regard to whether or not it is the public's duty to combat crime. The mean score for males was 2.74 and for females 3.16 and the F-value was 6.92 ( $p = 0.0089$ ) which was significant at the 0.05 level.

There are significant differences between males and females with regard to their



willingness to assist police. The means score for males is 2.17 for females 2.63 and the F-value was 9.22 ( $p = 0.0026$ ) which was significant at the 0.05 level. This implies that females are more duty-bound to combat crime and assist police in the combating of crime than males.

No difference was found for the last item, namely, whether or not the respondents felt that they were an important link in the criminal justice system.

**TABLE 7.17 GENDER AND PUBLIC'S OPINION OF POLICE PERFORMANCE  
(N = 385)**

Opinion	Males		Females		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Local police do a good job	2.88	1.29	3.10	1.28	2.75
Local police should have more power	1.91	1.09	2.11	1.17	3.05
Local police are prompt	2.89	1.25	2.81	1.23	0.40
Local police are co-operative	2.89	1.17	2.82	1.19	0.29
Local police are friendly	2.89	1.11	2.91	1.19	0.01
Local police are helpful	2.81	1.12	2.91	1.21	0.61
Local police are courteous	2.87	1.06	2.77	1.05	0.74
Local police are not interested in the case	3.17	1.18	3.15	1.30	0.02

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

Table 7.17 represents the male and female scores pertaining to their opinion of police performance. There are no significant differences between male and female respondents with regard to their opinion of police performance. The mean scores for males range between 1.91 to 3.17 and for females between 2.11 and 3.15. Although there are no significant differences between males and females, the following findings are noteworthy:

- ◆ Males tend to feel quite strongly that the police should have more powers.
- ◆ Females are more uncertain than males concerning whether or not the police are doing a good job, are friendly and helpful.

- ◆ Both males and females are uncertain as to the police's interest in their victimisation experience.

**TABLE 7.18 GENDER AND POLICE VISIBILITY (N = 385)**

Police visibility	Males		Females		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Fear of policeman (uniform)	1.84	0.37	1.79	0.41	1.77
Fear of policeman (plain clothes)	1.80	0.40	1.78	0.42	0.30
Patrolling of neighbourhood	4.13	0.96	4.19	0.96	0.31

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

Table 7.18 represents the attempt to measure significant differences between males and females and police visibility. There are no significant differences between males and females with regard to fear of policeman in uniform, fear of policeman in plain clothes and the actual visibility of the police through regular patrols. The means scores range from 1.84 to 4.13 for males and 1.78 to 4.19 for females. Neither males nor females express much fear of policemen (in or out of uniform). However, both seem to view the police as being somewhat "invisible" in their neighbourhoods.

## 7.4 SUMMARY

The police are an integral part of the relationship between crime and the fear of criminal victimisation. Various authors (Box et al. 1988; Garofalo 1978; Glanz 1989; Maree 1992 & Naser et al. 1993) viewed the role of the police as an important factor in the understanding of fear of crime as a social problem.

The relationship between fear of crime and the role of the police was examined as follows:

- ◆ Firstly, frequency distribution of responses to the type of contact respondents have had with the police; their un/willingness to report crime to the police; their view of their obligation to combat crime; and their opinion of police performance

was reflected in tabular form.

- ◆ Secondly, using Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient, the fear of crime measures were correlated with the four mentioned categories in order to reveal the relationships between the two variables.
- ◆ Thirdly, the F-test was used to test for significant differences between males and females and their interaction with, contact with and perception of the police.

All correlations and significant differences were set out in tabular form.

## CHAPTER 8

### RESPONSES TO THE FEAR OF CRIME

#### 8.1 INTRODUCTION

There is a tendency to view crime as the most potent threat to society. Conklin (1975:3) viewed crime and the fear of crime as exacting a toll on the citizens of a country. Karmen (1984:37) opined that victimisation is not just a loss but a burden:

“Something is left behind as well as taken away. Haunting memories, chilling scenarios, nightmarish images and similar psychological scars are carried about as a crushing mental load. They are oppressive, worrisome, anxiety provoking and encumbering to those who bear them.”

Thus, people who are confronted by the threat of criminal victimisation will do almost anything to defend themselves. They may change their behaviour and activities, and place barriers between themselves and the rest of the world. Glanz (1989:40) stated that in extreme cases, people may become paralysed by fear and avoid going out because they fear an attack on their person.

A distinction can be made between defensive responses to crime (e.g. avoidance behaviour), and offensive responses (e.g. purchasing of a firearm). In both defensive and offensive responses, the idea is to protect the person from any further victimisation.

#### 8.2 INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES TO THE FEAR OF CRIME

Defensive and offensive responses to the fear of crime refer to action taken by the individual to protect him- or herself against victimisation.

### 8.2.1 Defensive Responses to the Fear of Crime

The defensive response to the fear of crime can be characterised as an avoidance of situations which could put the individual at risk. According to Conklin (1975:105), people may reduce their contact with others and avoid situations that might lead to their victimisation. Clemente and Kleiman (1979:519) are of the same opinion as they state that: "People are forced to change their usual behavior. They stay off the streets at night, avoid strangers, curtail activities and may even move to other neighborhoods."

People who are scared are less sociable, unwilling to help others, and tend to stay behind the locked doors of their houses. Fear of crime generates distrust, insecurity, dislike of one's neighbours, and social isolation. Toseland (1982:205) warned that social isolation increased the level of fear. The undermining of social solidarity is also enhanced by barriers erected by neighbours. These barriers, which serve to protect against victimisation, also serve to prevent sociability, interaction between neighbours, and cohesion. For example, a criminal may think twice before entering premises with watchdogs, but so will children and neighbours.

Defensive behaviour is also common among people who perceive themselves to be vulnerable. Conklin (1975:107) reported that following the murder of seven young women in Boston, USA, in 1977, many young women refrained from hitchhiking, started going out in groups, and made enquiries about self-defence lessons. Another group that is likely to engage in defensive and avoidance behaviour is the elderly. This group generally feels vulnerable because of age and weakness. In conclusion, then, those that view themselves as vulnerable will refrain from entering situations which could put them at risk of criminal victimisation.

Defensive responses also produce changes in urban commerce. Conklin (1975:111) reported that shopkeepers kept their doors locked, and only opened for people considered to be "safe" customers, and closed up after dark. Not only does this reduce business, but it also inconveniences shoppers. Closing early means that there will be fewer people on the street at night. This in turn means less business for those stores

that are open, and less chance of social interaction. Thus defensive measures reduce the quality of human life by minimising the chances for sociability, human contact and the willingness to help others.

### **8.2.2 Offensive Responses to the Fear of Crime**

Offensive responses can be characterised as reactions in which the individual or community take active measures to combat the threat of crime. These active measures can include the purchasing of firearms, acquiring of watchdogs and burglar alarms, and joining a Neighbourhood Watch. These measures, according to Conklin (1975:290), often have a pathological aspect. For example, a gun accidentally kills a child, a dog bites its owner, and burglar guards could prevent escape from a fire. These offensive responses to the fear of crime could cause harm not only to the criminal but also to innocent people.

The offensive responses have been labelled as mobilisation measures by various authors (Conklin 1975 and Furstenberg 1972). These mobilisation methods include the purchasing of any one of

- ◆ locks and burglar guards
- ◆ alarms and panic buttons
- ◆ watch dogs
- ◆ firearms
- ◆ tear gas (mace)
- ◆ stun guns
- ◆ outside lighting
- ◆ self-defence lessons (can be paid for by individuals).

Acquiring of these mobilisation measures is normally preceded by an immediate threat of victimisation and/or the use of such measures by one's neighbours. Often reports in the mass media of a high crime rate are followed by an increase in the acquisition of protective measures. Conklin (1975:119) reported that when fear of crime is great, people become the willing purchasers of any security device, even though this

purchase does not offer total immunity from victimisation.

Furstenberg (in Conklin 1975:114) claims that protective measures are expensive, resulting in fewer people taking such measures compared to those engaging in avoidance behaviour. He concludes that the risk of victimization does not cause people to use security measures for self protection, rather, avoidance behaviour is related to risk and fear of crime.

The fact remains, however, that many people have taken protective measures to ensure their safety from victimisation. The result of these actions is reduced social interaction, inconvenience to the individual and others, direct harm caused to innocent people, and the placing of barriers to informal social control. Conklin (1975:125) stated that "... attempts to prevent victimisation can make people prisoners in their own houses". The lack of interaction, trust and attachment to neighbours weakens informal control in the community. In a close-knit community, people watch over each other, i.e. there is a high degree of surveillance. When this surveillance is jeopardised through lack of interaction, the risk of crime is greater, and so too is fear. When the physical measures taken to prevent crime and reduce the fear of crime fail, the community must act against crime and the fear of crime.

### **8.3 COMMUNITY RESPONSES TO THE FEAR OF CRIME**

Any social problem which affects community life must be solved or controlled. Crime generates fear, suspicion and distrust and affects social interaction. As solidarity in the community is weakened, so too are the social control mechanisms which were in use in the community. Conklin (1975:131) stated in this regard that "As a community is victimized, solidarity weakens and informal social control dissipates".

However, when people are confronted with crime, they normally assign full responsibility for crime prevention to the police. When a government structure is committed to fighting crime and protecting the citizens, then formal social control is being asserted.

The section that follows will deal firstly with informal social control in its broadest sense, formal social control, and finally, strategies for crime prevention and the reduction of fear.

### 8.3.1 Informal Social Control

Within any group, norms and values will act as prescriptions for human behaviour. These norms will delineate what is acceptable and what is not. These norms also exert a restraining influence, and are particularly strong in primary groups where people are in regular face to face contact.

When deviation from these norms occurs, and the deviant act is a direct challenge to dominant norms, the demand for punishment will be made by the group. This is the basis of informal social control, namely that the group members watch each other's behaviour, and if necessary take corrective measures to ensure the solidarity of the group. Conklin (1975:134) opined that a small homogenous community will pressurise potential deviants to conform to the dominant norms: "... moral censure immediately followed any observed deviance".

Within a community, informal social control operates through a network of social relationships which develop over time. Trivial contacts will gradually generate a network of trust and interdependence. When people know each other and interact regularly, informal control is more effective. In a well-integrated community people will know the normal patterns of social behaviour, and will notice strangers and behaviour which can be labelled as threatening. In other words, surveillance of behaviour is a high priority.

Conklin (1975:137) noted that although small towns were probably more tightly-knit communities than large cities, large cities can incorporate a number of well-integrated communities. Any community's level of informal social control will be determined by the structure of social interaction and the social relations within it, and *not* by its size. In plain terms, if there is social interaction, normative consensus and surveillance of



members' activities within a community, social control will be strong. If social control is strong, there is less likelihood of crime and the development of the fear of crime.

Conklin (1975:142) suggested that social order is not created by the police (i.e. formal mechanisms of social control), but "... by an intricate and nearly unconscious network of involuntary controls by private citizens". These "controls" involve the presence of people on the street, which ensures surveillance and enhances feelings of safety. This idea is based on the premise that, when people fear crime, they withdraw from social contacts. This implies that fewer people are on the streets, and people will be less likely to watch the streets. This weakens social control, which in turn increases the fear of crime. By creating a flow of human traffic on the streets however, informal control in the community can be strengthened.

A further prerequisite for informal control is that a significant number of people must have roots in the community; they must learn what constitutes unusual activity, and they must know who is a stranger in the community. Having roots in the community implies that patterns of interaction will develop between members of the community - which strengthens solidarity. Knowing what is the usual activity, and who belongs to the community and who does not, highlights the importance of surveillance.

However, Conklin (1975:149) warned that surveillance by itself would have no effect on crime or the fear of crime in a community, if action is not taken. Surveillance must then be reinforced by the willingness to involve direct control, i.e. the use of formal mechanisms of social control.

### **8.3.2 Formal Social Control**

Formal social control refers to the enforcement of norms by an outside agency. The criminal justice system is held to be responsible for the prevention of crime and the maintenance of social order and control. However, the inability of the system to protect people from crime and to control behaviour influences crime itself and the fear of crime. When people experience fear of crime, it reduces their willingness to support the

criminal justice system, and increases the criticism of the police and courts as a whole.

Citizens of a country hold the police responsible for crime prevention. The police will be viewed as effective if they are seen as apprehending criminals, responding promptly to calls, and having a physical presence in the community. However, it must be stated clearly that without the public's support and willingness to report crime, the effectiveness of the police decreases.

Closely tied to the effectiveness of the criminal justice system is the assistance it offers to victims. If the system is viewed as unsupportive of the victim, then few people will be willing to proceed with crime reporting. This attitude will also affect people's fear of possible victimisation as well as the communities' feelings of safety and security. When individuals view themselves as being in an unsupportive and non-protective position by the agencies which deal with social order and control, fear of victimisation will escalate. To remedy this situation, proposals have been made about a victim service programme which serves to meet the needs of the victim.

Snyman (in Schurink et al. 1992:475) discussed the work of Reeves (1985) in this regard. There are, according to Reeves (in Schurink et al. 1992:475), six broad categories of needs which must be satisfied. These are:

- ◆ Emotional needs: Help should be offered to victims to come to terms with the losses they have suffered. These emotional needs are extremely important and if they are overlooked, they could have a permanent effect on the victim.
- ◆ Acknowledgement needs: The victim should be offered reassurance and help which will encourage feelings of security and trust, and reduce fear.
- ◆ Practical needs: Victims need advice about the practical problems surrounding the circumstances of their loss, e.g. locks and broken windows must be repaired, stolen articles replaced, and, if a physical injury was incurred, there may have to be visits to the doctor.

- ◆ Information needs: The victim must be informed on the progress of the case, the court hearing date, the court process and the testifying process. Information on crime prevention and resources in the community must also be made available.
- ◆ Need for understanding: The community and the criminal justice system has a tendency to question the victim's involvement in the crime.
- ◆ The need for contact with the judicial process: Many victims have no knowledge of this process. They therefore need guidance and support in this regard.

In South Africa, according to Snyman (in Schurink et al. 1992:477), it is only since 1977 that victim support programmes which meet the above needs have come into existence. Both the private and public sector have been involved in the development of the programmes.

Contributors in the private sector have include:

- ◆ The Child and Family Welfare Society (1918)
- ◆ Life Line (1963)
- ◆ Rape Crisis South Africa (1977)(The Johannesburg branch has changed its name to People Opposing Woman Abuse or POWA)
- ◆ Child line (1983)
- ◆ National Institute for Crime Prevention and the Rehabilitation of Offenders (1987)
- ◆ Radio 702 Crisis Centre

State contributors include the following:

- ◆ The Child Protection Unit of the South African Police (1986)
- ◆ Rape Crisis and Child Abuse services at certain provincial hospitals
- ◆ State President's Fund (1983)
- ◆ Department of Health Services and Welfare

All in all, there would seem to be little support for victims of crime in South Africa. The result of this lack of support could well be an increased fear of becoming a victim of crime.

According to Conklin (1975:185), a collective response to crime is relatively uncommon. *People tend to be apathetic, especially if the police do not take any action towards preventing crime. However, people will engage in collective action if the threat is sufficiently severe.*

#### **8.4 CRIME PREVENTION STRATEGIES**

The prevention of crime and the personal safety of its members should be the aim of any society. However, crime and the fear of crime have become major social problems in our society. To prevent crime and reduce the fear of crime, it is necessary to develop *some form of strategy which could be implemented.*

Conklin (1975:186) opined that people would engage in collective action to fight crime. This action may vary from taking the law into their own hands, i.e. vigilantism, to civilian police patrols, until finally some or other community-based prevention strategy is enforced.

##### **8.4.1 Vigilantism**

*When people have attempted to stop crime but have had no effect, they can either resign themselves to crime, or move into a safer area, or they can take the law into their own hands, i.e. become vigilantes. Vigilante action, according to Conklin (1975:187), has a long history, and has usually occurred where formal means of law enforcement were weak or non-existent. People have then felt the need to take action themselves so as to establish a stable and viable community. Conklin (1975:184), opined that "vigilantism was a violent sanctification of the deeply cherished values of life and property".*

The aim of vigilantes is to apprehend the criminals, give them a formal but "illegal" trial at which a defence is presented, and then convict and punish them. According to Conklin (1975:190), there are three basic components of vigilantism, namely

- ◆ Self preservation of the members of the community through protection of life and property.
- ◆ The right to revolution, or to strike against formal authority when it fails to perform its duties.
- ◆ Popular sovereignty, or the belief in the right of the people to wield power in their own interests.

In the South African context, the term vigilante connotes violent, organised, and conservative groupings operating within the black communities. These groups were used to neutralise those who opposed apartheid and its institutions (in Hanson & Van Zyl-Smit 1990:63-64).

Informal civic management structures have existed in African townships since their inception. The formal structures were seen to enforce laws that excluded the African population. In the 1930s, civic associations took the form of street or ward committees comprising residents elected by peers and living in the same street. These committees settled disputes between neighbours, acted as spokespersons for residents, were concerned about safety, and mobilised a neighbourhood police force to patrol the area. However, after 1976 their influence dwindled, and the role of policing and disciplining residents was taken over by youths. People's courts developed where crimes were punished by the residents of a community. These courts also promoted political awareness and responsibility. In the mid 1980s, these courts were smashed by police, and the street committees consisting of adults in the community made their appearance again (in Hanson & Van Zyl-Smit 1990:64).

Vigilante movements can be socially constructive, i.e. when they deal with a particular problem and then disband, or socially destructive, i.e. especially when leaders fail to control the violent or sadistic tendencies of some of its members.

Vigilante groups may be substitutes for effective systems of law enforcement, but may also act as parallel structures to existing law-enforcement agencies. When the groups act as extensions of the police rather, than as their substitutes, then they can be called civilian police patrols.

#### **8.4.2 Civilian Police Patrols**

The civilian police patrols are referred to as neovigilantes. According to Conklin (1975:194), neovigilantism is a response to the perceived threat of crime and a feeling that the criminal justice system could not protect the inhabitants of modern cities.

The civilian police patrols and juvenile gangs developed to protect the individual's and community's security. These two groups dispensed justice and exercised "grass roots police power". Their actions established a "defended neighbourhood", which is a community within a distinct part of a city where informal social control regulates movement and behaviour.

Conklin (1975:175) opined that a defended neighbourhood was an urban phenomenon, as it emerged in cities which had become too large to exercise control as a single unit. The attempt is made within the defended neighbourhood to control behaviour of residents and outsiders - as outsiders are viewed as a threat to the community.

