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ABSTRACT

The extant literature on fear of crime has relied almost entirely upon quantitative data and was criticized as atheoretical due to its focus on the demographic characteristics associated with vulnerability. Emerging qualitative research on fear of crime has begun to overcome this limitation by drawing upon an intersectional lens, but quantitative assessments have yet to fully incorporate this theoretical development. The current study addresses this limitation by analyzing qualitative data collected through semi-structured interviews and quantitative data collected as part of a large-scale survey. The primary goal of this dissertation is to take an intersectional approach to understand the relationships between gender, race, class, as well as other social identities in relation to fear in order to develop a more meaningful explanation of fear of crime, examine who and what is feared, and where and when people are most fearful of crime in addition to the reasons why.

The qualitative component of the data analysis fosters a deeper understanding of how African American residents living in a high crime southern city cope, construct and react to fear of crime and how many social structures work simultaneously to generate fear. The key findings of this portion of the dissertation indicate that the overwhelming majority of residents do not report feeling afraid. Instead, both men and women use mental maps of specific spaces and people in those spaces to identify some areas as dangers and others as safe. Additionally religion linked with intersecting individual factors, played an enormous role in residents’ fear of crime responses.

The quantitative component of the analyses assesses many of the same issues as the qualitative chapter, but at a broader level. The data set analyzed in this chapter was collected as part of the annual Baton Rouge Social Survey (BRSS). The key findings of these analyses reveal
that examining two and three way interactions of individual characteristics provides a better explanation of those who are actually afraid of crime and of those who are not. Together this mixed methods approach reveals that not all individuals with characteristics associated with higher fear of crime are actually afraid of crime.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This dissertation focuses on a popular topic of criminology research and a topic that is viewed as a prevalent social concern in America’s society: fear of crime. The substantial amount of attention given to fear of crime research in recent years has been conducted in an attempt to understand why certain characteristics are associated with greater level of fear than others (Pain 2001). Certain neighborhoods are often perceived as being crime “blackspots- the proverbial wrong side of the tracks” (Manley and Donald 2006: 1). Crime in African American communities is indeed a serious concern. Research has shown that African Americans, women, and the impoverished are likely to experience heightened fear of crime within their community (Skogan 1990; Ferraro 1995; Sutton and Farrell 2005; Schafer, Huebner, and Bynum 2006). Despite the continued academic interest on this subject matter, much of the research conducted previously has relied almost entirely upon quantitative data (Carvalho and Lewis 2003). Indeed, quantitative research is respected for confirming patterns of responses across large groups of people, and in recognizing certain variables as controlling fear of crime responses, such as race, gender and class. However, the majority of this research has tended to treat these characteristics as isolated, independent variables (Warr 2000; Pain 2001; Trahan 2010). Emerging qualitative research on fear of crime has begun to overcome this limitation by using an intersectional lens, but quantitative assessments have yet to utilize it to its fullest capacity (Madriz 1997; Day 1999; Lupton 1999).

The purpose of this dissertation is to develop a deeper understanding of how African American residents living in high crime areas cope, construct and react to fear of crime by examining how social structural identities such as race, gender and class work together to generate fear. This dissertation aims to address the limitations in prior research by incorporating
a mixed methods approach in studying fear of crime within an intersectional framework using both semi-structured interviews and a large-scale survey. The use of a mixed methods approach from an intersectional perspective is needed in order to give a thorough explanation of the fear of crime concept by examining the interaction of multiple factors rather than focusing on only one. In intersectionality research, quantitative data is useful for creating generalizable assessments for a larger population, whereas qualitative data can provide detailed insights into institutional processes and be a gateway to listen to the voices and explanations of those most affected (poor African American men and women residing in high crime areas) based on their everyday embodied experiences (Dubrow 2013). Therefore, by focusing on this perspective, the results from the mixed methods approach assist in the understanding of how the intersection of race, sex and social class together influence how concerned residents are about being victimized by crime and how those concerns influence residents’ daily activities and lived experiences.

