

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Perceived community disorder moderates the relation between victimization and fear of crime

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/93444> since 2016-01-21T16:32:02Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1002/jcop.20470

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)



**Perceived community disorder moderates the relation
between victimization and fear of crime**

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>Journal of Community Psychology</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | JCOP-11-062 |
| Wiley - Manuscript type: | Brief Report |
| Keywords: | Fear of crime, Victimization, Disorder, Moderation |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

1
2
3
4
5
6 Running head: DISORDER, VICTIMIZATION AND FEAR OF CRIME
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 Perceived community disorder moderates the relation between victimization and fear of crime
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Michele Roccato, Silvia Russo, and Alessio Vieno
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Authors notes
34
35

36 Michele Roccato, Department of Psychology, University of Torino, Via Verdi 10, 10124
37
38 Torino, Italy. Telephone: +390116702015, Fax: +390116702061, E-mail: michele.roccato@unito.it
39
40 (corresponding author)
41
42

43 Silvia Russo, Department of Psychology, University of Torino, Via Verdi 10, 10124 Torino,
44
45 Italy. Telephone: +390116702055, Fax: +390116702061, E-mail: silvia.russo@unito.it
46
47

48 Alessio Vieno, Department of Developmental and social psychology, University of Padova,
49
50 Via Belzoni 80, 35131 Padova, Italy. Telephone +390498278479, Fax: +390498278451, E-mail:
51
52 alessio.vieno@unipd.it
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

60 Keywords: Fear of crime, Victimization, Disorder, Moderation

Abstract

In a representative sample of the Italian population ($N = 2,002$), surveyed in January 2008, we studied the direct and interactive effects exerted on fear of crime by direct and indirect victimization on the one hand and perceived level of disorder of participants' community on the other hand. Indirect victimization fostered fear of crime among participants reporting high levels of social disorder in their community. However, direct and indirect victimization did not influence fear of crime among participants reporting not to live in a disordered community. Implications and limitations of this work and possible further research directions are discussed.

Abstract word count = 99

1
2 Researchers are intrigued by the weak and often inconsistent links between victimization and
3
4 fear of crime (Tseloni & Zarafonitou, 2008). Some of them have even found the most fearful social
5
6 categories—women and the elderly—to be the least victimized ones (Balkin, 1979). This
7
8 “victimization-fear paradox” (LaGrange, Ferraro, & Supancic, 1992) has been tackled based on
9
10 three main lines of reasoning. Some researchers (e.g. Rountree, 1998) argued that when measuring
11
12 victimization analytically and fear of crime as a multidimensional construct, combining a cognitive
13
14 and an affective dimension, the paradox tends to disappear. Other authors (e.g. Farrall, Bannister,
15
16 Ditton, & Gilchrist, 2000) have pointed out that when respondents’ vulnerability is statistically
17
18 controlled for, a strong relationship between victimization and fear of crime can be detected.
19
20 Finally, some scholars argued that direct victimization triggers the search for urgent coping
21
22 strategies to a greater extent than indirect victimization does. Thus, indirect victimization should
23
24 more powerfully influence fear of crime than direct victimization (e.g. Gomme, 1988).
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 However, results obtained using such approaches have often been mixed, and the
32
33 “victimization-fear paradox” has not yet been fully explained. In this article we suggest a new
34
35 possible explanation for it. We have based our reasoning on Schultz and Tabanico (2009), who
36
37 experimentally showed that Neighborhood Watch (NW) schemes were only effective in affluent
38
39 communities, and that they sometimes heightened residents’ fear of crime in disadvantaged
40
41 communities. Based on Cialdini, Kallgren, and Reno’s (1991) Focus Theory of Normative Conduct,
42
43 Schultz and Tabanico interpreted these results arguing that NW signs push residents to deeply
44
45 explore their community and thus to make focal its contextual cues, either increasing or decreasing
46
47 perceptions of the crime rate. In other words, publicly posted NW signs “make salient the
48
49 contextual aspects of the community and serve to exacerbate pre-existing differences” (p. 1216):
50
51 Signs posed in low crime communities increase feeling of safety and reduce worries of being
52
53 victimized, and signs posed in high crime communities do the opposite.
54
55
56
57
58