However, when gangs are relied upon to protect the community, it can have destructive effects on that community. Some of these effects include

- ◆ reduction in informal social control
- ◆ the spreading of fear from their community to other areas
- ◆ reducing movement on the streets
- ◆ raising the crime rates

Under normal circumstances, neovigilantism in the USA is common in three distinctive communities, namely

- ◆ Afro-American enclaves, where residents feel they need protection from violence

by whites and the police

- ♦ white areas, where people feel threatened by the incursion of Afro-Americans
- ♦ urban communities, where the fear of crime is high (Conklin 1975:176).

On the positive side, certain civilian police patrols have the following advantages, namely

- ♦ they do not take the law into their own hands, because usually they apprehend the suspects and hand them over to the police
- ♦ they deter crime by observing and reporting street crimes to the police
- ♦ they patrol high crime-risk areas
- ♦ they attempt to provide social control over youths
- ♦ they escort elderly citizens to ensure their safety
- ♦ they work as police informants
- ♦ they provide inexpensive law enforcement for the community, i.e. they are normally volunteers
- ♦ they have open communication with the police
- ♦ they attempt to give self-help classes to residents in the community
- ♦ they increase the willingness of members of a community to become involved in crime prevention (Conklin 1975:196-208).

The negative consequences of civilian police patrols include the following, namely

- ♦ they can develop without a clear mandate from the community, i.e. they are viewed as illegitimate
- ♦ people do not support the group for fear of legal entanglements
- ♦ patrols often represent cliques in the community rather than the population as a whole
- ♦ they lack acceptance by residents of the community, who see patrols as ordinary citizens with no special powers
- ♦ the patrols could recruit sadistic and violent members
- ♦ residents of the community could impersonate group members in an attempt to gain personal power
- ♦ some patrol groups have used their power illegally and become involved in

criminal activities themselves

- ♦ some patrol groups are harassed by the police and thus cannot function effectively (Conklin 1975:196-208).

Although vigilantism and civilian police patrols can be viewed as extreme forms of crime prevention strategies, their main aim is always the prevention of crime and the protection of citizens. Maree (1993:58) concluded in her study on crime prevention that any reduction strategy should entail "... [ensuring that] residents are aware of the crime problem, secure their properties, look after their neighbours' premises and care for each other". Thus if people feel safe in their environment they will protect it, and this protection can take various forms.

#### **8.4.3 Establishing Residential Security: O'Block (1981)**

One of the most relevant views pertaining to crime prevention is that crimes of a personal nature or against property are the result of desire and opportunity. Therefore, if the aim is to prevent crime, desire and opportunity should be blocked, i.e. obstacles which could delay or deter the criminal should be implemented. O'Block (1981:307) stated in this regard that "... (a) defensible space is a living residential environment which can be employed for the enhancement of their lives, while further providing security for their families, neighbours and friends".

The concept of defensible space can be divided into four main categories, namely

- ♦ territoriality, which implies the maintenance of perceived boundaries, which in turn promotes feelings of cohesiveness amongst residents
- ♦ natural surveillance, which indicates that residents should be able to observe the public areas of their living areas
- ♦ image and milieu, which involves the reduction of the perception that houses themselves are isolated
- ♦ safe areas should be identified which increase observation abilities and random surveillance by the police



Residential security, according to O'Block (1981:92-93), can be expressed in four words: deter, delay, deny and detect. The deterrence of the criminal occurs when there are physical barriers which force the criminal to go elsewhere. If access to a residential area is gained, then delaying tactics such as burglar-proofing could further impede the crime. The next step is to deny the criminal access to valuable goods by locking them in a safe area. The detection of the criminal could further be enhanced by surveillance by the police and other residents.

The use of neighbours to watch over each others' property and lives indicates the willingness of people within a community to become involved in the prevention of crime and the reduction of fear. An example of a strategy which attempts to ensure residential security is the "neighbourhood watch" system.

#### **8.4.4 Neighbourhood Watch Programme**

The idea which underlies the development of a Neighbourhood Watch Programme is that people seek to gain control or order over their lives and their community. These self-help groups foster the development of social solidarity and community development.

The programme is based on the premises that crime can be reduced if the potential offender can be made to believe that the likelihood of being caught is high. These programmes are normally organised in cooperation with the police, and the residents of neighbourhoods become the eyes and ears of the police. Examples of such programmes include: Business Watch, Block Watch, citizen patrols, safe homes (where certain houses are pinpointed to be a refuge if residents are threatened), block parenting (where an adult is available for children to go to for protection), alarm networks, and volunteers for escorting the elderly and children (Lab, 1988:37-38).

A recent development in the Neighbourhood Watch Programme is the establishment of community policing stations which operate as mini police stations within communities. These mini-police stations are at the service of local residents, and they handle most

of the communities' problems.

The following disadvantages of the Neighbourhood Watch Programme were noted, namely

- ◆ the programmes reduce fear of crime, but have little impact on the reduction of crime itself
- ◆ few residents are willing to become involved
- ◆ the programme will not work well in neighbourhoods where residents hardly know each other
- ◆ the residential areas where programmes have been implemented are low risk areas, and members become bored with mundane activities
- ◆ it is difficult to organise and implement this type of programme in areas of high risk owing to high mobility and the socio-economic and political conditions (Naudé 1992 in Schurink et al. 1992:462).

#### **8.4.5 Citizen Patrols**

The aim of citizen patrols is to increase the surveillance within an area by the systematic patrolling of residential areas by residents. These patrols are discouraged from physically intervening in a criminal act. The idea is to observe and then call the police, but not to take action (Lab 1988:38).

*The citizen patrols depend on mutual reliance between the police and residents. They are intended to supplement police activity and not replace the police. Both the patrols and the police are required to encourage people to take part in the controlling of crime and calling the police.*

Citizen patrols encourage community involvement and cohesion. They promote better relationships between the police and public (Lab 1988:40-41).

#### 8.4.6 Community Policing

Manning (in Radelet 1986:486) claimed that the term community policing refers to the ordering and regulating of an interacting group of persons within a given territory. The term community implies the interacting group of people within a given environment who share common norms and values. "Police" in this instance is a verb - to police - which implies to order, to control or to maintain authority over someone.

All policing is community policing, as the emphasis is on maintaining social order. According to Manning (in Radelett 1986:487), community policing entailed the following:

- ◆ The encouragement of community closeness.
- ◆ The motivation of conforming behaviour.
- ◆ Facilitating communication between legitimate structures and the community.
- ◆ The participation of all in establishing a crime-free community.

With limited manpower resources, the idea behind the involvement of the community in policing is being encouraged by all concerned. Community involvement is voluntary and without all participants' active involvement, crime and the fear of crime will not be brought under control.

Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990:10) discuss ten principles of community policing which include:

- ◆ The encouragement of a working relationship between police and community residents to solve problems of crime, fear of crime, physical and social disorder and neighbourhood decay.
- ◆ The formulation of an organisational strategy which focuses on both civilians and police solving community problems.
- ◆ The creation of a Community Policing Officer (CPO) who acts as a direct link between the police and the people in the community.
- ◆ The creating and sustaining of continuous contact between the CPO and law-

abiding citizens in the community.

- ◆ The acceptance of involvement by both the CPO and the community in solving problems. This generates trust and will help to overcome apathy and restrain vigilantism.
- ◆ Community policing adds a proactive element to fighting crime and the fear of crime.
- ◆ The exploration of new ways to protect and enhance life.
- ◆ The promotion of the use of technology by police.
- ◆ The CPO is regarded as a specialist who bridges the gap between the community and the police.
- ◆ The decentralization of the police force, which is based on the premise that control and order cannot be improved from the outside, and that people must be encouraged to engage in policing activity within their own community.

Thus *community policing* sets out to improve conditions which act as a magnet to crime. The effort is made to set up face-to-face meetings with the average citizens and community leaders. A challenge is then issued to the community to accept its share of responsibility for reducing crime and disorder. According to Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990:93), these activities could include

- ◆ target hardening of stores and residences
- ◆ improved residential involvement
- ◆ shepherding senior citizens on their shopping trips
- ◆ *engaging young people in activities within the community*
- ◆ persuading businesses to provide resources for these effects.

Peak and Glensor (1996:71) claim that community policing has been successful at combating crime and the fear of crime. Community policing addresses both concrete and formless fear, the actual crime rate, and social and physical disorder. In this way it provides for community action and development within a decentralised police approach.

Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990:158) mention that although community policing can work and inspire positive action against crime by communities, there is a "downside". If the community feels safe, it will start participating in daily life as usual, which in turn could cause an increase in the opportunity for crime. However, communities cannot lock themselves behind doors or allow themselves to be consumed by terror. Community policing provides the community with a way of working within the system and contributing to the calming of a violent climate within society (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux 1990:159).

The police are, however, unable to solve problems such as unemployment and poverty, which influence crime and its insidious shadow, the fear of crime.

#### **8.4.7 The Impact of Social Development Programmes on Crime Prevention**

The social development programmes have as their main aim the control and prevention of factors which contribute to crime and victimisation. The social environment of offenders and victims must be studied, and problems within the environment identified and solved. Some of the problems identified by Naudé (1992:464) include

- ◆ inadequate education
- ◆ discrimination
- ◆ poor housing
- ◆ overpopulation
- ◆ unemployment
- ◆ poverty
- ◆ slum conditions
- ◆ inadequate parenting

These problems can contribute to deviant lifestyles, crime and victimisation. The social programmes developed to improve educational standards (especially among the youth), health care, employment opportunities, recreational facilities, after-school care and parental guidance and counselling are thought to improve the social environment of possible future offenders.

These programmes are normally undertaken by local and central government authorities, with the assistance of recognised community leaders, welfare agencies, and the community itself.

At the time that the study was conducted, no Community Policing Forums existed in the Richards Bay and Empangeni area. Community Policing forums were only introduced after the fieldwork had been completed. Therefore only precautionary measures taken by the respondents and their involvement in Neighbourhood Watch programmes were researched.

## **8.5 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA**

When people fear crime or criminal victimisation they are likely to change their behaviour to protect themselves, their families and their property. These actions are viewed as responses to the threat of criminal victimisation and comprise the following:

- ◆ Precautionary measures taken to protect property against any type of crime. These measures include the acquisition of a guard dog, installation of an alarm system, putting up extra outside lights, fixing of deadlocks to doors, fixing of burglar-proofing, engraving valuables, installation of security warning lights, leaving the radio, TV and lights on while not at home; erection of concrete walls, and acquisition of a firearm.
- ◆ Precautionary measures taken to protect the person against any type of crime. These measures include not going out alone at night, not going out alone during the day, carrying a personal alarm, taking self defence classes, locking all doors while driving a car, notifying others of your whereabouts and carrying a firearm.
- ◆ Neighbourhood involvement which includes asking a neighbour to keep a watchful eye on your property while you are away; (abridged to ask neighbour asked by a neighbour to keep a watchful eye on their property while they are away; (abridged to asked by a neighbour); and judging the willingness of

neighbours to come to your rescue in time of need (abridged to neighbour comes to the rescue).

- ◆ Involvement in a neighbourhood watch programme which includes knowledge about such programmes, membership in such programmes and willingness to *be involved in such programmes*.

The frequency distribution of responses to the questions pertaining to precautionary measures are prescribed in tables 8.1 to 8.4 respectively.

**TABLE 8.1 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SECURITY MEASURES TAKEN TO PROTECT PROPERTY (N = 385)**

[illegible]



Table 8.1 shows that of the 385 respondents 223 (57.90%) locked their doors and 162 (42.10) did not take this precautionary measure. Of the respondents, 128 (33.20%) had acquired a guard dog, while 257 (66.80%) had not. Fifty eight (15.10%) of the respondents had installed an alarm, and 327 (84.90%) had not taken this precaution to protect their property. With regard to fixing locks on doors, 152 (39.50%) had taken this precaution, while 233 (60.50%) had not. Of the respondents, 247 (64.20%) had installed burglar-proofing and 138 (35.80%) had not taken this precautionary measure. Forty-eight (12.50%) respondents had their possessions engraved, and 337 (87.50%) had not engraved their goods. Seventy-six (19.70%) had installed security lights and 309 (80.30%) had not taken such a precautionary measure. With regard to leaving the radio, TV and lights on when not at home, 196 (50.90%) respondents said that they did, while 189 (49.10%) said that they did not. Of the respondents 122 (31.70%) had erected walls around their property while 263 (68.20%) had not. With reference to the purchasing of a firearm, 113 (29.40%) of the respondents had purchased a firearm and 272 (70.60%) had not taken this precautionary measure.

The measures used by the majority of the respondents were locking doors, burglar proofing and leaving the radio/TV and lights on when not at home. These measures are relatively inexpensive and the fixing of burglar proofing to windows can be done by the respondents themselves.

**TABLE 8.2 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SECURITY MEASURES TAKEN TO PROTECT PERSON (N = 385)**

Category of responses	Don't go out alone (night)		Don't go out alone (day)		Carry alarm		Self-defence Classes		Lock Doors of Car		Notify Others		Carry Firearm	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	250	64.90	68	17.70	56	14.50	103	26.80	288	74.80	236	61.30	101	26.20
No	135	35.10	317	82.30	329	85.50	282	73.20	97	25.20	149	38.70	284	73.80
TOTAL	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00

Table 8.2 reveal that of the 385 respondents, 250 (64.90%) do not go out alone at night, while 135 (35.10%) do not take this precautionary measure. Sixty-eight (17.70%) of the respondents do not go out alone during the day, and 317 (82.30%) do go out alone. Fifty six (14.50%) respondents carry personal alarms with them, while 329 (85.50%) do not. Of the respondents, 103 (26.80%) have taken self defence classes, while 282 (73.20%) have not taken this precautionary measure. With regard to the locking of doors while driving a vehicle, 288 (74.80%) said that they did take this precautionary measure, and 97 (25.20%) said that they did not. Of the respondents 236 (61.30%) notified others of their whereabouts, while 149 (38.70%) did not notify anyone. With regard to carrying a firearm on their person, 101 (26.20%) of the respondents said that they did, and 284 (73.80%) said that they did not carry a firearm on their person. Most respondents do not go out alone at night, lock the doors of their cars when they travel and also notify others of their whereabouts. These measures are inexpensive and easy to follow.

**TABLE 8.3: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF INVOLVEMENT OF NEIGHBOURS AS A PROTECTIVE MEASURE (N = 385)**

Category of responses	Asked neighbour		Asked by neighbour		Neighbour come to the rescue	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	313	81.30	297	77.10	229	59.50
No	72	18.70	88	22.90	57	14.80
Don't know	0	0	0	0	99	25.70
TOTAL	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00

In table 8.3 the involvement of the respondents with their neighbours is revealed. Of the 385 respondents, 313 (81.30%) had asked their neighbours to keep a watchful eye over their property while 72 (18.70%) had not. With regard to being asked by a neighbour to keep watch over their property, 297 (77.10%) of the respondents had been asked, while 88 (22.90%) had not asked neighbours to keep a watchful eye over their property. Of the respondents, 229 (59.50%) felt that their neighbours would come to their rescue in time of need; 57 (14.80%) felt that their neighbours would not; and 99 (25.70%) were unsure as to their neighbours' reaction.

The majority of the respondents indicate involvement with their neighbours by asking their neighbours to look after their homes, reciprocating the favour and being positive that neighbours will come to their assistance in times of need.

**TABLE 8.4: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF INVOLVEMENT IN A NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAMME (N = 385)**

Category of responses	Neighbourhood Watch exists		Present Membership		Willingness to be a member	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	93	24.20	57	14.80	236	61.30
No	202	52.50	328	85.20	149	38.70
Don't know	90	23.40	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00

Table 8.4 reveals that of the 385 respondents, 93 (24.20%) knew about an active neighbourhood watch programme in their area of residence, 202 (52.50%) did not, and 90 (23.40%) did not know if there was a neighbourhood watch programme in their area of residence. Fifty-seven (14.80%) of the respondents were members of a neighbourhood watch programme and 328 (85.20%) were not members. Of the respondents, 236 (61.30%) were willing to be members of a neighbourhood watch programme and 149 (38.70%) were not. Most respondents do not have a neighbourhood watch programme in their residential areas, over half of those who do belong to the programme, and more than half of all the respondents were willing to be members of the programme.

#### **8.5.1 Involvement in the Neighbourhood and the Fear of Crime**

It has been reported earlier in this study (Chapter 1) that neighbourhood cohesion leads residents to feel safer (Lewis & Salem, 1986; Box *et al.*, 1988; Kennedy & Silverman, 1985; and Conklin, 1975). When bonds of friendship form between neighbours, they become willing to help each other. Lack of integration leads residents to feel isolated and afraid. Toseland (1982:207) proposed that if an individual perceives his/her neighbours as helpful and friendly, and there is involvement in the community on the

part of residents, the level of fear will be low.

In order to test the relationship between respondents' involvement in their neighbourhood and the fear of crime, the following hypothesis was formulated:-

Hypothesis 10:        There are significant differences between respondents who are involved in their neighbourhoods and those who are uninvolved, and their fear of crime.

The measurement of the respondents' involvement in their neighbourhood included the following questions:

- ◆ During the past two years have you asked a neighbour to keep a watchful eye on your property while you are away? (abridged to asked neighbour)
- ◆ During the past two years has a neighbour asked you to keep a watchful eye on their property while they are away? (abridged to asked by neighbour)
- ◆ If you were being attacked while at home, do you think your neighbours would come to your rescue? (abridged to neighbour comes to the rescue)
- ◆ Is there any neighbourhood watch programme operating in the area where you live? (abridged to neighbourhood watch exists)
- ◆ Are you a member of this neighbourhood watch programme? (abridged to present membership)
- ◆ Are you willing to participate in such a programme? (abridged to willingness to be a member)

The measurement of fear of crime included the following:

- ◆ How safe do you feel walking alone at night? (abridged to walking alone)
- ◆ How safe do you feel when alone in your home or apartment? (abridged to home alone)
- ◆ How safe do you feel when leaving or arriving at home? (abridged to leaving/arriving home)

The F-test was used to establish the significant differences between respondents who are involved in their neighbourhoods and neighbourhood watch programmes (abridged to involved) and those who are not involved (abridged to un-involvement).

The findings are presented in table 8.5 and 8.6 respectively.