**Purpose, Goals & Objectives**

Taken together, the central aim of this dissertation is to advocate for intersectionality in explaining fear of crime research. I argue that intersectionality is an important concept for criminologists who study fear of crime when using both qualitative and quantitative statistical methods, although some scholars would argue that quantitative analyses were not designed with intersectionality in mind (Bowleg 2008). The second research objective is to explain how residents’ lived experiences are affected by their racial, gender, and class identity and how these identities overlap to create multiple inequalities. A final objective of this dissertation is to examine how prior theoretical approaches used by researchers and theorists to explain residents’ fear of crime can be better explained from an intersectional perspective. This dissertation focuses on several general research questions:
1. How do cultural practices/rituals mediate fear?

2. When, where and how residents come to use mental maps to determine what areas are safe and what areas are not?

3. How might the vulnerability model better explain fear of crime through the incorporation of an intersectional approach?

4. What effect, if any, do gender, age, educational attainment, income, and religiosity have on fear of crime for Blacks, and in what ways does structural factors account for crime amongst the Black community?

**Literature Review**

**The Fear of Crime**

Fear of crime, as a research topic has been an evolving social issue dating back to the mid-1960s when President Lyndon Johnson told lawmakers “the most damaging of the effects of violent crime is fear, and that fear must not be belittled.” That statement suggested that fear of crime had grown into a public illness (Warr 2000). Once scholars became mindful of the seriousness of fear of crime, they begin to focus on related independent variables such as race, class, gender and age. Since then, fear of crime has become a substantial research concern. The majority of studies focusing on fear of crime are largely quantitative using obtainable data from either the General Social Survey or the National Crime Survey (Covington and Taylor 1991; Taylor and Covington 1993; Carvalho and Lewis 2003). Additionally, some researchers have gathered their own data by surveying residents in particular towns and localities and by using questions modeled after the two (Taylor and Covington 1993), while others have made use of official crime statistics using police or court records (Noaks and Wincup 2005) to gather fear of crime data.
One debated issue in fear of crime research has been how to measure and define fear. Scholars have highlighted the need for theoretical clarification of the meaning and methods used concerning the fear of crime concept since the early 1970s (Gabriel and Greve 2003). Fear of crime is most typically measured by responses to the question: Are you afraid to walk in your neighborhood at night? Overtime, others have measured fear by asking respondents how safe they felt walking alone in their neighborhoods during the daytime hours (Covington and Taylor 1991) and how worried they were of specific types of crimes (Markowitz, Bellair, Liska, and Liu 2001). The current study measured fear of crime through the BRSS question that asked participants if there was an area within one mile of their home in which they were afraid to walk alone in at night. Although this question is criticized for being limited to nighttime, failing to mention crime and only measuring intensity, this particular question is most likely practiced by social scientists given that it has been routinely used by the Gallup Organization and the National Opinion Research Center to measure fear since the 1960s (Warr 2000).

There are several definitions for fear of crime that occur in the literature; however, a clear-cut definition is an unending dispute (Reid and Konrad 2004). There are, however, categories of fear of crime that many scholars would agree on. Generally speaking, fear of crime is associated with a wide range of emotions, anxieties, concerns, opinions, and attitudes (Ditton and Farall 2000; Mawby, Brunt and Hambly 2000; Warr 2000). Therefore, fear is possibly best described as a multidimensional practice that represents individuals’ feelings, behaviors and thought processes about being physically harmed by criminal victimization (Roundtree 1998). This definition is related to the concern about being outside one’s home, most likely in an urban area, unaccompanied and possibly susceptible to personal harm (Stanko 1995). In this dissertation, fear is referred to as a multifaceted concept of crime where fear becomes an
everyday practice based on three interlinked categories of experience: emotional (such as worrying or anxiety), behavioral (such as avoiding certain areas and purchasing equipment for protection) and cognitive (such as thinking one is at risk and vulnerable to crime) (Roundtree 1998; Gabriel and Greve 2003). All of these features are related to a person’s fear of becoming a victim of a crime (Gabriel and Greve 2003).