59 Building on this evidence, we hypothesized that similar results would be found when
60
analyzing the victimization-fear of crime link. Victimization experiences, pushing residents to focus

1
2 on the contextual cues of the environment they live in, should foster their fear of crime if their
3
4 exploration brings them to see many signs of decay, in that urban blight—suggesting residents that
5
6 in their community social order is wavering—is one of the most effective predictors of fear of crime
7
8 (Lagrange et al., 1992). On the contrary, the exploration of a non-disordered community following
9
10 a victimization experience should not foster people's fear of crime, as they would not find in the
11
12 environment relevant signs of threat. Thus, in methodological terms, perceived community
13
14 disadvantage should moderate the relation between victimization and fear of crime: Such a link
15
16 should be much stronger in disadvantaged than in advantaged communities. Based on LaGrange
17
18 and colleagues (1992), we conceived community disadvantage in terms of social incivilities (such
19
20 as loiterers, unruly teenagers, begging, prostitution, and public drug use or sales) and physical
21
22 incivilities (such as abandoned cars, vandalized property, litter, and graffiti). Based on previous
23
24 research, we postulated social incivilities to exert stronger effects than physical incivilities (Russo,
25
26 Vieno, & Roccato, 2010).
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Method

34
35 We performed a secondary analysis on the data collected in January 2008 by the Observatory
36
37 of the North-West, a research institution of the University of Torino. The sample ($N = 2,002$) was
38
39 representative of the Italian population over 18 years of age according to gender, age, geopolitical
40
41 area of residence and size of area of residence.
42
43

44 We used as proxy variable for fear of crime the four-category item “Think of
45
46 micro-criminality. How would you define the situation regarding this problem in your area of
47
48 residence?”, and predicted it by performing a two-step hierarchic regression. In Step 1 we used
49
50 gender (1 = man, 0 = woman), age, years of education, number of sons/daughters (which in Italy
51
52 may be considered as a proxy of enjoying favorable economic conditions: see Bichi, 2005), and size
53
54 of area of residence to control for participants' vulnerability. Moreover, we used four variables
55
56 assessing victimization and perceived disorder. Based on Hale (1996), we computed direct and
57
58 indirect victimization indexes respectively aggregating offenses involving the participant
59
60

1
2 him/herself or his/her social network in the 12 months preceding the survey. The victimization
3
4 experiences we took into consideration were car theft, burglary in one's own home, pick-pocketing,
5
6 robbery, violent assault, and sexual assault. We computed the perception of social disorder as the
7
8 sum of the frequency of seeing, in one's own area of residence, people on drugs, prostitutes,
9
10 homeless and drunk people, loiterers, beggars, and people working illegally in the streets ($\alpha =$
11
12 $.751$). Finally, we computed the perception of physical disorder through four items assessing the
13
14 presence in participants' area of residence of abandoned houses and signs of vandalism such as
15
16 burnt out garbage bins, abandoned cars and broken telephone boxes ($\alpha = .583$). We computed these
17
18 disorder indexes based on Taylor (1999). We considered the alpha of the physical disorder items to
19
20 be sufficiently high, given the small number of items and their reasonable mean correlation ($\bar{r} =$
21
22 $.26$). In Step 2 we included the four interactions between direct and indirect victimization and
23
24 physical and social disorder.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Results

32
33 Table 1 displays the results of our hierarchic regression. In Step 1, vulnerability (assessed in
34
35 terms of being a woman, a young person, a poorly educated person, and an urban dweller) was
36
37 positively associated with fear of crime, even if the number of sons and daughters and
38
39 unsatisfactory health did not influence it. Perceived social and physical disorder fostered fear of
40
41 crime while, consistent with the "victimization-fear paradox", direct and indirect victimization did
42
43 not directly influence it. However, the interaction between indirect victimization and perceived
44
45 social disorder, entered in Step 2, did directly influence fear of crime. A simple slope analysis (see
46
47 Figure 1) showed that indirect victimization fostered fear of crime when participants perceived their
48
49 community as characterized by a high degree of social disorder, simple slope = $.086$, $t(2000) =$
50
51 4.165 , $p < .001$, while it did not influence it when one's own community was not perceived as being
52
53 particularly disordered, simple slope = $-.038$, $t(2000) = -1.340$, $p = .180$. The other three
54
55 victimization-perceived disorder interactions did not influence fear of crime.
56
57
58
59
60