**TABLE 8.5: SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO ARE INVOLVED/UN-INVOLVED WITH THEIR NEIGHBOURS  
(N = 385)**

Fear of crime	Have asked					Have been asked					Neighbour to the rescue						
	Yes		No		F-value	Yes		No		F-value	Yes		No		Don't know		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Walking home	2.85	0.98	2.39	1.05	13.04*	2.86	0.98	2.46	0.99	11.41*	2.71	1.01	2.98	1.04	2.78	0.93	1.75
Home alone	2.53	0.99	2.08	0.82	12.06*	2.54	0.98	2.13	0.87	12.66*	2.35	0.98	2.72	1.08	2.50	0.86	3.45*
Leaving/arriving at home	2.68	0.89	2.19	0.88	17.71*	2.65	0.91	2.40	0.88	5.29*	2.55	0.88	2.70	1.03	2.64	0.90	0.83

Table 8.5 reveals that there are significant differences between respondents who have asked their neighbours to keep watch over their property and those who have not done so, for all the measures of fear. In all instances the F-values are, 13.04 ( $p = 0.0003$ ); 12.06 ( $p = 0.0004$ ) and 17.71 ( $p = 0.0001$ ) respectively. The mean scores ranged from 2.53 to 2.85 for those who have asked their neighbours, and 2.08 to 2.39 for those who have not asked their neighbours to keep watch over their property. Significant differences were also found between those respondents who had been asked by their neighbours to keep watch over their property and those who had not been asked on all measures of fear. The F-values were 11.41 ( $p = 0.0008$ ); 12.66 ( $p = 0.0004$ ) and 5.29 ( $p = 0.0220$ ) respectively. The mean scores ranged from 2.54 to 2.86 for those who had been asked, and 2.13 to 2.46 for those who had not been asked to keep watch over a neighbours property. No significant differences were found between those who claimed their neighbours would come to their rescue in time of need, those who said their neighbours would not and those who did not know what their neighbours would do in such circumstances on the first and last measure of fear. The mean scores were 2.71 and 2.55; 2.98 and 2.70 and 2.78 and 2.64 respectively.

A significant difference existed for the second measure between those who knew their neighbours would come to their rescue, those who knew their neighbours would not come to their aid and those who did not know what their neighbours would do. The F-values was 3.45 (significant at the 0.05 level) and the mean scores were 2.35; 2.72 and 2.50 respectively.

These findings indicate that respondents who have asked their neighbours to keep watch over their property are slightly more fearful than those who have not. The same results were found for respondents who have been asked by their neighbours to watch over their property. It is difficult to understand why respondents involved with their neighbours should be slightly more fearful, but it could be the fear that has motivated neighbours to become more involved with each other.

In general, those respondents who indicated that their neighbours would not come to their rescue in a time of need are slightly more afraid than other respondents on the



second measure of formless fear (home alone). This finding is similar to the findings on household composition, i.e. the presence of others should lesson fear but in fact the presence of others does not make the respondent feel safer.

**TABLE 8.6 SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO ARE INVOLVED/UN-INVOLVED IN NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAMMES (N = 385)**

Measures of the Fear of Crime	Neighbourhood Watch Exists							Membership of Programme					Willingness to participate				
	Exist		Doesn't exist		Don't know		F-value	Member		Non member		F-value	Willing		Unwilling		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Walking home	2.83	1.03	2.77	1.04	2.79	0.88	0.35	2.51	1.04	2.81	0.99	4.49*	2.86	0.96	2.62	1.05	4.97*
Home alone	2.20	0.93	2.53	0.98	2.50	0.96	3.81*	2.26	0.95	2.48	0.97	2.33	2.48	0.97	2.39	0.98	0.77
Leaving/arriving at home	2.53	0.88	2.59	0.94	2.66	0.88	0.46	2.44	0.85	2.62	0.92	1.92	2.69	0.89	2.44	0.92	6.66*

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

Table 8.6 reveals no significant differences between those respondents who have knowledge of an operational neighbourhood watch in their area of residence and those who had no such knowledge on the first and last measure of fear of crime (walking alone and leaving/arriving at home). The mean scores were 2.83 and 2.53 for those who knew about the existence of a neighbourhood watch programme, 2.77 and 2.59 for those who knew for certain that one didn't exist and 2.79 and 2.66 for those who did not know if one existed or not. A significant difference was obtained for the second measure of fear (home alone) between those who knew, those who knew that one did not exist and those who did not know if one existed or not. The F-value was 3.81 ( $p = 0.0229$ ) which is significant at the 0.05 level. The mean scores ranged from 2.20 to 2.50 respectively.

There is a significant difference between those who are members of neighbourhood watch and those who are not members on the first measure of fear (walking alone). The F-value was 4.49 ( $p = 0.0348$ ) which is significant at the 0.05 level. The mean scores are 2.51 for members and 2.81 for non members.

*There are no significant differences between members and non-members of neighbourhood watch programmes and the last two measures of fear (home alone and leaving/arriving at home). The F-values are 2.33 and 1.92 respectively. The mean scores are 2.26 and 2.44 for members; and 2.48 and 2.62 for non members respectively.*

Significant differences existed between those who were willing to participate in such a programme and those who were unwilling with regard to the first and last measure of fear (walking alone and leaving/arriving at home). The F-value were 4.97 ( $p = 0.0264$ ) and 6.66 ( $p = 0.0103$ ) respectively (significant at the 0.05 level). The mean scores were 2.86 and 2.69 for those willing to join; and 2.62 and 2.44 for those who were unwilling to join a neighbourhood watch programme.

No significant difference was found between those who were willing and those who were unwilling on the second measure of fear (home alone). The mean scores were

2.48 and 2.39 respectively.

The findings of table 8.6 indicate that where neighbourhood watch does not exist, respondents are slightly more afraid of being home alone. Respondents who are not members of neighbourhood watch reported slightly more fear than members on the first measure of formless fear (walking alone).

Respondents who are willing to be members of Neighbourhood Watch showed slightly more fear than those who were unwilling to be members. It could be that people are fearful but willing to be members in the hope that they will feel safer in their neighbourhoods.

## 8.6 SUMMARY

When an assessment has been made of the threat to the individual, this individual responds in various ways such as

- ◆ erection of barriers both physical and social between themselves and others
- ◆ avoidance of activities which could put them in jeopardy
- ◆ decrease in sociable activity
- ◆ purchasing firearms and any other form of weapon for protection
- ◆ engaging in self defence lessons
- ◆ purchasing any security device available.

When these responses fail, it is left to the community to attempt to provide safety and security.

The community can react in various ways, namely

- ◆ *pressurize potential deviants to conform to acceptable norms*
- ◆ notice strangers and watch their behaviour
- ◆ watch out for any unusual activity

- ◆ contact the police
- ◆ become involved in community based crime prevention strategies.

Crime prevention strategies include the following:

- ◆ Establishing residential security which is based on the concept of defending the environment within which the community is based. This is done through erecting physical barriers to keep criminals out; using delaying tactics to impede the crime; and to detect criminals in a residential area through surveillance.
- ◆ Neighbourhood Watch, which is based on the idea that crime can be reduced if offenders know that they could be caught. Normally this programme also entails the establishment of mini-police stations in high risk areas which serve the local residents.
- ◆ Citizen patrols which involves increasing the surveillance within an area by systematically patrolling residential or business areas. Residents do not apprehend the criminals, but report the offence to the police. Within the Richards Bay area at the main business complex there are attendants who watch over cars while people do their shopping. If an attempt is made at stealing the car, these attendants report to the mini police station established at the complex.
- ◆ Community Policing is the involvement of the community and the police in ordering and regulating the interaction of persons within a given area. This form of policing requires close co-operation between the community and the police and leads to a better understanding between these two groups.
- ◆ Social development programmes which attempt to improve the standards of living of potential offenders. If education, health care, employment opportunities, recreational facilities, after school care and guidance counselling for parents was available, the social environment of the possible future offender could be better.

With regard to the precautionary measures taken by the respondents in this study, the frequency distribution of the basic findings were presented in Table 8.1 to 8.4 respectively. The precautionary measures were divided into those taken to protect the property of the respondent and those taken to protect the person against possible future criminal victimisation.

The respondents were also asked to indicate their involvement in their neighbourhoods. This involvement was measured by whether or not they had asked their neighbour to keep watch over their property; whether or not they had been asked to keep watch over a neighbour's property; and whether or not they thought that their neighbours would come to their rescue in the time of need. Since Neighbourhood Watch programmes are a community based crime prevention strategy, the respondents were also asked if a neighbourhood watch programme existed in their area, whether or not they were members; and whether they would be willing to belong to such a programme.

In order to test if there were significant differences between those respondents who were "involved" in their neighbourhood/community and those who were "uninvolved" and their fear of crime, the F-test was conducted.

## **CHAPTER 9**

### **FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **9.1 INTRODUCTION**

The primary aim of this study was to analyse the nature of the fear of crime.

In Chapter 2 of this study, a review of the socio-theoretical explanations/models of victimology and the fear of crime are presented. The models on victimology include those of Fattah (1976); Cohen and Felson (1979) and Cohen, Kleugel and Land (1981). Those on the fear of crime included the irrational model, the cognitive model and the social control model. Theoretical concept of the independent variables included gender, age, household composition, type of housing, previous victimisation, rating of crime as a social problem, the role of the police and involvement in the neighbourhood. The dependent variable included the three measures of formless fear and the measures of concrete fear. Formless fear was measured by feelings of safety when walking alone at night, when alone in the house or apartment at night, and when leaving or arriving at home. Concrete fear was measured by the respondents' fear of personal victimisation and property crimes. The statistical analysis of data is presented in chapter 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. Chapter 9 summarises the discussion on hypothesis testing and findings. It also details the limitations of this study and concludes with recommendations.

#### **9.2 LIMITATIONS AND PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED WITH THIS STUDY**

For ethical reasons it is necessary for a researcher to point out the limitations and problems encountered during the course of this investigation. The limitations and problems included the following:

- ◆ Literature on the fear of crime in South Africa was limited to a few studies in the 1970s (Schurink & Strydom 1976 and Schurink & Prinsloo 1978); in the 1980s

(Glanz 1989 and Smith & Glanz 1989); and in the 1990s (Glanz 1991; Maree 1993; Naser et al. 1993 and Pretorius 1994). These studies were conducted in predominantly urban areas of Gauteng and Western Cape Province.

- ◆ The use of a non-probability sampling technique which does not allow for generalisations. The extremely poor response of the sample also created logistical and scientific problems.
- ◆ The questionnaire had to be translated to Zulu for some of the respondents. Although care was taken not to influence the respondents, the possibility could not be ruled out.

### 9.3 TESTING OF HYPOTHESES

Ten hypotheses were formulated for statistical testing. These hypotheses are based on age, gender, household composition, type of housing, previous victimisation, crime as a social problem, the role of the police and involvement in the neighbourhood.

Hypothesis 1: "There is a relationship between age and the fear of crime".

There is a very weak relationship between age and the fear of crime measures (both formless and concrete fear of crime measures). The following aspects are especially noticeable:

- ◆ The relationship between age and the fear of crime was positive for the first measure of formless fear (i.e. walking alone at night); and for the fear of housebreaking (Tables 4.1 to 4.3).
- ◆ The relationship between age and the other two measures of formless fear and the fear of personal victimisation and property crimes was negative (Tables 4.1 to 4.3).



Although the statistical indications appear to be somewhat inconsistent, the above hypothesis could not be rejected out of hand.

Hypothesis 2: "There are significant differences between male and female respondents and their fear of crime".

There were significant differences between the male and female respondents and their fear of crime. The following are especially noticeable:

- ◆ Females were in general more fearful of crime (as measured by their feelings of safety when walking alone, when they are home alone, and when they leave or arrive at home), than males (Table 4.4).
- ◆ Females indicated more fear of personal victimisation than male respondents (Table 4.5).
- ◆ Females were generally more fearful of property crimes than males (Table 4.6).

This hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis 3: "There is a relationship between household composition and the fear of crime".

The relationship between household composition and the fear of crime is weak. The following are especially noticeable:

- ◆ There was a weak positive relationship between all the formless fear of crime measures (walking alone, home alone and leaving/arriving at home) and household composition. The relationships between the last two measures and household composition were statistically significant (Table 4.8).

- ◆ Weak, positive relationships existed between the fear of personal victimisation and household composition. The rho's for fear of rape at home, rape away from home, killed at home, killed away from home, robbed or mugged and being shot at were all significant at the 0.05 level (Table 4.9).
- ◆ There was a weak positive relationship between fear of property crimes and household composition. The rho's for fear of housebreaking, arson and hijacking were statistically significant (Table 4.10).

Although the findings of this correlation are inconsistent, the hypothesis could not be rejected, and is therefore partially accepted.

Hypothesis 4: "There are significant differences between the type of housing of respondents and the fear of crime".

There are no significant differences between the type of housing in which a respondent lives and their fear of crime. The hypothesis is therefore rejected. On none of the fear of formless crime measures nor on the fear of personal victimisation and fear of property victimisation were any significant differences found (Table 4.12 to 4.14).

Hypothesis 5: "There are significant differences in the fear of crime between respondents who have been victimised (victims) and those who have not (non-victims).

The findings of the F-test with regard to this hypothesis are arbitrary. The following discussion highlights some of the major findings:

- ◆ No significant differences were found between victims of sexual assault and non-victims and the formless fear of crime measures (Table 5.4).
- ◆ Significant differences were found between victims of robbery and non-victims and formless fear of crime measures (Table 5.5).

- ◆ Respondents who had not been shot at while driving a vehicle indicated a higher level of fear when walking alone in their neighbourhood than respondents who had been victimised (Table 5.5).
- ◆ No significant differences were found between victims of a stoning and non-victims and formless fear of crime measures (Table 5.5).
- ◆ No significant differences occurred between victims of a sexual assault and non-victims and the fear of personal crime (Table 5.5).
- ◆ Respondents who had been robbed/mugged showed greater fear for being killed at home and physical assault than did non-victims (Tables 5.5).
- ◆ No significant differences existed between respondents who had been shot at while driving a car and those who had not and the fear of personal crimes (Table 5.5).
- ◆ Respondents who had been sexually assaulted were not more fearful of property crimes than non-victims (Table 5.6).
- ◆ Respondents who had been robbed/mugged were more fearful of housebreaking, property damage, vehicle broken into and hijacking than were non-victims (Table 5.6).
- ◆ Respondents who have been shot at while driving are more fearful of housebreaking than non-victims (Table 5.6).
- ◆ No significant differences between respondents who have been stoned while driving a car and non-victims and fear of property crimes (Table 5.6).
- ◆ Victims of housebreaking are more fearful of crime than non-victims (formless fear measures) (Table 5.7).

- ◆ Victims of property damage had to be more fearful when alone at home than non-victims (Table 5.7).
- ◆ Respondents who have had their vehicles broken into and valuables stolen are more fearful of walking alone in their neighbourhoods than non-victims (Table 5.7).
- ◆ Victims of vehicle theft are more fearful of being home alone than non-victims (Table 5.7).
- ◆ Victims of housebreaking are generally more fearful of rape (away from home), being killed (at home), being robbed, and being physically assaulted than are non-victims (Table 5.8).
- ◆ Victims of property damage are more fearful of robbery than non-victims (Table 5.8).
- ◆ Respondents who have not had their vehicle broken into are less fearful of rape (at home) and rape (away from home) than victims (Table 5.8).
- ◆ No significant differences exist between victims of vehicle theft and non-victims and fear of personal victimisation (Table 5.8).
- ◆ Victims of a housebreaking are more fearful of arson and hijacking than non-victims (Table 5.9).
- ◆ No significant differences exist between victims of vehicle theft and non-victims and the fear of property crime (Table 5.9).

The findings relating to the above hypothesis are somewhat variable. For this reason the hypothesis is partially accepted.

Hypothesis 6: "There is a relationship between the respondents' rating of crime as a social problem and the fear of crime".

The relationship between crime as a social problem and the fear of crime is inconsistent. The following findings are especially noticeable:

- ◆ With regard to the relationship between the three measures of formless and statutory crimes as a social problem, the relationship was found to be weak but positive in nature. The relationship between traffic violations as a social problem and two measures of formless fear (walking alone and leaving/arriving at home) were statistically significant at the 0.05 level (Table 6.3).
- ◆ The relationship between personal victimisation as a social problem and fear of crime was weak but positive in nature. All the relationships were statistically significant at the 0.05 level.
- ◆ The relationship between the three measures of fear of crime and the six types of property crimes (rated as social problems by the respondents) were all weak but positive in nature. All these relationships were statistically significant at the 0.05 level (Table 6.5).

The hypothesis is therefore partially accepted.

Hypothesis 7: "The opinion respondents have of the service rendered by the police will influence how they rate different crimes as a social problem in their area of residence.

The relationship between the respondents' opinion of police performance and their rating of different crimes as a social problem is weak and arbitrary. The following findings were reported:

- ◆ The opinion of respondents on the service rendered by the police and the rating of statutory crime as a social problem is generally weak but positive in nature (Table 6.9).
- ◆ The relationship between the rating of different types of personal victimisation as a social problem and the service rendered by the police was generally weak but positive in nature. For all types of personal victimisation, the police were seen as doing a good job, prompt when called out, co-operative, friendly, helpful and courteous (Table 6.10).
- ◆ The relationship between the rating of sexual assault, robbery, being killed and abduction as social problems and the variable "Police were uninterested in the case" was weak and negative (Table 6.11).
- ◆ The relationships between property crimes as a social problem and the service rendered by the police was generally weak but positive in nature. For all types of property crimes rated as a social problem, the police were seen as doing a good job, prompt, co-operative, friendly, helpful and courteous (Table 6.11).
- ◆ The opinion of respondents that the police were uninterested in the case and the rating of housebreaking, theft of or out of vehicle, other forms of theft, vandalism, hijacking and bag snatching as social problems in the respondents area of residence was weak and negative in nature (Table 6.11)

Although these findings are inconsistent, the hypothesis cannot be rejected out of hand, and is therefore partially accepted..

Hypothesis 8: "The role of the police influences the fear of crime".

The relationship between the role of the police and the fear of crime was inconsistent. The tables revealed the following findings:

◆ **Fear of crime and contact with the police**

The relationship between the three measures of formless fear and actual contact with the police was very weak and negative (Table 7.9).

◆ **Fear of crime and the reporting of crime to the police**

The relationship between the three measures of fear and the reporting of crime to the police ranged from a very weak negative correlation (-0.00302) for feelings of safety when home alone and the reporting of crime in which the respondent had been a victim to a very weak positive relationship (0.04297) between feelings of safety when leaving and arriving at home and reporting a crime of which respondent had knowledge (Table 7.9).

◆ **Fear of crime and the reasons for not reporting crime to the police**

The relationship between the three measures of formless fear and the reasons why respondents did not report crime to the police ranged from a very weak negative relationship (-0.0669) between the second measure of fear and respondents not reporting crime because involvement in the criminal justice system is time consuming to a weak positive relationship (0.15711) between the second measure of fear and respondents not reporting crime because the police make them feel like the guilty party (Table 7.9).

◆ **Fear of crime and feelings of respondents toward contact with the police**

The relationship between fear of crime and the feelings of respondents towards contact with the police are all weak and positive; varying from 0.01117 for the second measure of fear and willingness of the respondent to lodge a complaint to 0.12140 for the third measure of fear and willingness of the respondent to call on the police when threatened (Table 7.10).

◆ **Fear of crime and the respondents obligation toward crime prevention**

It is noticeable that the three measures of formless fear and respondents' opinion or their obligation toward crime prevention varies from an extremely weak negative relationship between the last measure of formless fear

(leaving/arriving at home) and respondents' willingness to assist the police in combating crime (-0.00962); to a weak positive relationship between the second measure of fear (home alone) and respondents' view that they are an important link in the criminal justice system (0.03413) (Table 7.11).

◆ **Fear of crime and the public's opinion of police performance**

*The relationship between the measures of formless fear and the public's opinion of police performance varies from a very weak negative relationship between the third measure of fear (leaving/arriving at home) and the respondents opinion that the police are uninterested in the case (-0.03290) to a definite but small positive relationship between the last measure of fear and respondents' opinion that the police are doing a good job of combating crime (0.20747). In general the findings are statistically significant at the 0.05 level (Table 7.12).*

◆ **Fear of crime and police visibility**

*The relationship between the three measures of formless fear and police visibility ranged from weak and negative (-0.04332) for the first measure of fear and fear of policeman in plain clothes to a small but definite relationship (0.27792) between the second measure of fear and the actual patrolling of the respondents' neighbourhood by the police.*

Hypothesis 8 cannot be completely rejected and therefore is partially accepted.

Hypothesis 9: "There are significant differences between male and female respondents and their experience with the police".

The findings of the F-test were inconclusive. The following were obtained:

◆ **Gender differences and contact with the police**

There is a significant difference between male and female respondents and the contact they had with the police (Table 7.14).



◆ **Gender differences in the reporting of crime to the police**

There are significant differences between male and female respondents with regard to reporting crime in which they have been a victim or of which they have knowledge (Table 7.14).

◆ **Gender differences and reasons for not reporting crime to the police**

The only gender difference in the list of reasons why respondents did not report crime to the police was obtained for the females willingness to settle a case personally (Table 7.14).

◆ **Gender differences and police visibility**

There are no significant differences between male and female respondents with regard to fear of policeman in uniform; fear of a plain clothes policeman and actual patrolling by the police of residential neighbourhoods (Table 7.18).

◆ **Gender differences and feelings of respondents toward contact with the police**

The only significant difference between male and female respondents was observed in the willingness to lodge a complaint at the police station (Table 7.15).

◆ **Gender differences and the opinion of respondents on police performance**

No significant differences were obtained between male and female respondents and their opinion of the performance of local police (Table 7.17).

◆ **Gender differences in the respondents' obligation toward crime prevention**

Significant differences were found between male and female respondents with regard to their obligation to combat crime. Females were far more willing to combat crime and assist the local police (Table 7.16).

No significant differences were found between male and female respondents and their view on being an important link in the criminal justice system (Table

7.16).

The statistical findings of the above hypothesis are inconclusive. Therefore the hypothesis is partially accepted.

Hypothesis 10: "There are significant differences in the fear of crime between residents who are involved in their neighbourhoods and those who are uninvolved.

The findings of the F-test with regard to significant differences was arbitrary. The following discussion highlights the findings:

- ◆ There are significant differences between those respondents who are involved in their neighbourhood (as measured by asking a neighbour to watch over your property, and being asked by a neighbour to watch over their property) and those who are uninvolved, on all three measures of formless fear (Table 8.5).
- ◆ In answer to the question pertaining to the opinion respondents have on their neighbour being willing to come to their rescue in time of need, the only significant difference was on the measure of formless fear (Table 8.5).
- ◆ No significant differences were found between those respondents who knew of the existence of a neighbourhood watch programme and those who did not on the three measures of formless fear (Table 8.6).
- ◆ A significant difference between those who are members of a neighbourhood watch system and those who are not was found on the first measure of formless fear of crime (walking alone)(Table 8.6).
- ◆ Significant differences in fear of crime (the measures being walking alone and leaving/arriving at home) were found between those respondents who were willing to participate in a neighbourhood watch programme and those who were

unwilling (Table 8.6).

The hypothesis is partially accepted.

## **9.4 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

The findings discussed in this section included the influence of age, gender and household composition, previous victimisation, crime as a social problem, the role of the police, involvement in the neighbourhood on the fear of crime.

### **9.4.1 Age, Gender, Household Characteristics and the Fear of Crime**

The relationship between age, gender, household composition and fear of crime has produced interesting results. Each variable and its relationship with the fear of crime will be discussed.

#### **9.4.1.1 Age and the fear of crime**

Research on the effect of age on the fear of crime (Baumer 1985; Garofalo 1979; Keane 1992; La Grange & Ferraro 1989; Miethe et al. 1978; Ortega & Myles 1987; Smith & Glanz 1989; Stafford & Galle 1984; Toseland 1982 and Yin 1982 to mention but a few) has produced inconsistent results. Generally, the findings have been that age is positively related to the fear of crime. In other words, as age increased so did the fear of crime. On the one hand, the elderly were viewed as being vulnerable to personal victimisation and on the other hand, the young tended not to admit to fear.

However, La Grange and Ferraro (1989) found the relationship between age and the fear of crime to be negative. These findings were that younger persons reported a greater fear than older persons. Smith and Glanz (1989) claimed that there was little difference in the levels of fear of the different categories of the age variable.

The findings of this research were congruent with that of La Grange and Ferraro (1989)

and Smith and Glanz (1989). The relationship between age and the first formless fear measure was positive but weak. This implied that as age increased so did the fear of walking alone in the neighbourhood. The rest of the measures of formless fear were negatively related to age and the magnitude of the relationship was weak. This indicated that as age increased, so fear of crime decreased. But these relationships were extremely weak.

When age was correlated with the fear of personal victimisation and fear of property crimes, except for age and the fear of housebreaking which was positively related, the rest of the correlations were weak and negative. The negative correlations implied that as age increased so fear of personal victimisation and fear of the remaining property crimes decreased, but these correlations were weak. Thus, the findings of this study can be viewed as somewhat inconsistent.

#### 9.4.1.2 Gender and the fear of crime

Gender has emerged as the most powerful predictor of fear of personal crimes. Various authors (Clemente & Kleiman 1977; Conklin 1975 and Garofalo 1979) have found women to be considerably more fearful than men.

La Grange and Ferraro (1989) stated that regardless of how fear of crime is measured, women were significantly more fearful of criminal victimisation than men. Their findings were consistent with those of Box et al. (1988); Toseland (1982); Stafford and Galle (1984) and Garofalo (1979). However, Smith and Glanz (1989) in their study of fear of crime among the South African public, reported little difference between levels of fear with regard to gender. The findings of this research clearly support previous findings that women generally fear crime (whether formless or concrete fear) more than men. The F-values for all the measures of formless and concrete fear are significant at the 0.05 level. Especially significant was that women were extremely fearful of rape either at home or away from home. This supports the suggestion by Warr (1984) that a higher fear of crime for women may be fear of male violence. Also noteworthy, is the difference in levels of fear shown by males and females with regard to being robbed or

mugged and housebreaking. Robbery/mugging is a form of personal victimisation which could account for the difference. As for housebreaking, the difference could be based on the perception of the women that if she was at home or disturbed burglars by coming home during the housebreaking, she could be raped or murdered. Thus, fear of personal victimisation on the part of the women respondents in this study is high.

However, men showed high levels of fear of being killed at home or away from home, being shot at and being hijacked. Thus, although there are gender differences in the fear of crime, it can be stated that fear of criminal victimisation exists, regardless of gender, for the respondents of this study.

#### 9.4.1.3 Household composition and fear of crime

An individual's sense of safety is influenced by the presence of other persons in their immediate environment. According to Warr (1990:894), being alone provokes fear as the isolated individual is an easy target for victimisation and the absence of people implies that there is no one to come to your aid in the event of an attack.

Various researchers used the number of persons residing with the respondent as a demographic variable (Keane 1992; Miethe et al. 1987; Naser et al. 1993; Parker & Ray 1990; Smith & Hill 1991; Smith & Jarjoura 1989 and Toseland 1982).

Although a positive relationship existed between household composition and fear of crime (*i.e. the greater the number of persons who resided with the respondent, the greater the fear*) the relationship was weak.

Although these relationships were weak as far as this investigation is concerned, it is interesting to note that two measures of formless fear (home alone and leaving and arriving at home) and certain measures of concrete fear (fear of being raped at home, rape away from home, killed at home, killed away from home, robbed/mugged, shot at, housebreaking, arson, and hijacking) were significantly related to household composition. This would imply that respondents who had people to care about

(families) were fearful of crimes in which their loved ones could be hurt.

#### 9.4.1.4 Type of housing and fear of crime

Little research has been done on the relationship between type of housing and fear of crime (Keane 1992; Naser et al. 1993 and Smith & Jarjoura 1989). Over seventy-five percent of the respondents resided in brick houses and the remaining respondents lived in connected housing (duplex, simplex or flat) or alternative housing (shack, rented room, tent or rondavel).

The research findings indicated no significant differences between type of housing and the measures of formless and concrete fear of crime. However, the mean scores ranges from 2.43 to 2.86 on the three measures of formless fear; 2.66 to 3.43 for fear of personal victimisation and from 2.90 to 3.20 for fear of property crimes. These scores indicate considerable fear of crime on the part of respondents, regardless of their type of housing.

#### 9.4.2 Previous Victimisation and Fear of Crime

In general, the findings of various authors (Baumer 1985; Box et al. 1988; Garofalo 1979; Naser et al. 1993; Parker & Ray 1990; Smith & Glanz 1989 and Smith & Hill 1991) have indicated that individuals who have been previously victimised are substantially more fearful of criminal victimisation than non-victims. Factors which affect the fear of crime include the following:

- ◆ The time lapse between the victimisation experience and the research study.
- ◆ The type of victimisation, i.e. either personal or property.
- ◆ The precautionary measures taken by victims and non-victims.
- ◆ The perceived safety of the neighbourhood in which the individual lives.
- ◆ The seriousness of the victimisation experience.

The general findings of this study indicated that individuals who had been robbed, were

more fearful of crime than non-victims. (The fear of crime measures included both formless fear and fear of personal victimisation and property crimes). Respondents who had not been shot at indicated a greater level of formless fear than victims, but victims showed a higher fear of property crimes than non-victims. Respondents who had suffered property victimisation tended to report higher levels of fear (for both formless fear of crime measures and concrete fear of crime measures). One noticeable exception was victims of vehicle theft whose fear of personal victimisation and property crimes did not differ substantially from non-victims' fear of crime.

Robbery is viewed as a serious crime by the respondents of this study, and being a victim of a robbery influences the level of fear considerably. Robbery is also viewed as a crime against the person which could account for these findings. The fact that victims of property crimes are more fearful of crime than non-victims could be accounted for by the fact that having already been victimised, the individual knows what to expect and fears the outcome of future victimisation. A victim of a housebreaking could fear a further victimisation aimed at the person instead of the property.

These results echo the findings of Smith and Hill (1991) who found that previous personal victimisation has little effect on fear levels, but that previous property victimisation or a combination of personal and property victimisation is positively associated with fear (Smith & Hill 1991:232).

#### **9.4.3 Crime as a Social Problem and Fear of Crime**

In order to measure respondent's concern about crime, the individual's perception of the seriousness of the problem of crime in their residential area was obtained.

Concern about crime is important as many male respondents in this study indicated that they were concerned about crime but not fearful of it. Concern, also taps the image the individual has of the environment in which he or she lives, and the threat of criminal victimisation in that environment. In this study, concern with statutory crimes, crimes of a personal nature and property crimes was used as a measure.

The frequency distribution of responses indicates that the respondents viewed drunken driving, assault, housebreaking, theft from vehicles, other forms of theft, robbery and hijacking as problems in their area of residence.

The relationship between statutory crime as a social problem and the three formless fear of crime measures was weak but positive. People who are concerned about statutory crime, are more fearful of crime. The same findings for the relationship between personal victimisation and property crime as a problem and the fear of crime existed. All these relationships were significant at the 0.05 level. Respondents who were concerned about personal victimisation and property crime (who viewed them as a social problem) were more fearful of crime (as measured by formless fear of crime measures).

#### 9.4.3.1 Crime as a social problem and respondents' opinion of police performance

Respondents' rating of personal victimisation as a social problem was positively related to the opinion respondents have on police performance. A similar result was obtained for property crimes as a social problem and the opinion of respondents. This implies that the more problematic the crime is rated, the more negative the respondents' opinion of the police's performance.

#### 9.4.4 Role of the Police

The role of the police in combating crime is an important factor in the reduction of the fear of criminal victimisation.

Little literature is available on the issue of the role of police, and the study of Glanz (1989) was viewed as an important source of information. Good police-community relations are important because the police depend on the public for information about crime and to combat crime.



The role of the police was divided into four categories, namely contact with the police, the reporting and non-reporting of crime to the police, the opinion of respondents on their obligation towards crime prevention and the opinion of the concerning police performance (services rendered) and police visibility.

#### 9.4.4.1 *Fear of crime and contact with the police*

The type of contact that a respondent has had with the police was negatively related to the fear of crime. If the type of contact was negative in nature, then respondents' fear of crime would be influenced.

#### 9.4.4.2 *Reporting and non-reporting of crime and the fear of crime*

The relationship between the reporting of crime in which a respondent has been a victim and the fear of crime is negative in nature, i.e. if a victim reports crime his level of fear is more than a victim who does not report a crime. Reporting a crime of which a person has knowledge of will decrease the person's level of fear. In general, the reasons why respondents did not report crimes were positively related to the fear of crime (the measures of formless crime).

#### 9.4.4.3 *Obligation to crime prevention and fear of crime*

The relationship between respondents' opinion of their obligation to crime prevention and fear of crime is inconsistent. Respondents appear to be unwilling to assist in crime prevention regardless of the high level of fear.

#### 9.4.4.4 *The Public's opinion of police performance and visibility and fear of crime*

The weak positive relationship between the services rendered by the police and the fear of crime (with the exception of the police being uninterested), indicates that the respondents' fear of crime is not influenced by the performance of the police. These findings can be explained by the fact that almost one third of the respondents were

uncertain with regard to the services rendered by the police, another third disagreed with the statements regarding police performance, while another third agreed (Table 7.7). This group of uncertain respondents is large enough to cause concern about the effectiveness of the police in crime prevention.

A positive relationship also existed between police visibility and the fear of crime. This finding implied that, irrespective of a police presence, the fear of crime existed among the respondents.

#### 9.4.4.5 Gender differences in the respondents' experience with the police

Female respondents were less likely to report crime to the police in which they had been a victim or of which they had knowledge, more than male respondents, and to settle the cases in which they were involved personally, without police assistance. Females were also more unwilling to lodge a complaint with the police, to combat crime and assist the police, than males.

The unwillingness of women to get involved in crime prevention can be due to their higher levels of fear. Men could also refrain from involvement in the criminal justice system as to acknowledge fear is against the "masculine" image of South African men.

#### 9.4.5 Involvement in the Neighbourhood and Fear of Crime

*Fear of criminal victimisation can cause a break down in social cohesion and solidarity, and lead to the disappearance of sociability, mutual trust and willingness to help others (Box et al. 1988; Clemente & Kleiman 1977; Liska et al. 1988; Smith & Glanz 1989 and Warr 1990).*

The reaction of the individual to fear of crime includes defensive responses and offensive responses. Defensive responses imply not going out, avoiding strangers and keeping off the streets. Offensive responses to crime, imply that the individual actually does something physically to protect their person or property against crime.

Of the defensive measures used by respondents of this study, not going out alone at night, locking the doors while driving a vehicle, locking doors of home; notifying others of their whereabouts and leaving the radio, TV and lights on when not at home figure as the most important (Table 8.1 & 8.2). The offensive measures most often engaged in included adding extra security lights, and installing burglar-proofing.

Within the community context, neighbours tend to watch over each other and enforce informal social control. When neighbourhoods are well integrated, residents know each other, and notice strangers or behaviours which are out of the ordinary. Crime prevention strategies then have a community base. The most often used crime prevention strategy in neighbourhoods is the neighbourhood watch programme and, introduced later, the community policing forums.

In this study the respondents' involvement in his/her neighbourhood, and the respondent's involvement in neighbourhood watch programmes were investigated.

Respondents who are involved in their neighbourhoods (who have asked neighbours and have been asked by neighbours to watch over property) were more fearful of crime than respondents who were uninvolved. Respondents who knew that their neighbours would not come to their rescue were more fearful than those who knew that their neighbours would assist them.

The respondents who were willing to join a Neighbourhood Watch programme indicated more fear of crime than those who were unwilling. Respondents who were already members of a neighbourhood watch programme were less fearful than those who were not members.

These findings are interesting. Neighbours who are involved, could have become involved with their neighbours after a victimisation experience. The willingness to join a Neighbourhood Watch programme could be motivated by high levels of fear. In general then, involvement in the neighbourhood could reduce levels of fear.