Discussion

1
2 Our analyses showed that research on fear of crime can be fine-tuned by analyzing the
3
4 moderator effect exerted by perceived community disorder on the link between victimization and
5
6 fear of crime. Indeed, victimization influenced fear of crime only when a high degree of social
7
8 disorder was perceived in participants' community. Consistent with Gomme (1988), indirect
9
10 victimization played a more relevant role than direct victimization, implicitly confirming that it is
11
12 somewhat more difficult to cope with indirect than with direct victimization. As concerns disorder,
13
14 we showed that social incivilities concur to predict fear of crime both directly and moderating the
15
16 victimization-fear link, while physical incivilities fostered it only directly. This result suggests that
17
18 "zero tolerance" policies would be better focused on combating social rather than physical disorder.
19
20
21
22

23 This research has three limitations. First, our fear of crime measure was not fully satisfactory.
24
25 Even though it has a fairly long tradition in Italian research and has produced fairly consistent
26
27 results (see for instance Russo & Roccato, 2010), it should only be considered as a proxy variable
28
29 for fear of crime, in that it plausibly assesses a mix of fear of crime and crime risk perception.
30
31 Moreover, the indirect effect we detected was very small. The weakness of this effect may be
32
33 attributed, at least in part, to methodological rather than theoretical reasons. Indeed, as we used
34
35 secondary analysis, we were able to use plausibly suboptimal items. New research performed using
36
37 more satisfactory scales will likely produce stronger results. Furthermore, our disorder indexes
38
39 measured individual perceptions and not actual community features. Perkins and Taylor (1996)
40
41 showed that self-report measures and on-site assessments of disorder strongly correlate. However, it
42
43 would be desirable to conduct new research using a multilevel approach to model the effects
44
45 exerted on fear of crime by resident and community characteristics.
46
47
48
49
50

51 In spite of these limitations, we believe that our results are relevant from two different points
52
53 of view. From the theoretical point of view, they could be the basis for a new explanation of the
54
55 "victimization-fear paradox". From the point of view of policy making, they may be considered as
56
57 the basis for fine-tuning the approaches aimed at combating fear of crime by adapting them to the
58
59 characteristics of the communities in which people live (e.g. Robert, 1991).
60

References

- 1
2
3
4 Balkin, S. (1979). Victimization rates, safety and fear of crime. *Social Problems*, 26(3), 343-358.
- 5
6
7 Bichi, R. (2005). Più o meno giovani [Young? More or less]. In V. Cesareo (Ed.), *Ricomporre la*
8
9 *vita* [Reassembling life] (pp. 266-291). Roma: Carocci.
- 10
11 Cialdini, R. B., Kallgren, C. A., & Reno, R. R. (1991). A focus theory of normative conduct: A
12
13 theoretical refinement and reevaluation of the role of norms in human behavior. In M. P.
14
15 Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 21, pp. 201-234). San Diego,
16
17 CA: Academic Press.
- 18
19
20
21 Farrall, S., Bannister, J., Ditton, J., & Gilchrist, E. (2000). Social psychology and the fear of crime:
22
23 Re-examining a speculative model. *British Journal of Criminology*, 40(3), 339-413.
- 24
25
26 Gomme, I. M. (1988). The role of experience in the production of fear of crime: A test of a causal
27
28 model. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 30(1), 67-76.
- 29
30
31 Hale, C. (1996). Fear of crime: A review of the literature. *International Review of Victimology*,
32
33 4(2), 79-150.
- 34
35
36 LaGrange, R. L., Ferraro, K. F., & Supancic, M. (1992). Perceived risk and fear of crime: Role of
37
38 social and physical incivilities. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 29, 311-334.
39
40 doi: 10.1177/0022427892029003004
- 41
42
43 Perkins, D. D., & Taylor, R. B. (1996). Ecological assessment of community disorder: Their
44
45 relationship to fear of crime and theoretical implications. *American Journal of Community*
46
47 *Psychology*, 24, 63-107. doi: 10.1007/BF02511883
- 48
49
50 Robert, Ph. (Ed.) (1991). *Les politiques de prévention de la délinquance a l'aune de la recherche*
51
52 [Criminality prevention policies by the yardstick of research.]. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- 53
54
55 Rountree, P. W. (1998). A re-examination of the crime-fear linkage. *Journal of Research in Crime*
56
57 *and Delinquency*, 35, 341-372. doi: 10.1177/0022427898035003006
- 58
59
60 Russo, S., & Roccato, M. (2010). How long does victimisation foster fear of crime? A longitudinal
study. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 38, 960-974. doi: 10.1002/jcop.20408