## 9.5 CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions can be drawn from the empirical findings of this study:

- (i) The relationship between age and fear of crime is inconsistent and necessitate further investigation. It can be said that all age groups fear criminal victimisation. However, the age categories of this study did not allow for a comprehensive analysis of this relationship.
- (ii) Gender emerges as a strong predictor of fear. Although females were generally more fearful than males, males too were fearful of criminal victimisation. Thus, fear of crime is a reality for both male and female respondents of this study.
- (iii) Household composition is related to the fear of crime. However the relationship was weak. The findings are interesting in that one would expect the relationship to have been negative, i.e. the more isolated the individual, the more fearful they are of criminal victimisation. Instead, respondents who had more people residing with them were more fearful of crime.
- (iv) There are no significant differences between the type of housing in which respondents reside and the fear of crime. Although there are no significant differences respondents' fear of crime is real.
- (v) Previous victims of a robbery are generally more fearful of crime than non-victims. Having experienced property crimes also influences the level of fear of the respondent. In general, previous victims are more fearful than non-victims.
- (vi) Respondents who were concerned about statutory crimes, personal victimisation and property crimes were fearful of crime. In this regard, concern about crime influenced the respondents' fear of crime. Concern and fear are therefore related issues.

- (vii) The relationship between the role of the police and the respondents' fear of crime is arbitrary. In general, the role of the police has little influence on respondents' fear of crime. The respondents view their obligation to assist the police as minimal, and they seem to be unsure as to the quality of services rendered by the local police. Gender differences in respondents' image of the police were minimal. Females were more willing to assist the police and to have contact with the police than men.
- (viii) People become involved with their neighbours in an attempt to reduce their fear levels. Involvement in Neighbourhood Watch programmes also entails a reduction in the level of fear felt by respondents. Neighbourhood cohesion is according to the literature (Box et al. 1988; Conklin 1975 and Toseland 1982) an important factor in any fear reduction strategy.

## 9.6 RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the emphasis of the present study is on the factors influencing the fear of crime, a number of non-prescriptive recommendations can be made. The most important aspect of the recommendations is on ways to reduce the fear of crime amongst the respondents and the South African public in general. These recommendations are two fold, namely, programmes or strategies to reduce fear and recommendations for further research.

### 9.6.1 *Recommendations for Police-Community Relations*

- ◆ Improve the image of the police. Much has been done by the South African Police Service to improve its image among the South African public since 1994. In the postapartheid era, the formal structure of the police has been reorganised in order to eliminate the paramilitary ranking used pre-1994. In KwaZulu-Natal, the KwaZulu Police and the erstwhile South African Police have united to the current South African Police Service (SAPS). The image of both have been tarnished by media reports of police bias and police involvement in political

violence. This image needs to be rectified before the public will trust the police.

- ◆ Greater involvement of the local police at school level. Glanz (1989:66) recommended that the police give talks, discussions and present videos on crime prevention at a practical level at all schools. This recommendation is supported by this researcher as it is perceived as a valuable educational tool to improve the image of the SAPS and to make the police more user friendly.
- ◆ Increased foot patrols. Visibility of the police is a deterrent to criminal activity. Greater visibility is needed. However, acknowledgement must be made of the serious manpower shortage faced by the police. In Empangeni and Richards Bay, foot patrols are seldom encountered in residential areas, but do occur in the business area especially at the end of the month.
- ◆ Increase the awareness of the existence of the concept of Neighbourhood Watch programmes. Although most white residents in Empangeni and Richards Bay have knowledge of what the Neighbourhood Watch programme entails, few programmes have been initiated and fewer have survived. There is a lack of commitment and a general apathy toward the actual activity of the programme. Within the black residential areas, the concept of Neighbourhood Watch seldom exists and might usefully be promoted.
- ◆ The establishment of community policing forums. Community policing entails *voluntary involvement on the part of the community in policing activity*; and the creation of a community policing officer (CPO) who acts as a direct link between the police and the community. CPO's not only serve to combat crime but also solve the particular problems experienced in the community. Community policing is based on mutual trust between the police and the community, and its major aim is to build a sense of community amongst residents.

Community policing addresses fear of crime, social and physical disorder and community decay.

The implementation of community policing forums in Empangeni and Richards Bay occurred in September 1995 - after the fieldwork was completed. However, in the humble opinion of the researcher, community policing is the crime prevention strategy most likely to effect any reduction in the level of fear.

#### 9.6.2 Future Research

Future research on the following is recommended:

- ◆ It is necessary to initiate in the province of KwaZulu-Natal (and other provinces) an official crime survey, as this would assist researchers in their endeavours.
- ◆ In the present climate of violence and increasing criminal victimisation, priority should be given to a similar study amongst all population groups in KwaZulu-Natal.
- ◆ *Research on crime prevention strategies and how they can be implemented, should be prioritized.*

In conclusion then, crime and the fear of crime is a daily reality for many residents in KwaZulu-Natal. This problem must be addressed, as the quality of life of people in our province is severely affected by crime and the threat of criminal victimisation.

## REFERENCES

- Akers, R.L., La Greca, A.J., Sellers, C. & Cochran, J. 1987. Victimization and fear of crime among the elderly in different types of community. *Criminology*, 25(3):487-505.
- Akers, R.L. 1985. *Deviant behavior: A social learning approach* (3rd ed.): Belmont CA: Wadsworth.
- Babbie, E. 1990. *Survey research methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bailey, K.D. 1987. *Methods of social research* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Baker, M.H., Weinstedt, B.C., Everett, R.S. & McCleary, R. 1983. The impact of a crime wave: Perceptions, fear and confidence in the police. *Law and Society Review*, 17(2):319-35.
- Balkin, S. 1979. Victimization rates, safety, and the fear of crime. *Social Problems*, 26(3):343-357.
- Balkin, S. & Houlden, P. 1983. Reducing fear of crime through occupational presence. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 19(1):13-33.
- Baumer, T.L. 1978. Research on fear of crime in the United States. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 3(3-4):254-264.
- Baumer, T.L. 1985. Testing a general model of fear of crime: Data from a national sample. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 22(3):239-255.
- Baumer, T. & Rosenbaum, D. 1982. "Fear of Crime: An empirical clarification of a major problem." Presented at the annual APA conference, Washington. August 23-27, 1982.
- Beyer, L. 1993. *Community policing: Lessons from Victoria*. Australian Studies in Law, Crime and Justice. Canberra, ACT: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Biderman, A. (Ed.). 1972. *Crime and justice: a symposium*. New York: Naelburg.
- Blalock, H.M. 1981. *Social statistics* (2nd ed.). London: McGraw-Hill.
- Block, C.R. & Block, R.L. 1986. Crime definition, crime measurement, and victim surveys. *Journal of Social Issues*, 40:137-160.
- Block, R.L. 1971. Fear of crime and fear of the police. *Social Problems*, 19:91-101.
- Box, S., Hale, C. & Andrews, G. 1988. Explaining fear of crime. *British Journal of Criminology*, 28(3):240-356.



- Braungart, M.H., Braungart, R.G. & Hayer, W.J. 1980. Age, sex and social factors in fear of crime. *Sociological Focus*, 13(1):55-56.
- Brooks, J. 1974. The fear of crime in the United States. *Crime and Delinquency*, 20:241-244.
- Brown, S.E., Esbensen, F.A. & Geis, G. 1991. *Criminology. Explaining crime and its context*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing Company.
- Brown, S.E., Esbensen, F. & Geis, G. 1996. *Criminology. Explaining crime and its context* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing Company.
- Carmines, E.G. & Zeller, R.A. 1974. "On establishing the empirical dimensionality of theoretical terms: An Analytic example: *Political Methodology*, 1:75-96.
- Carmines, E.G. & Zeller, R.A. 1979. *Reliability and validity assessment*. London: Sage Publications.
- Clemente, F. & Kleiman, M.B. 1976. Fear of crime among the aged. *Gerontologist*, 16: 207-210.
- Clemente, F. and Kleiman, M.B. 1977. Fear of crime in the United States: A multivariate analysis. *Social Forces*, 56:519-531.
- Cloete, M.G.T. & Stevens, R. 1990. *Criminology*. Southern Book Publishers. Halfway House: Southern.
- Cohen, E.C., Kleugel, J.R. & Land, K.C. 1981. Social inequality and predatory criminal victimization. An exposition and test of formal theory. *American Sociological Review*, 49:505-524.
- Cohen, L.E. & Felson, M. 1979. Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review*. 44:588-608.
- Cohen, L.E. & Felson, M. 1992. Social change and crime rate trends: Structure activity approach. In W.J. Schurink, I. Snyman, W.F. Krugel & L. Slabbert (Eds). *Victimization: Nature and trends*. Pretoria: HSRC.
- Conklin, J.E. 1975. *The impact of crime*. New York: MacMillan.
- Drapkin, I. & Viano, E. (eds). 1974. *Victimology*. London: DC Heath.
- Du Bow, F., McCabe, E. & Kaplan, G. 1987. *Reactions to crime: A Critical review of the literature*. In K.F. Ferraro & R.L. La Grange. The measurement of fear of crime. *Sociological Inquiry*, 57:70-101.

- Durkheim, E. 1980. The Rules of Sociological method. In J. Hughes. *The philosophy of social research*. London: Longman.
- Eve, R.A. & Eve, S.B. 1984. The effects of powerlessness, fear of social change, and social integration on fear of crime among the elderly. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 9:290-295.
- Fattah, E.A. 1979. Some recent theoretical developments in victimology. *Victimology*, 4:198.
- Fattah, E.A. 1992. Some recent theoretical developments in victimology. In W.J. Schurink, I. Snyman, W.F. Krugel & I. Slabbert (Eds). *Victimization: Nature and trends*. Pretoria: HSRC.
- Fattah, E.A. 1981. Becoming a victim: The victimization experience and its aftermath. *Victimology*, 6(1):29-47.
- Ferraro, K.F. & La Grange, R.L. 1987. The measurement of fear of crime. *Sociological Inquiry*, 57:70-101.
- Frankfort-Nachmias, C. & Nachmias, D. 1992. *Research methods in the social sciences*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Fitzgerald, J.D. & Cox, C.M. 1987. *Research methods in criminal justice: An introduction*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Furstenberg, F.G. 1971. Public reaction to crime in the streets. *American Scholar*, 40(4):601-610.
- Futrell, M. & Roberson, C. 1988. *An introduction to Criminal Justice research*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Garofalo, J. 1979. Victimization and the fear of crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 16:80-87.
- Garofalo, J. 1981. The fear of crime: Causes and consequences. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 82:839-857.
- Garofalo, J. 1992. Reassessing the lifestyle model on criminal victimization. In W.J. Schurick, I. Snyman, W.F. Krugel & L. Slabbert (Eds). *Victimization: Nature and trends*. Pretoria: HSRC.
- Garofalo, J. & Laub, J. 1978. The fear of crime: Broadening our own perspective. *Victimology*, 2:242-253.

- Giddens, A. 1993. *Sociology: An introductory text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbs, J.J. & Hanrahan, K.J. 1993. Safety demand and supply: An alternative to fear of crime. *Justice Quarterly*, 10(3):368-397.
- Glanz, L. 1989. *Coping with crime: The South African public's perceptions of and reactions to crime*. Pretoria: HSRC.
- Glanz, L. 1991. *Crime and victimization of the elderly in the Cape Peninsula*. Pretoria: HSRC.
- Glanz, L. 1992. Fear of crime among the elderly in the Cape Peninsula. *Acta Criminologica*, 5(2):16-26.
- Haralambos, M. 1991. *Sociology: Themes and perspectives* (3rd ed.). London: Unwin Hyam Limited.
- Harris, M.B. 1995. *Basic statistics for behavioural science research*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Harris, R. 1969. *The fear of crime*. London: Frederick A. Praeger.
- Hartnagel, T.F. 1979. The perception and fear of crime: Implications for neighbourhood cohesion, social activity, and community affects. *Social Forces*, 58:176-193.
- Hanson, J. & Van Zyl-Smit, O. 1990. *Towards justice: Crime and state control in South Africa*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Hindelang, M.J., Gottfredson, M.R. & Garofalo, J. 1978. *Victims of personal crime: An empirical foundations for a theory of personal victimization*. Cambridge: Ballinger.
- Hughes, J. 1980. *The philosophy of social research*. London: Longman.
- Hunter, A. 1986. Symbolic Communities: The persistence and change of Chicago's local communities. In D.A Lewis & G. Salem. *Fear of Crime: Incivility and the production of a social problem*. Oxford: Transaction Books.
- Jaycox, V. 1978. The elderly's fear of crime: Rational or irrational? *Victimology*, 3(3-4):329-334.
- Karmen, A. 1984. *Crime victims: An introduction to victimology*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

- Keane, C. 1992. April. Fear of crime in Canada: An examination of concrete and formless fear of victimization. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 215-224.
- Kelling, G.L. & Wilson, J.Q. 1982. March. "Broken windows: The police and neighbourhood safety." *The Atlantic Monthly*, 29-38.
- Kelling, G.L. & Coles, C.M. 1996. *Fixing Broken Windows*. New York: Martin Kessler.
- Kennedy, L.W. & Silverman, R.A. 1985. "Significant others and fear of crime among the elderly." *International Journal on Ageing and Human Development*, 20(4):241-256.
- Klein, L., Luxenburg, J. & King, M. 1986. Perceived Neighbourhood Crime and the impact of private security. *Crime and Delinquency*, 35(3):365-377.
- Korinek, L. 1992. The awareness of crime and the sense of public security in Hungary. *Criminal Policy and The Rule of Law*. Budapest: Hungarian Society for Criminology.
- La Grange, R.L. & Ferraro, K.F. 1989. Assessing age and gender differences in perceived risk and fear of crime. *Criminology*, 27(4):697-717.
- Lab, S.P. 1990. Citizen crime prevention: Domains and participation. *Justice Quarterly*, 7(3):467-492.
- Lab, S.P. 1988. *Crime Prevention*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing Company.
- Lasley, J.R. & Rosenbaum, J.L. 1988. Routine activities and multiple personal victimization. *SSR*, 73(1):47-50.
- Leedy, P.D. 1985. *Practical Research: Planning and design*. New York: Macmillan.
- Lewis, D.A. & Salem, G. 1986. *Fear of crime: Incivility and the production of a social problem*. Oxford: Transaction Books.
- Lewis, D.A. & Maxfield, M.G. 1980. Fear in the neighbourhood: An investigation of the impact of crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 17:160-189.
- Lewis, D.A. (Ed.). 1989. Reactions to crime. In L. Glanz. *Coping with crime: The South African public's perceptions of and reactions to crime*. Pretoria: HSRC.
- Lin, N. 1976. *Foundations of social research*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Liska, A.E., Lawrence, J.J. & Sanchirico, A. 1982. Fear of crime as a social fact. *Social Forces*, 60:760-770.

- Liska, A.E., Sanchirico, A. & Reed, M.D. 1988. Fear of crime and constraint behaviour: Specifying and estimating a reciprocal effects model. *Social Forces*, 66:827-837.
- Mannheim, H. 1965. *Comparative criminology*, vol. 2. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Manning, P.K. 1986. The police and crime. In L.A. Radelet. *The police and the community*. New York: Macmillan.
- Maree, A. 1993. Inwoners se besorgdheid oor misdaad en misdaadnavorsing. *Acta Criminologica*, 6(1):55-60.
- Maris, R. 1987. *Social Problems*. New York: Macmillan.
- Maxfield, M. 1984. The limits of vulnerability in explaining fear of crime: A Comparative neighbourhood analysis. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 21:233-250.
- Maxfield, M.G. & Babbie, E. 1995. *Research Methods for Criminal Justice and Criminology*. New York: Wadsworth.
- Miethe, T.D., Stafford, M.C. and Long, J.S. 1987. Social differentiation in criminal victimisation: A test of routine activities/lifestyle theories. *American Sociological Review*, 52:184-194.
- Miethe, T.D. 1991. Citizen-based crime control activity and victimization risks: An Examination of displacement and free-rider effects. *Criminology*, 29(3):419-441.
- Miethe, T.D. & Lee, G.R. 1984. Fear of crime among older people: A Reassessment of the predictive power of crime related factors. *Sociological Quarterly*, 25:395-415.
- Mouton, J. & Marais, H.C. 1988. *Metodologie van die geesteswetenskappe: Basiese begrippe* (2de uit.). Pretoria: RGN.
- Mqadi, L.P. 1994. *Juvenile delinquency among secondary school children with reference to the influence of the family. A socio-criminological study*. Unpublished D.Phil. thesis. University of Zululand, KwaDlangezwa.
- Naudé, C.M.B. 1992. Community-based prevention of crime: A Victimological perspective. In W.J. Schurink, I. Snyman, W.F. Krugel & L. Slabbert (Eds). *Victimization: Nature and trends*. Pretoria: HSRC.

- Neser, J.J., Geldenhuys, S.F., Stevens, B., Grobbelaar, M.M. & Ladikos, A. 1993. Vrees vir misdaad en die misdaadslagoffer in die Sunnyside-area in Pretoria. *Acta Criminologica*, 6(2):29-42.
- O'Block, R.L. 1981. *Security and crime prevention*. Boston: Butterworth Heinemann.
- O'Block, R.L., Donnermeyer, J.F. & Doeren, S.E. 1991. *Security and crime prevention* (2nd ed.). Boston: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Ortega, S.T. & Myles, J.C. 1987. Race and gender effects on the fear of crime: An Interaction model with age. *Criminology*, 25(1):133-152.
- Parker, K.D. & Ray, M.G. 1990. Fear of crime: An Assessment of related factors. *Sociological Spectrum*, 10:29-40.
- Parker, K.D. 1988. Black-white differences in perceptions of fear of crime. *International Journal of Social Psychology*, 28(4):48-494.
- Peak, K.J. & Glensor, R.W. 1996. *Community policing and problem-solving: Strategies and practices*. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Pretorius, M. 1994. *Bejaardes se persepsies van en vrees vir viktimisasie en die effek daarvan op hulle lewenstyl*. Ongepubliseerde D.Phil.-proefskrif. Universiteit van Pretoria, Pretoria.
- Radelet, C.A. 1986. *The police and the community*. New York: Macmillan.
- Radelet, L.A. & Carter, D.L. 1994. *The Police and the Community*. New York: Macmillan.
- Reeves, H. 1992. Victim support schemes. In W.J. Schurink, I. Snyman, W.F. Krugel & L. Slabbert (Eds). *Victimization: Nature and trends*. Pretoria: HSRC.
- Regoli, R.M. & Hewitt, J.D. 1996. *Criminal Justice*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Riley, M.W. 1963. *Sociological Research: a case approach*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Reiner, R. 1992. *The politics of the police*. London: Harvester Whealsheaf.
- Rosenbaum, D.P. (Ed.). 1986. *Community crime prevention: Does it work?* Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Schafer, S. 1977. *Victimology: The victim and his criminal*. Reston, VA: Reston.
- Schurink, W.J., Snyman, I., Krugel, W.K. & Slabbert, L. (Eds). 1992. *Victimization: Nature and trends*. Pretoria: HSRC.

- Schurink, W.J. & Prinsloo, K.K. 1978. *Meerdoelige opname onder swartes in stedelike gebiede - die vrees vir misdaad*. Pretoria: RGN.
- Schurink, W.J. & Strydom, H.G. 1976. *Die vrees vir misdaad by die publiek van Soweto*, Pretoria: RGN.
- Sherif, C.W., Sherif, M. & Nebergal, R.E. 1965. *Attitude and attitude change*. Philadelphia: WB Saunders.
- Silberman, C. 1987. "Fear." In K.F. Ferraro & R.L. La Grange. The measurement of fear of crime. *Sociological Inquiry*, 57:70-101.
- Silverman, R.A. & Kennedy, L.W. 1985. Loneliness, satisfaction and fear of crime. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 27(1):1-13.
- Skogan, W.G. 1987. The impact of victimization on fear. *Crime and Delinquency*, 33(1):135-154.
- Skogan, W.G. & Maxfield, M.G. 1981. *Coping with crime: individual and neighbourhood reactions*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Smith, K. & Glanz, L. 1989. Fear of crime among the South African public. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 20(1):53-60.
- Smith, D.A. & Jarjoura, G.R. 1989. Household characteristics, neighbourhood composition and victimization risk. *Social forces*, 68(2):621-640.
- Smith, L.N. & Hill, G. 1991. Victimization and fear of crime. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 18(2):217-239.
- Snyman, R. 1992. Victim support and a proposed model for rendering services to victims of crime in South Africa. In W.J. Schurink, J. Snyman, W.F. Krugel & L. Slabbert (Eds). *Victimization: Nature and trends*. Pretoria: HSRC.
- Spector, P.E. 1992. *Summated rating scale contribution: An introduction*. London: Sage.
- Stafford, M.C. & Galle, O.R. 1984. Victimization rates, exposure to risk, and fear of crime. *Criminology*, 22(2):173-185.
- Stevens, R. & Cloete, M.G.T. 1996. *Introduction to Criminology*. Johannesburg: Thomson Publishing.
- Stevens, S.S. 1951. *Handbook of experimental psychology*. New York: John Wiley.

- Strijdom, H.G. & Schurink, W.J. 1992. Theoretical perspectives in victimology with brief reference to contributions from a micro-antipositivistic and macropositivistic approach. In W.J. Schurink, I. Snyman, W.F. Krugel & L. Slabbert (Eds). *Victimization: Nature and Trends*. Pretoria: HSRC.
- Taylor, R.B. & Hale, M. 1986. Criminology: Testing the alternative models of fear of crime. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 77(1):151-189.
- Toseland, R.W. 1982. Fear of crime: who is most vulnerable? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 10:199-209.
- Trojanowicz, R. & Bucqueroux, B. 1990. *Community policing: A contemporary perspective*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing Company.
- Van der Walt, P.J. 1964. 'n Sosiologiese klassifikasie van misdade: 'n studie in die misdaadstatistiek. Kaapstad: Nasau.
- Van der Walt, P.J., Cronje, G. & Smit, B.F. 1985. *Criminology: an introduction*. Pretoria: HAUM.
- Van der Westhuizen, J. 1982. 'n Inleiding tot kriminologiese navorsing. Pretoria: Unisa.
- Van der Westhuizen, J. (ed.). 1982. *Geweldsmisdaad in Suid Afrika*. Pretoria: Unisa.
- Van der Wurff, A., Van Staalduinen, L. & Slinger, P. 1985. Fear of crime in residential environments: Testing a social psychological model. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 129(2):141-160.
- Van Dijk, J. 1979. The extent of public information and the nature of public attitudes. *In public opinion on crime and criminal justice*. Strasburg: Council of Europe.
- Van Dijk, J. & Mayhew, P. 1992. *Criminal victimization in the industrialized world*. Rome: Unicri.
- Van Heerden, T.J. 1976. *Inleiding tot die polisiekunde*. Pretoria: Unisa.
- Vito, G.F., Latessa, E.J. & Wilson, D.G. 1988. *Introduction to Criminal Justice research methods*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Warr, M. & Stafford, M. 1983. Fear of victimization: A look at proximate causes. *Social Forces*, 61:633-1044.
- Warr, M. 1984. Fear of victimization: why are women and the elderly more afraid? *Social Science Quarterly*, 65:681-702.
- Warr, M. 1985. Fear of rape among urban women. *Social Problems*, 32:238-250.



- Warr, M. 1987. Fear of victimization and sensitivity to risk. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 3(1):29-46.
- Warr, M. 1990. Fear of victimization. *Social Forces*, 68(3):89-907.
- Weber, M. 1980. In J. Hughes. *The philosophy of social research*. London: Longman.
- Williams, P. and Dickinson, J. 1993. Fear of crime. Read all about it? *British Journal of Criminology*, 33(1):33-56.
- Yin, R.K. 1986. Community crime prevention: A synthesis of eleven evaluations. In Rosenbaum, D.P (Ed.). *Community crime prevention: Does it work?* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Yin, P. 1982. Fear of crime as a problem for the elderly. *Social Problems*, 30(3):240-245.
- Yin, R.P. 1980. Fear of crime among the elderly: Some issues and suggestions. *Social Problems*, 27(4):492-503.
- Yin, P.P. 1985. *Victimization and the aged*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Young Rifai, M.A. 1992. Victimology: A theoretical framework. In W.J. Schurink, I. Snyman, W.F. Krugel & L. Slabbert (Eds). *Victimization: Nature and trends*. Pretoria: HSRC.

UNIVERSITY OF ZULULAND

QUESTIONNAIRE: FEAR OF CRIME

---

Dear Respondent

- Your assistance in this research project is of the utmost importance and is highly appreciated.
- All information supplied by you will be treated in the strictest confidence
- Please ensure that you answer all the questions
- Mark your answers with a cross (x).

## SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

### Q.1 GENDER

Male	1
Female	2

### Q.2 MARITAL STATUS

Married	1
Widowed	2
Divorced	3
Separated	4
Single	5

### Q.3 AGE \_\_\_\_\_

### Q.4 ETHNIC GROUP

Black	1
White	2
Asian	3
Coloured	4

### Q.5 HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

Below Standard 8	1
Standard 8	2
Standard 9	3
Standard 10	4
Diploma	5
Degree	6

**Q.6    PRESENT OCCUPATION**

Unemployed	1
Semi-skilled /Skilled labourer	2
Professional worker (doctor, lawyer)	3
Technical worker	4
Businessmen - sales worker	5
Administration	6
Student or scholar	7
Service worker (nurse, social worker)	8
Armed forces	9
Agricultural worker	10
Self employed	11

**Q.7    AREA OF RESIDENCE**

Empangeni/Ngwelezane TLC	1
Richards Bay/Esikhawini TLC	2

**Q.8    TYPE OF HOUSING**

Brick houses	1
Connected housing (duplex, simplex, flat)	2
Alternative housing (shack, tent, caravan)	3

**Q.9    NUMBER OF PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD**

One	1
Two	2
Three	3
Four	4
Five or more	5

**SECTION B: FEAR OF CRIME**

**Q.10 HOW SAFE DO YOU FEEL WALKING ALONE AT NIGHT IN YOUR NEIGHBOURHOOD?**

Very safe	1
Fairly safe	2
Fairly unsafe	3
Very unsafe	4

**Q.11 HOW SAFE DO YOU FEEL WHEN ALONE IN YOUR HOME/APARTMENT AT NIGHT?**

Very safe	1
Fairly safe	2
Fairly unsafe	3
Very unsafe	4

**Q.12 HOW SAFE DO YOU FEEL IN YOUR NEIGHBOURHOOD WHEN LEAVING OR ARRIVING AT HOME?**

Very safe	1
Fairly safe	2
Fairly unsafe	3
Very unsafe	4

**HOW FEARFUL ARE YOU OF THE FOLLOWING CRIMES?**

Type of Crime	Not fearful	A little fearful	Quite fearful	Very fearful
<b>Q.13 Rape (at home)</b>	1	2	3	4
<b>Q.14 Rape (away from home)</b>	1	2	3	4
<b>Q.15 Killed (at home)</b>	1	2	3	4
<b>Q.16 Killed (away from home)</b>	1	2	3	4
<b>Q.17 Robbery / mugging</b>	1	2	3	4
<b>Q.18 Assault</b>	1	2	3	4
<b>Q.19 Abduction</b>	1	2	3	4
<b>Q.20 Shot at with firearm</b>	1	2	3	4
<b>Q.21 Housebreaking</b>	1	2	3	4

- Q.22 Property damage
- Q.23 Arson
- Q.24 Vehicle broken into
- Q.25 Ambushed while driving a car (hijacked)

1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4

#### SECTION C: PREVIOUS VICTIMISATION

DURING THE PAST YEAR, HAS ANY OF THE FOLLOWING HAPPENED TO YOU

- Q.26 Sexual assault
- Q.27 Robbery / mugging
- Q.28 Shot at (in a car)
- Q.29 Stoned (while in a car)
- Q.30 Housebreaking
- Q.31 Property damage
- Q.32 Vehicle broken into
- Q.33 Vehicle stolen

Yes	No
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2

#### SECTION D: CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM

HOW DO YOU RATE THE FOLLOWING TYPES OF CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM IN YOUR AREA OF RESIDENCE?

- Q.34 Traffic violations
- Q.35 Driving under the influence of alcohol
- Q.36 Rape
- Q.37 Robbery
- Q.38 Assault
- Q.39 Murder (being killed)
- Q.40 Abduction
- Q.41 Housebreaking
- Q.42 Theft of/out of vehicle

No problem at all	Less of a problem	More of a problem	Very problematic
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4

Q.43 Other forms of theft

1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4

Q.44 Vandalism

Q.45 Hijacking

Q.46 Bag snatching

## SECTION E: THE ROLE OF THE POLICE

Q.47 HAVE YOU EVER BEEN IN JURIDICAL CONTACT WITH THE POLICE?

As an accused and convicted in court

1

As an accused but acquitted in court

2

As a suspect

3

As a witness

4

As an informant

5

No contact

6

DO YOU REPORT ALL CRIMES AND MISCONDUCT TO THE POLICE?

Q.48 Where you are the victim  
(complainant)?

Q.49 Those you have knowledge of?

Always	Often	Some- times	Never
1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4

INDICATE BELOW WHETHER THE FOLLOWING REASONS HAVE PLAYED A ROLE IN YOUR DECISION NOT TO REPORT CRIME TO THE POLICE:

NB: Mark each one below as either "YES" or "NO"

Q.50 Did not want the bother the police with trivial matters

Q.51 The case would in any case not receive proper attention by the police

Q.52 The police do not react promptly to emergency calls

Q.53 The case is unsolvable (i.e. nothing can be done to trace the offender or to recover stolen property)

Q.54 The inability of the police to solve the crime

Yes	No
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2

- Q.55 Not in the interest of the society that the case should be reported
- Q.56 The case is settled personally
- Q.57 Personal nature of the case
- Q.58 *Attending court is too time consuming*
- Q.59 Hate to get involved in court cases
- Q.60 Negative attitude and approach of the police
- Q.61 You are treated as the "guilty party" when reporting crime to the police
- Q.62 Partiality on the part of the police when crime is reported
- Q.63 Fear of retaliation

1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2

**DO YOU FEEL AT LIBERTY TO:**

- Q.64 Call upon police when threatened
- Q.65 To greet a policeman
- Q.66 Lodge a complaint at the police station

Yes	No
1	2
1	2
1	2

**DO YOU FEAR:**

- Q.67 A policeman in uniform
- Q.68 A detective (plain clothes)

Yes	No
1	2
1	2

**Q.69 DO YOU AS A MEMBER OF SOCIETY, HAVE A DUTY TO COMBAT CRIME?**

Undoubtedly	1
To a large extent	2
Uncertain	3
To a lesser extent	4
Not at all	5



**Q.70 ARE YOU WILLING TO ASSIST THE POLICE TO COMBAT CRIME:**

Always	1
Often	2
Uncertain	3
Sometimes	4
Never	5

**Q.71 DO YOU REGARD YOURSELF AS AN IMPORTANT LINK IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM?**

Yes	1
No	2

**INDICATE YOUR OPINION OF THE SERVICE RENDERED BY THE LOCAL POLICE**

**Key**    SA    Strongly agree  
           A    Agree  
           U    Uncertain  
           DA    Disagree  
           SDA   Strongly Disagree

- Q.72** Local police are doing a good job
- Q.73** Local police need more power to arrest and charge perpetrators
- Q.74** Police are prompt
- Q.75** Police are cooperative
- Q.76** Police are friendly
- Q.77** Police are helpful
- Q.78** Police are courteous
- Q.79** Police are uninterested

SA	A	U	DA	SDA
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5

**Q.80 HOW OFTEN DO THE POLICE PATROL YOUR NEIGHBOURHOOD?**

Monthly	1
Weekly	2
Daily	3
Seldom	4
Never	5

**SECTION F: PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES**

**HAVE YOU TAKEN ANY STEPS (PRECAUTIONS) TO PROTECT YOUR PROPERTY AGAINST ANY TYPE OF CRIME?**

**PLEASE MARK EACH MEASURE BELOW**

Type of Security Measure	
<b>Q.81 Do you lock the doors of your home</b>	
<b>Q.82 Acquisition of guard dog</b>	
<b>Q.83 Installation of alarm system</b>	
<b>Q.84 Extra outside lights</b>	
<b>Q.85 Fixing of deadlocks on doors</b>	
<b>Q.86 Fixing of burglar-proofing</b>	
<b>Q.87 Valuables engraved, photographed and serial numbers kept</b>	
<b>Q.88 Installed security warning lights</b>	
<b>Q.89 Radio/TV/Lights left on while not at home</b>	
<b>Q.90 Erection of concrete walls to keep out intruders</b>	
<b>Q.91 Acquisition of fire-arm</b>	

Yes	No
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2
1	2

**ARE THERE ANY PRECAUTIONS THAT YOU TAKE TO PROTECT YOURSELF AGAINST A PHYSICAL ATTACK?**

**PLEASE MARK EACH MEASURE BELOW**

Type of Precaution	Yes	No
Q.92 Do not go out alone at night	1	2
Q.93 Do not go out alone during the day	1	2
Q.94 Carry a personal alarm	1	2
Q.95 Have done self-defence training	1	2
Q.96 Lock all doors whilst driving alone in my vehicle	1	2
Q.97 Notify others about my movements	1	2
Q.98 Carry a fire-arm	1	2

**Q.99 DURING THE PAST TWO YEARS, HAVE YOU ASKED A NEIGHBOUR TO KEEP A WATCHFUL EYE ON YOUR PROPERTY WHILE YOU WERE AWAY?**

Yes	1
No	2

**Q.100 DURING THE PAST TWO (2) YEARS HAS A NEIGHBOUR ASKED YOU TO KEEP A WATCHFUL EYE ON HIS/HER PROPERTY WHILE HE/SHE WERE AWAY?**

Yes	1
No	2

**Q.101 IF YOU WERE BEING ATTACKED AT HOME DO YOU KNOW IF YOUR NEIGHBOURS WOULD COME TO YOUR ASSISTANCE**

Yes	1
No	2

**Q.102 IS THERE ANY NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH SYSTEM OPERATING IN THE AREA WHERE YOU LIVE?**

Yes	1
No	2
Do not know	3

**Q.103 ARE YOU A MEMBER OF THIS NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH SYSTEM?**

Yes	1
No	2

**Q.104 WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO PARTICIPATE IN SUCH A SYSTEM?**

Yes	1
No	2

**ANNEXURE B****FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS TO ALL VARIABLES****TABLE B1: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE (N = 385)**

<b>DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS</b>	<b>FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>GENDER</b>		
Male	151	39.20
Female	234	60.80
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>MARITAL STATUS</b>		
Married	161	141.80
Widowed	15	3.90
Divorced	24	6.20
Separated	2	0.50
Single	183	47.50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>AGE</b>		
18-24	85	22.10
25-34	138	35.80
35-44	104	27.00
45-54	40	10.40
55-64	15	3.90
65>	3	0.80
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>ETHNIC GROUP</b>		
Black	285	76.60
White	100	23.40
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS</b>		
Below standard 8	11	2.90
Standard 8	9	2.30
Standard 9	12	3.10
Standard 10	155	60.30
Diploma	120	31.20
Degree	78	20.30
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>OCCUPATION</b>		
Unemployed	40	10.40
Semi-skilled worker	19	4.90
Professional worker	155	40.30
Technical/related worker	21	5.40
Businessman/sales	17	4.40
Administrative worker	41	10.70

Student	70	8.20
Service worker	14	3.60
Armed forces	6	1.60
Agricultural worker	0	0.00
Self-employed	2	0.50
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>AREA OF RESIDENCE</b>		
Empangeni	180	6.8
Richards Bay	205	53.2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>TYPE OF HOUSING</b>		
Brick housing	290	75.3
Connected housing	88	
Alternative forms	7	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION</b>		
Single	40	10.40
Two persons	57	14.80
Three persons	69	17.90
Four persons	78	20.30
Five or more persons	141	36.60
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**TABLE B2: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ON FEAR OF CRIME (N = 385)**

<b>RESPONSE CATEGORIES</b>	<b>WALKING ALONE</b>		<b>HOME ALONE</b>		<b>LEAVING/ARRIVING HOME</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Very safe	41	10.60	61	15.80	35	9.10
Fairly safe	124	32.20	165	42.90	164	42.60
Fairly unsafe	104	27.00	86	22.30	109	28.30
Very unsafe	116	30.10	73	19.00	77	20.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**TABLE B3: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS TO FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION (N = 385)**

Response Categories	Rape (away)		Rape (home)		Killed (home)		Killed (away)		Robbery		Assault		Abduction		Shot at	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not fearful at all	140	36.40	140	36.40	40	10.40	37	9.60	32	8.30	35	9.1	68	17.70	48	12.50
A little fearful	31	8.10	28	7.30	63	16.40	54	15.30	70	18.20	72	18.7	66	17.10	46	11.90
Quite fearful	26	6.80	26	6.80	47	12.20	51	13.20	102	26.50	114	29.6	60	15.60	45	11.70
Very fearful	188	48.80	191	49.60	235	61.00	238	61.80	181	47.00	164	42.6	191	49.60	246	63.90
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**TABLE B4 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS TO FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME**