- 1
2 Russo, S., Vieno, A., & Roccato, M. (2010). Predicting concrete and abstract fear of crime using
3
4 individual and environmental variables: A multilevel analysis. In J. Valentín & L. Gamez
5
6 (Eds.), *Environmental psychology: New developments* (pp. 211-225). New York: Nova.
7
8
9 Schultz, P. W., & Tabanico, J. J. (2009). Criminal beware: A social norms perspective on posting
10
11 public warning signs. *Criminology*, 47, 1201-1222. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.2009.00173.x
12
13 Skogan, W. G. (1993). The various meanings of fear. In W. Bilsky, C. Pfeiffer, & P. Wetzels (Eds.),
14
15 *Fear of crime and criminal victimization* (pp. 131-140). Stuttgart: Enke.
16
17
18 Taylor, R. B. (1999). The incivilities thesis: Theory, measurement, and policy. In R. H. Langworthy
19
20 (Ed.), *Measuring what works: Proceedings from the police research institute meeting* (pp. 65-
21
22 88). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice and Office of
23
24 Community-Oriented Policing Services.
25
26
27
28 Tseloni, A., & Zarafonitou, C. (2008). Fear of crime and victimization: A multivariate multilevel
29
30 analysis of competing measurements. *European Journal of Criminology*, 5, 387-409. doi:
31
32 10.1177/1477370808095123
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1.

Prediction of Fear of Crime

| | Step 1 | | | Step 2 | | |
|---------------------------|----------|-------------|-------|----------|-------------|-------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>S.E.</i> | Beta | <i>B</i> | <i>S.E.</i> | Beta |
| Constant | 2.309*** | .090 | | 2.316*** | .090 | |
| Man | -.095** | .034 | -.059 | -.097** | .034 | -.060 |
| Age | .003* | .001 | .056 | .003* | .001 | .053 |
| Education | -.012* | .005 | -.057 | -.012* | .005 | -.055 |
| Number of sons/daughters | -.002 | .016 | -.003 | -.004 | .016 | -.006 |
| Size of area of residence | .388*** | .043 | .195 | .386*** | .043 | .194 |
| Health | -.001 | .041 | .000 | .005 | .041 | .003 |
| Direct victimization | .076 | .042 | .038 | .064 | .044 | .032 |
| Indirect victimization | .033 | .018 | .040 | .019 | .019 | .023 |
| Social incivilities | .055*** | .005 | .235 | .054*** | .005 | .231 |
| Physical incivilities | .086*** | .015 | .129 | .084*** | .015 | .126 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------|---------------------------------|-------|
| Direct victimization*social incivilities | | | | .012 | .010 | .027 |
| Direct victimization*social incivilities | | | | -.021 | .035 | -.013 |
| Indirect victimization*physical incivilities | | | | .019*** | .005 | .087 |
| Indirect victimization*physical incivilities | | | | -.017 | .014 | -.029 |
| Improvement of the fit of the model | | | | | $\Delta(F(4)) = 3.706. p < .01$ | |

Note. *** $p < .001$. ** $p < .01$. * $p < .05$.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure caption

Figure 1. Moderating Effect of Community Perceived Disorder on the Relation between Indirect
Victimization and Fear of Crime.

For Peer Review

Figure 1.