Response Categories	Housebreaking		Property Damage		Arson		Vehicle broken Into		Hijacking	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not fearful at all	35	9.10	37	9.60	59	15.30	37	9.60	48	12.50
A little fearful	73	19.00	74	19.20	53	13.80	58	15.10	51	13.20
Quite fearful	95	24.70	131	34.00	46	11.90	97	25.20	64	16.60
Very fearful	182	47.30	143	37.10	227	59.00	193	50.10	222	57.70
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**TABLE B5: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PREVIOUS PERSONAL VICTIMISATION EXPERIENCE (N = 385)**

Response Categories	Raped		Robbed/ Mugged		Shot at		Stoned	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	22	5.70	57	14.80	10	2.60	31	8.10
No	363	94.30	325	85.20	375	97.40	354	91.90
TOTAL	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00

**TABLE B6: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PREVIOUS PROPERTY CRIME (N = 385)**

Response Categories	Housebreaking		Property Damage		Vehicle Broken into		Vehicle Stolen	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	92	23.90	89	23.10	70	18.20	35	9.10
No	293	76.10	296	76.40	315	81.80	350	90.90
TOTAL	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00



**TABLE B7: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS' RATING OF TYPE OF CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM IN THEIR AREA OF RESIDENCE (N = 385)**

Types of crime	Categories of Responses									
	No Problem at all		Less of a Problem		More of a Problem		Very Problematic		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Statutory Crime</b>										
Traffic violations	83	21.60	126	32.70	96	24.90	80	20.80	385	100.00
Driving under the influence of alcohol	38	9.90	108	28.10	110	28.60	129	33.50	385	100.00
<b>Personal Crimes</b>										
Rape	144	37.40	87	22.60	66	17.10	88	22.90	385	100.00
Robbery	32	8.30	87	22.60	122	31.70	144	37.40	385	100.00
Assault	45	11.70	109	28.30	111	28.80	120	31.20	385	100.00
Killed	69	17.90	109	28.30	79	20.50	128	33.20	385	100.00
Abduction	99	25.70	141	36.60	67	17.40	78	20.30	385	100.00
<b>Property Crimes</b>										
Housebreaking	28	7.30	78	20.30	106	27.50	173	44.90	385	100.00
Theft of/out of vehicle	36	9.40	78	20.30	95	24.70	176	45.70	385	100.00
Other forms of theft	34	8.80	70	18.20	93	24.20	188	48.80	385	100.00
Vandalism	55	14.30	128	33.20	109	28.30	93	24.20	385	100.00
Hijacking	90	23.40	85	22.10	82	21.30	128	33.20	385	100.00
Bag snatching	69	17.90	109	28.30	79	20.50	128	33.20	385	100.00

**TABLE B8: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CONTACT WITH THE POLICE**  
**(N = 385)**

Types of Contact	Frequency Distribution	
	N	%
Accused/convicted	19	4.90
Accused/acquitted	38	9.90
Suspect	31	8.10
Victim	62	16.10
Witness	37	9.60
Informant	16	4.20
No contact	182	47.30
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100.00</b>

TABLE B9: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CONTACT WITH THE POLICE (N = 385)

Response	Always		Often		Sometimes		Never		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Victim	134	34.80	30	7.80	103	26.80	118	30.60	385	100.00
Knowledge	104	37.00	35	9.10	109	28.30	137	35.60	385	100.00

**TABLE B10: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF REASONS FOR NOT REPORTING CRIME (N = 385)**

	Yes		No		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bother police	313	34.00	254	66.00	385	100.00
No proper attention	210	54.50	175	45.50	385	100.00
No prompt	216	56.10	169	43.90	385	100.00
Unsolvable case	198	51.40	187	48.60	385	100.00
Police unable to solve	207	53.80	178	46.20	385	100.00
Society uninterested	92	23.60	293	76.10	385	100.00
Settled personally	118	30.60	267	69.40	385	100.00
Personal nature	132	34.30	253	65.70	385	100.00
Time consuming	119	30.90	266	69.10	385	100.00
Dislike of involvement	153	39.70	232	60.30	385	100.00
Negative attitude	186	48.30	199	51.70	385	100.00
Guilty party	155	40.30	230	59.70	385	100.00
Partiality of police	168	43.60	217	56.40	385	100.00
Fear of retaliation	173	44.90	212	55.10	385	100.00

**TABLE B11: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS' FEAR OF POLICEMAN (N = 385)**

Fear of Policeman	Yes		No		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Fear of policeman (uniform)	74	19.20	311	80.80	385	100.00
Fear of policeman (plain clothes)	82	21.30	303	78.70	385	100.00

**TABLE B12: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF FEELINGS TOWARD CONTACT WITH THE POLICE (N = 385)**

FEAR TOWARD CONTACT	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION					
	YES		NO		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Call on police	207	53.80	178	46.20	385	100.00
Greet a policeman	217	56.40	168	43.60	385	100.00
Lodge a complaint	222	57.70	163	52.30	385	100.00

**TABLE B13: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS' OPINION  
ON THEIR DUTY TO COMBAT CRIME (N = 385)**

Attitude Towards		Frequency Distribution	
	Fighting Crime	N	%
A.	<u>Duty to combat crime</u>		
	Undoubtedly	86	22.30
	To a large extent	93	24.20
	Uncertain	49	12.70
	To a lesser extent	50	13.00
	Not at all	107	27.80
	TOTAL	385	100.00
B.	<u>Willingness to assist police</u>		
	Always	160	41.60
	Often	57	14.80
	Uncertain	42	10.90
	Sometimes	86	22.30
	Never	40	10.40
	TOTAL	385	100.00
C.	<u>Important link in CJS</u>		
	Yes	229	59.50
	No	156	40.50
	TOTAL	385	100.00

**TABLE B14: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLIC'S OPINION OF POLICE PERFORMANCE (N = 385)**

Opinion	Strongly Agree		Agree		Uncertain		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Good job	58	15.00	75	19.50	120	31.20	67	17.40	65	16.90	385	100.00
More power	160	41.60	118	30.60	60	15.60	28	7.30	19	4.90	385	100.00
Prompt	67	17.40	78	20.30	137	35.60	54	14.00	49	12.70	385	100.00
Co-operate	53	13.80	100	26.00	129	33.50	59	15.30	44	11.40	385	100.00
Friendly	48	12.50	89	23.10	146	37.90	57	14.80	45	11.70	385	100.00
Helpful	47	12.20	104	27.00	134	34.80	51	13.30	49	12.70	385	100.00
Courteous	40	10.40	102	26.05	167	43.40	43	11.20	33	8.60	385	100.00
Uninterested	45	11.70	61	15.80	140	36.40	65	16.90	74	19.20	385	100.00

**TABLE B15: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SECURITY MEASURES TAKEN TO PROTECT PROPERTY (N = 385)**

[illegible]

**TABLE B16: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SECURITY MEASURES TAKEN TO PROTECT PERSON (N = 385)**

[illegible]



**TABLE B17: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF INVOLVEMENT OF NEIGHBOURS AS A PROTECTIVE MEASURE (N = 385)**

Category of Responses	Asked Neighbour		Asked by Neighbour		Neighbour come to your aid	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	313	81.30	297	77.10	229	59.50
No	72	18.70	88	22.90	156	40.50
TOTAL	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00

**TABLE B18: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF INVOLVEMENT IN A NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAMME**

Category of Responses	Neighbourhood Watch		Present Membership		Willingness to be a member	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	93	24.20	57	14.80	236	61.30
No	292	75.80	328	85.20	149	38.70
TOTAL	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00

## SPEARMAN'S RANK-ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENT

TABLE B19: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION AND THE FEAR OF CRIME (N = 385)

FEAR OF CRIME	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	
	rho	probability
Walking alone	0.9317	0.0678
Home alone	0.1773	0.0005*
Leaving/arriving at home	0.1110	0.0294*

TABLE B20: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION (N = 385)

FEAR OF PERSONAL CRIME	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	
	rho	probability
Being raped (at home)	0.15479	0.0023*
Being raped (away from home)	0.14810	0.0036*
Being killed (at home)	0.15852	0.0018*
Being killed (away from home)	0.16047	0.0016*
Being robbed or mugged	0.10769	0.0347*
Being physically assaulted	0.08814	0.0841
Being abducted	0.08116	0.1118
Being shot at	0.18667	0.0002*

TABLE B21: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME (N = 385)

FEAR OF PERSONAL CRIME	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	
	rho	probability
Housebreaking	0.12779	0.0121*
Damage to property	0.09452	0.0639
Arson	0.18183	0.0003*
Vehicle broken into	0.07692	0.1319
Ambushed while driving a motor vehicle	0.12197	0.0166*

**TABLE B22: STATUTORY CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND FEAR OF CRIME (N = 385)**

STATUTORY CRIME	WALKING ALONE AT NIGHT		HOME ALONE		LEAVING/ARRIVING HOME	
	rho	prob	rho	prob	rho	prob
Traffic violations	0.11352	0.0259*	0.04119	0.4203	0.19062	0.002*
Driving under the influence of alcohol	0.03842	0.4519	0.08280	0.1048	0.09481	0.0631

**TABLE B23: PERSONAL VICTIMISATION AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND FEAR OF CRIME (N = 385)**

PERSONAL VICTIMISATION	WALKING ALONE		HOME ALONE		LEAVING/ ARRIVING HOME	
	rho	prob	rho	prob	rho	prob
Rape	0.25440	0.0001*	0.25726	0.0001*	0.26826	0.0001*
Robbery	0.16797	0.0009*	0.16578	0.0011*	0.24935	0.0001*
Assault	0.14882	0.0034*	0.21097	0.0001*	0.18562	0.0003*
Shot at	0.27399	0.0001*	0.28481	0.0001*	0.19313	0.0001*
Abduction	0.15067	0.0037*	0.20354	0.0001*	0.22341	0.0001*

**TABLE B24: PROPERTY CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND FEAR OF CRIME (N=385)**

PROPERTY CRIME	WALKING ALONE		BEING ALONE		LEAVING/ ARRIVING HOME	
	rho	prob	rho	prob	rho	prob
Housebreaking	0.22980	0.0001*	0.26259	0.0001*	0.28845	0.0001*
Theft off/from vehicle	0.13176	0.0096*	0.19103	0.0002*	0.22744	0.0001*
Other theft	0.17861	0.0004*	0.17211	0.0007*	0.23267	0.0001*
Vandalism	0.17342	0.0006*	0.18051	0.0004*	0.23185	0.0001*
Hijacking	0.13115	0.0100*	0.13759	0.0069*	0.19313	0.0001*
Bagsnatching	0.17668	0.0005*	0.19994	0.0001*	0.28301	0.0001*

TABLE B25: STATUTORY CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND POLICE PERFORMANCE (N = 385)

	Good job	More powers	Prompt	Cooper- ative	Friendly	Helpful	Courteo- us	Not intereste- d
Traffic violation	0.05378	0.06079	0.07199	0.06827	0.04769	0.01545	0.03476	0.00533
Driving under the influence of alcohol	0.19800*	0.00716	0.15434*	0.14829*	0.14819*	0.04397	0.08853	-0.05113

TABLE B26: PERSONAL VICTIMISATION AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND POLICE PERFORMANCE (N = 385)

	Good job	More powers	Prompt	Coopera- tive	Friendly	Helpful	Courteous	Not interested
Rape	0.18041*	0.12111*	0.11428*	0.10988*	0.12899*	0.08101	0.14194*	-0.03201
Robbery	0.29260*	0.07736	0.18421*	0.17781*	0.16127*	0.14324*	0.18911*	-0.01158
Assault	0.27881*	0.09831	0.19308*	0.18825*	0.14142*	0.14312*	0.18317*	0.00432
Shot at	0.19515*	0.11970*	0.12213*	0.16206*	0.10722*	0.13865*	0.17759*	-0.10720*
Abduction	0.17496*	0.09137	0.11228*	0.22135*	0.21522*	0.14340*	0.22312*	-0.07503

TABLE B27: RATING OF PROPERTY CRIME AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM AND POLICE PERFORMANCE (N = 385)

	Good job	More powers	Prompt	Coopera- tive	Friendly	Helpful	Cour- teous	Not Interested
Housebreaking	0.17101*	0.09358	0.18153*	0.18114*	0.20718*	0.19628*	0.17160	-0.06952
Theft of/out of vehicle	0.23073*	0.11954*	0.16717*	0.16782*	0.18245*	0.14774*	0.15226*	-0.04741
Other theft	0.20007*	0.11458*	0.17880*	0.20710*	0.22495*	0.23597*	0.20277*	-0.10796*
Vandalism	0.225387*	0.04739	0.21108*	0.24480*	0.25955*	0.17810*	0.20750*	-0.12298*
Hijacking	0.22255*	0.12518*	0.20806*	0.20252*	0.21453*	0.16757*	0.15731*	-0.08562
Bag snatching	0.17158*	0.04450	0.09614	0.11658*	0.14600*	0.08604	0.17175*	-0.06329

TABLE B28: FEAR OF CRIME, CONTACT WITH THE POLICE AND CRIME REPORTING (N = 385)

Contact with police and crime reporting	Walking alone		Home alone		Leaving/arriving at home	
	rho	prob	rho	prob	rho	prob
Contact with police	-0.02410	0.6373	-0.10325	0.0429*	-0.04088	0.4238
Report crime (victim)	-0.06071	0.2347	0.00302	0.9529	0.01110	0.8281
Report crime (knowledge)	0.00503	0.9216	-0.00585	0.9090	0.04297	0.4004
<u>Reasons for not reporting crime</u>						
Bother police	0.08879	0.0819	0.08671	0.0893	0.11808	0.0205*
No proper attention	0.02290	0.6542	0.08780	0.0853	0.05968	0.2427
Not prompt	0.13738	0.0069*	0.06913	0.1759	0.08707	0.0880
Unsolvable case	0.12738	0.0124*	0.11254	0.0272*	0.13351	0.0087*
Police unable to solve	0.07618	0.1357	0.07862	0.1236	0.08503	0.0957
Society uninterested	0.08384	0.1005	0.04190	0.4124	0.03021	0.5545
Settled personally	0.05073	0.3208	0.07082	0.1655	0.00314	0.9510
Personal nature	-0.02641	0.6054	-0.02222	0.6638	-0.03659	0.4741
Time consuming	0.07948	0.1195	-0.00669	0.8959	0.02437	0.6335
Dislike-involvement	0.04465	0.3823	-0.01355	0.7910	0.01361	0.7901
Negative attitude	0.10117	0.0473*	0.09474	0.0633	0.12097	0.0176*
Guilty party	0.06263	0.2201	0.15711	0.0020*	0.13066	0.0103*
Partiality of the police	0.11603	0.0228*	0.12537	0.0138*	0.13066	0.0103*
Fear of retaliation	0.08680	0.0890	0.09564	0.0608	0.10279	0.0438*

**TABLE B29: FEAR OF CRIME AND THE RESPONDENTS' FEELINGS TOWARD CONTACT WITH THE POLICE (N = 385)**

Feelings towards contact	Walking alone		Being alone		Leaving/arriving at home	
	rho	prob	rho	prob	rho	prob
Call on police	0.10972	0.0314*	0.08558	0.0936	0.12140	0.0172*
Greet a policeman	0.06658	0.1923	0.02224	0.6636	0.10058	0.0486*
Lodge a complaint	0.04914	0.3363	0.01117	0.8270	0.06994	0.1709

**TABLE B30: FEAR OF CRIME AND THE PUBLIC'S OBLIGATION TOWARDS CRIME PREVENTION (N = 385)**

Public's Opinion	Walking alone		Being alone		Leaving/arriving at home	
	rho	prob	rho	prob	rho	prob
Duty to combat crime	-0.06629	0.1943	0.02826	0.5803	-0.04231	0.4077
Willing to assist	0.00861	0.4325	0.00192	0.9700	-0.00962	0.8507
Important link	-0.04789	0.3487	0.03413	0.5043	-0.02514	0.6229

**TABLE B31: FEAR OF CRIME AND THE PUBLIC'S OPINION OF POLICE PERFORMANCE (N = 385)**

Public's opinion	Walking alone		Being alone		Leaving/arriving at home	
	rho	prob	rho	prob	rho	prob
Local police do a good job	0.17356	0.0006*	0.16950	0.0008*	0.20747	0.0001*
Local police should have more power	0.10395	0.0415*	0.11397	0.0253*	0.09342	0.0671
Local police are prompt	0.09999	0.0499*	0.07077	0.1658	0.13257	0.0092*
Local police are co-operative	0.13296	0.0090*	0.12375	0.0151*	0.15151	0.0029*
Local police are friendly	0.09191	0.0716	0.07202	0.1584	0.11908	0.0194*
Local police are helpful	0.14260	0.0051*	0.17639	0.0005*	0.12149	0.0171*
Local police are courteous	0.18945	0.0002*	0.19466	0.0001*	0.18383	0.0003*
Local police are not interested in the case	-0.04838	0.3438	-0.11066	0.0299*	-0.03290	0.5198

**TABLE B32: FEAR OF CRIME AND POLICE VISIBILITY (N = 385)**

Police Visibility	Walking alone		Being alone		Leaving/arriving at home	
	rho	prob	rho	prob	rho	prob
Fear of policeman (uniform)	-0.04035	0.4298*	-0.07618	0.1357	-0.09003	0.0777
Fear of policeman (plain clothes)	-0.03645	0.4757	-0.09580	0.0604	-0.07788	0.1272
Patrolling of neighbourhood	0.04332	0.3966	0.27792	0.0001*	0.04225	0.4084

## PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT

TABLE B33: AGE AND FEAR OF CRIME (N = 385)

FEAR OF CRIME	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	
	r	probability
Walking alone	0.07899	0.1218
Home alone	-0.04433	0.3857
Leaving/arriving at home	-0.08202	0.1081

TABLE B34: AGE AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION (N = 385)

PERSONAL CRIMES	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	
	r	probability
Rape (at home)	-0.10556	0.0384*
Rape (away from home)	-0.12127	0.0173*
Being killed (at home)	-0.14217	0.0052*
Being killed (away from home)	-0.11894	0.0196*
Being robbed or mugged	-0.01923	0.7068
Physical assault	0.01888	0.7119
Abducted	-0.14973	0.0032*
Shot at with AK 47	-0.07385	0.1481

TABLE B35: AGE AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME (N = 385)

PROPERTY CRIMES	CORRELATION COEFFICIENT	
	rho	probability
Housebreaking	0.04951	0.3326
Damage to property	-0.00961	0.8809
Arson	-0.14693	0.0039*
Vehicles broken into	-0.00168	0.9738
Ambushed whilst driving	-0.10096	0.0478*



## F-TEST

TABLE B36: GENDER AND FEAR OF CRIME (N = 385)

PERSONAL CRIMES	MALES		FEMALES		F-VALUE
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Walking alone	2.48	0.98	2.95	0.97	20.96*
Home alone	2.30	0.92	2.54	1.00	5.68*
Leaving/arriving at home	2.40	0.84	2.74	0.93	11.78*

TABLE B37: GENDER AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION (N= 385)

PERSONAL CRIMES	MALES		FEMALES		F-VALUE
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Rape (at home)	1.42	0.95	3.49	0.95	432.61*
Rape (away from home)	1.50	1.06	3.47	0.98	347.15*
Killed (at home)	3.00	1.16	3.39	0.97	12.88*
Killed (away from home)	3.03	1.12	3.43	0.96	13.59*
Robbed or mugged	2.88	1.06	3.28	0.91	15.44*
Physical assault	2.92	1.03	3.15	0.95	4.80*
Abducted	2.73	1.23	3.12	1.11	10.34*
Shot at with an AK 47	3.11	1.11	3.38	1.06	5.71*

TABLE B38: GENDER AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME (N = 385)

PROPERTY CRIMES	MALES		FEMALES		F-VALUE
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Housebreaking	2.81	1.09	3.29	0.90	22.15*
Damage to property	2.87	0.98	3.06	0.97	3.35
Arson	2.96	1.20	3.26	1.10	6.54*
Vehicle broken into	2.99	1.05	3.26	0.97	6.78*
Ambushed whilst driving	3.03	1.31	3.30	1.04	6.08*

TABLE B39: TYPE OF HOUSING AND THE FEAR OF CRIME (N=385)

FEAR OF CRIME	TYPE OF DWELLING						F-VALUE
	BRICK		CONNECTED		ALTERNATIVE		
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Walking alone	2.76	0.97	2.86	1.05	2.65	1.14	0.52
Home alone	2.43	0.93	2.55	1.16	2.38	1.04	0.46
Leaving/arriving at home	2.60	0.92	2.66	0.97	2.46	0.73	0.54

TABLE B40: TYPE OF HOUSING AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION (N = 385)

PERSONAL VICTIMISATION	TYPE OF DWELLING						F-VALUE
	BRICK		CONNECTED		ALTERNATIVE		
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Rape (at home)	2.66	1.40	2.66	1.14	2.87	1.32	0.36
Rape (away from home)	2.70	1.39	2.59	1.48	2.86	1.29	0.45
Killed (at home)	3.23	1.05	3.21	1.20	3.35	0.95	0.24
Killed (away from home)	3.26	1.03	3.26	1.15	3.43	0.93	0.48
Robbed or mugged	3.31	0.96	3.09	1.14	3.14	0.98	0.05
Physical assault	3.06	0.97	3.02	1.12	3.14	0.98	0.16
Abduction	2.97	1.17	2.93	1.26	3.05	1.13	0.13
Shot at	3.26	1.07	3.31	1.13	3.27	1.15	0.05

TABLE B41: TYPE OF HOUSING AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME (N= 385)

PROPERTY CRIMES	TYPE OF DWELLING						F-VALUE
	BRICK		CONNECTED		ALTERNATIVE		
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Housebreaking	3.12	0.99	3.02	1.08	3.11	1.07	0.24
Property damage	3.00	0.95	2.90	1.13	3.02	0.90	0.31
Arson	3.13	1.14	3.16	1.24	3.24	1.12	0.16
Vehicle broken into	3.17	0.99	3.20	1.08	3.00	1.05	0.51
Hijacking	3.20	1.07	3.16	1.17	3.22	1.08	0.05

TABLE B42: SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PREVIOUS PERSONAL VICTIMISATION EXPERIENCE AND FEAR OF CRIME (N = 385)

	Sexual Assault					Robbed/Mugged					Being Shot At					Being Stoned				
	Victims		Nonvictims		F-value	Victims		Nonvictims		F-value	Victims		Nonvictims		F-value	Victims		Non-victims		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Walking alone	3.00	1.07	2.75	0.99	1.28	3.21	0.96	2.69	0.99	13.68*	2.10	0.99	2.78	0.99	4.61*	2.64	0.98	2.78	1.00	0.49
Home alone	2.73	1.08	2.43	0.96	1.98	2.88	1.05	2.37	0.94	13.71*	2.30	1.06	2.45	0.97	0.23	2.48	0.89	2.44	0.98	0.06
Leaving/ arriving at home	2.73	0.94	2.58	0.91	0.52	3.07	0.90	2.51	0.89	19.40*	2.30	0.95	2.60	0.91	1.06	2.45	0.85	2.66	0.91	0.81

TABLE B43: SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PREVIOUS PERSONAL VICTIMISATION EXPERIENCE AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION (N = 385)

Fear of Personal Victimisation	Sexual Assault					Robbed/Mugged					Being Shot At					Being Stoned				
	Victims		Nonvictims		F- value	Victims		Nonvictims		F-value	Victims		Nonvictims		F- value	Victims		Nonvictims		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Rape (home)	2.84	1.44	2.67	1.39	0.23	2.74	1.40	2.67	1.39	0.11	2.20	1.32	2.69	1.39	1.23	2.39	1.41	2.71	1.39	1.51
Rape (away)	3.05	1.36	2.67	1.39	1.47	2.82	1.40	2.67	1.39	0.57	2.80	1.40	2.69	1.39	0.06	2.65	1.43	2.70	1.39	0.05
Killed (home)	2.64	0.66	3.21	1.08	3.26	3.54	0.83	3.18	1.09	5.54*	3.40	0.97	3.23	1.07	0.23	3.39	0.84	3.23	1.08	0.65
Robbery	3.68	0.78	3.25	1.05	3.63	3.49	0.89	3.23	1.06	2.96	3.40	1.07	3.27	1.04	0.15	3.32	0.98	3.27	1.05	0.08
Physical assault	3.36	0.95	3.11	0.99	1.40	3.49	0.83	3.06	1.00	9.56*	2.80	1.14	3.13	0.98	1.10	3.13	1.02	3.12	0.98	0.00
Abduction	3.14	1.13	2.96	1.18	0.46	3.21	1.05	2.93	1.19	2.79	3.00	1.25	2.97	1.73	0.01	3.13	0.96	2.96	1.19	0.61
Shot at	3.50	1.06	3.26	1.09	1.04	3.51	0.91	3.23	1.11	3.23	3.50	0.85	3.26	1.10	0.46	3.32	1.05	3.27	1.09	0.08

**TABLE B44: SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PREVIOUS PERSONAL VICTIM VICTIMISATION EXPERIENCE AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME (N = 385)**

Fear of Property Crimes	Sexual Assault					Robbed/Mugged					Being Shot At					Being Stoned				
	Victims		Nonvictims		F-value	Victims		Nonvictims		F-value	Victims		Nonvictims		F-value	Victims		Nonvictims		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Housebreaking	3.50	0.74	3.01	1.02	3.67	3.42	0.94	3.05	1.01	6.82*	2.40	1.17	3.12	1.00	5.01*	2.94	1.12	3.12	1.00	0.91
Property damage	3.18	1.01	2.08	0.97	0.93	3.42	0.84	2.91	0.98	13.70*	2.60	1.17	3.00	0.07	1.62	2.77	0.96	3.01	0.98	1.61
Arson	3.41	1.10	3.13	1.15	1.23	3.35	0.94	3.11	1.18	2.14	3.20	1.14	3.14	1.15	0.02	3.13	0.99	3.15	1.16	0.01
Vehicle broken into	3.32	0.89	3.15	1.01	0.59	3.49	0.80	3.10	1.03	7.43*	3.20	0.92	3.16	1.01	0.02	3.00	0.89	3.17	1.02	0.83
Hijacking	3.50	0.96	3.18	1.09	1.86	3.52	0.91	3.14	1.10	6.36*	3.70	0.92	3.19	1.09	0.00	3.42	0.92	3.18	1.09	1.45

**TABLE B45: SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PREVIOUS PROPERTY VICTIMISATION AND FEAR OF CRIME (N = 385)**

Fear of Crime	Housebreaking					Property Damage					Vehicle Broken Into					Vehicle Stolen				
	Victims		Nonvictims		F- value	Victims		Nonvictims		F- value	Victims		Nonvictims		F- value	Victims		Nonvictims		F- value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Walking alone	2.97	1.03	2.70	0.98	4.98*	2.85	1.10	2.74	1.00	0.89	3.01	0.92	2.71	1.00	5.34*	2.97	0.86	2.75	1.01	1.63
Home alone	2.79	0.99	2.33	0.94	16.22*	2.67	1.00	2.38	0.96	6.75*	2.61	1.01	2.41	0.96	2.63	2.83	0.92	2.41	0.97	6.10*
Leaving/arriving at home	2.85	0.90	2.51	0.90	9.79*	2.70	0.93	2.56	0.90	1.53	2.69	0.89	2.58	0.91	0.91	2.71	0.86	0.86	0.91	0.69

**TABLE B46: SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PROPERTY VICTIMISATION EXPERIENCE AND FEAR OF PERSONAL VICTIMISATION (N = 385)**

Fear of Personal Victimisation	House Breaking					Property Damage					Vehicle broken Into					Vehicle Stolen				
	Victims		Nonvictims		F- value	Victims		Nonvictims		F- value	Victims		Nonvictims		F- value	Victims		Nonvictims		F- value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Rape (home)	2.92	1.36	2.60	1.39	3.74	2.57	1.43	2.71	1.38	0.69	2.37	1.43	2.75	1.37	4.28*	2.34	1.39	2.71	1.38	2.29
Rape (away)	2.86	1.33	2.61	1.40	4.27*	2.63	1.43	2.72	1.38	0.27	2.37	1.43	2.77	1.38	4.70*	2.63	1.42	2.70	1.39	0.09
Killed (home)	3.51	0.87	3.15	1.10	8.02*	3.43	0.96	3.18	1.09	3.63	3.27	1.10	3.23	1.06	0.08	3.26	1.01	3.24	1.07	0.01
Robbery	3.49	0.92	3.20	1.07	5.28*	3.52	0.93	3.20	1.06	6.45*	3.14	1.12	3.30	1.02	1.33	3.26	0.98	3.27	1.06	0.01
Physical assault	3.32	0.96	3.06	0.99	4.68*	3.29	0.92	3.07	1.00	3.47	3.03	1.08	3.14	0.97	0.77	3.20	1.05	3.11	0.98	0.24
Abduction	3.16	1.06	2.91	1.20	3.24	3.16	1.05	2.92	1.20	2.92	2.94	1.18	2.98	1.74	0.05	2.86	1.14	2.98	1.18	0.36
Not at	3.46	0.97	3.21	1.12	3.56	3.43	0.96	3.22	1.12	2.41	3.31	1.06	3.26	1.10	0.43	3.40	0.95	3.26	1.10	0.55

**TABLE B47: SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN PREVIOUS PROPERTY VICTIMISATION EXPERIENCE AND FEAR OF PROPERTY CRIME (N = 385)**

Fear of Property Crimes	Housebreaking					Property damage					Vehicle broken into					Vehicle theft				
	Victims		Nonvictims		F-value	Victims		Nonvictims		F-value	Victims		Nonvictims		F-value	Victims		Nonvictims		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
House breaking	3.25	1.04	3.05	0.99	2.64	3.19	0.98	3.07	1.02	0.91	2.94	1.21	3.14	0.96	2.12	3.17	1.17	3.09	0.99	0.91
Property damage	3.11	0.94	2.95	0.98	1.89	3.16	0.88	2.93	1.00	3.56	2.94	1.00	3.00	0.97	0.18	3.20	0.93	2.97	0.98	1.84
Arson	3.41	0.95	3.06	1.19	6.64*	3.40	0.93	3.07	1.20	5.95*	3.20	1.16	3.13	1.15	0.19	3.17	1.18	3.14	1.15	0.02
Theft from vehicle	3.32	0.90	3.11	1.03	3.37	3.25	0.87	3.13	1.04	0.90	3.31	0.92	3.23	1.02	2.06	3.40	0.85	3.13	1.02	2.22
Hijacking	3.50	0.92	3.10	1.11	9.82*	3.37	0.99	3.14	1.11	3.07	3.27	1.05	3.18	1.09	0.14	3.25	0.98	3.19	1.09	0.13

TABLE B48: GENDER AND CONTACT WITH THE POLICE (N = 385)

Contact	Males		Females		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Juridical contact	4.77	2.08	5.43	1.94	9.81*
Report crime (victim)	2.12	1.16	2.48	1.27	8.23*
Report crime (knowledge)	2.30	1.17	2.68	1.24	9.27*
Bother police	1.28	0.45	1.38	0.48	3.42
No proper attention	1.56	0.50	1.53	0.50	0.30
Not prompt	1.60	0.49	1.54	0.50	1.23
Unsolvable case	1.54	0.50	1.50	0.50	0.49
Police unable to solve	1.56	0.50	1.52	0.50	0.64
Society uninterested	1.23	0.42	1.25	0.43	0.26
Settled personally	1.25	0.43	1.35	0.48	4.44*
Personal nature	1.32	0.47	1.36	0.48	0.69
Time consuming	1.28	0.45	1.32	0.47	0.69
Dislike involvement	1.37	0.49	1.41	0.49	0.73
Negative attitude	1.49	0.50	1.48	0.50	0.05
Guilty party	1.36	0.48	1.43	0.50	2.09
Partiality of police	1.40	0.49	1.46	0.50	1.06
Fear of retaliation	1.42	0.50	1.47	0.50	0.65

TABLE B49: GENDER AND FEELINGS TOWARDS CONTACT WITH POLICE (N = 385)

Feelings towards contact	Males		Females		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Call upon police	1.43	0.80	1.48	0.50	1.01
Greet a policeman	1.40	0.49	1.46	0.50	1.54
Lodge a complaint	1.36	0.48	1.47	0.50	4.43*

TABLE B50: GENDER AND OBLIGATION TO COMBAT CRIME (N = 385)

Obligation to combat crime	Males		Females		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Duty to combat crime	2.74	1.55	3.16	1.52	6.92*
Willing to assist	2.17	1.37	2.63	1.50	9.22*
Important link	1.35	0.48	1.44	0.50	3.04



**TABLE B51: GENDER AND PUBLIC'S OPINION OF POLICE PERFORMANCE (N = 385)**

Opinion	Males		Females		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Local police do a good job	2.88	1.29	3.10	1.28	2.75
Local police should have more power	1.91	1.09	2.11	1.17	3.05
Local police are prompt	2.89	1.25	2.81	1.23	0.40
Local police are cooperative	2.89	1.17	2.82	1.19	0.29
Local police are friendly	2.89	1.11	2.91	1.19	0.01
Local police are helpful	2.81	1.12	2.91	1.21	0.61
Local police are courteous	2.87	1.06	2.77	1.05	0.74
Local police are not interested in the case	3.17	1.18	3.15	1.30	0.02

**TABLE B52: GENDER AND POLICE VISIBILITY (N = 385)**

Police visibility	Males		Females		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Fear of policeman (uniform)	1.84	0.37	1.79	0.41	1.77
Fear of policeman (plain clothes)	1.80	0.40	1.78	0.42	0.30
Patrolling of neighbourhood	4.13	0.96	4.19	0.96	0.31

**TABLE B53: SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO ARE INVOLVED/UN-INVOLVED WITH THEIR NEIGHBOURS (N = 385)**

Fear of crime	Have asked					Have been asked					Don't know				
	Yes		No		F-value	Yes		No		F-value	Yes		No		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Walking home	2.85	0.98	2.39	1.05	13.04*	2.86	0.98	2.46	0.99	11.41*	2.71	1.01	2.98	1.04	1.75
Home alone	2.53	0.99	2.08	0.82	12.06*	2.54	0.98	2.13	0.87	12.66*	2.35	0.98	2.72	1.08	3.45*
Leaving/arriving at home	2.68	0.89	2.19	0.88	17.71*	2.65	0.91	2.40	0.88	5.29*	2.55	0.88	2.70	1.03	0.83

**TABLE B54: SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO ARE INVOLVED/UN-INVOLVED IN NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH PROGRAMMES (N = 385)**

Measures of the Fear of Crime	Neighbourhood Watch Exists							Membership of Programme					Willingness to participate				
	Exist		Doesn't exist		Don't know		F-value	Member		Non member		F-value	Willing		Unwilling		F-value
	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD		$\bar{x}$	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	
Walking home	2.83	1.03	2.77	1.04	2.79	0.88	0.35	2.51	1.04	2.81	0.99	4.49*	2.86	0.96	2.62	1.05	4.97*
Home alone	2.20	0.93	2.53	0.98	2.50	0.96	3.81*	2.26	0.95	2.48	0.97	2.33	2.48	0.97	2.39	0.98	0.77*
Leaving/arriving at home	2.53	0.88	2.59	0.94	2.66	0.88	0.46	2.44	0.85	2.62	0.92	1.92	2.69	0.89	2.44	0.92	6.66*

**CRONBACH'S COEFFICIENT ALPHA**

$$\alpha = \frac{K}{K-1} \times \frac{S^2 - \sum S_i^2}{S^2}$$

$S^2$  is total variance of the sum of the items

$S^2$  is the variance of an individual item

$K$  is number of items

**SPEARMAN'S RANK-ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENT**

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{6 \sum D^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}$$

$\sum D^2$  = sum of squared differences between ranks

$N$  = number of pairs of ranks

**PEARSON'S CORRELATION COEFFICIENT (r)**

Raw score formula  $r = \frac{N \sum XY - \sum X \sum Y}{\sqrt{(N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2)(N \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2)}}$

**F-TEST (FISHER TEST)**

$$F = \frac{MS_{bg}}{MS_{wg}}$$

$MS_{bg}$  = mean squares between groups

$MS_{wg}$  = mean squares within groups