Prior research on fear of crime has drawn mostly upon the vulnerability, disorder and social integration models in explaining fear of crime differences. The vulnerability model emphasized individual characteristics such as age, race, sex, and social class when explaining group differences in concern about criminal victimization. At the community level, research on fear of crime has mainly drawn upon the disorder and integration models. The disorder model is rooted in the broken windows thesis, which argues that residents react negatively to signs of social and physical disorder in their respective neighborhood. The integration model is grounded in the social disorganization and collective efficacy frameworks, which state that neighborhoods characterized by concentrated poverty, residential mobility, and heterogeneous populations tend to feature weaker neighborhood communities and in turn higher crime (Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997; Sampson 2012).

The enduring racial, class, and sex divide is well recognized in the vulnerability model which focuses on demographic variables as predictors of fear when explaining group differences. Findings from this model found that fear of crime were higher among women, African Americans, and individuals with lower socio-economic status (Skogan 1990; Sutton and Farrell 2005; Schafer, Huebner, and Bynum 2006). For instance, Schafer and colleagues (2006) pointed out that males and females experienced fear based upon different factors. More particularly, women conveyed more fear of personal victimization and more trepidation with their safety.
However, both men and women displayed similar fear of property crime. In a comparable study, Sutton and Farrall (2005) used linear regression modeling to examine the relationships between gender, fear of crime and socially desirable responding. The authors’ study discovered that the fear levels of men were inversely related to scores on the lie scale that measured the tendency to provide socially desirable responses.

Prior research on the racial differences, associated with vulnerability model on fear of crime, suggests that Blacks are more exposed to higher rates of criminal activity and as a result, they report being more fearful than Whites (Garofalo 1979; Skogan and Maxfield 1981). In the St. John and Healdmoore (1995) study, the authors tested the race question to determine the effect that the race of strangers in which individuals encountered in public had on their fear of being a victim of crime. They found that Whites were more fearful, but only when those encounters were amongst strangers who were black. The vulnerability model also highlighted the importance of age, but findings were inconsistent with some studies reporting younger people were more likely to be concerned about crime (Miethe 1995) and others finding that the elderly were more fearful (Acierno Rheingold, Resnick and Kilpatrick 2004).

An important limitation of assessments of the vulnerability model was that researchers treated these characteristics as being independent of each other (Warr 2000; Pain 2001). As earlier research has acknowledged, fear of crime research is limited in addressing the differences amongst different intersecting social categories (Madriz 1997). Additionally, quantitative research utilizing an intersectional methodical framework is limited, and previous research that focuses on fear of crime has relied almost entirely upon quantitative data.
Intersectionality

The inclusion of an intersectional perspective offers a better understanding of how individual characteristics associated with the vulnerability model may differentially influence a person’s level of fear based on certain social identities that interact (Franklin and Franklin 2009). Intersectional frameworks developed from feminists who recognize that there were significant disparities amongst women and men. Feminist scholars argued that it is vital to study race, gender, and class as intersecting groups of oppression or as matrix of domination (Collins 2000; 2004; McCall 2005). Consequently, it is necessary for researchers to consider each interlocking system of oppression independently for the intentions of offering conceptual grounding, but they must understand that each identity is interconnected as “intersecting oppressions” and experienced simultaneously (Crenshaw 1989; Collins 2004). Critical race scholars and Black feminists advanced the concept of intersectionality once they realized that much of prior feminist research concentrated greatly on educated middle-class White women; thus, failing to take into account how race shaped women differently, particularly women of color (Crenshaw 1989; Crenshaw 1991). In “Ain’t I a Woman?” Bell Hooks (1981) confronts feminist scholars’ inclination of associating the discrimination faced by women under patriarchy with the suppression of Blacks’ in America. This equivalence, she specified, suggests that all women are White and all Blacks are men. Though the term “intersectionality” itself did not emerge for eight more years (Crenshaw 1989), Hook’s work encouraged researchers across a range of disciplines to dismantle race, class, and gender typologies (Trahan 2010). Intersectionality as a theoretical framework has developed from the study of the construction and reproduction of discrimination, domination, and oppression (Shields 2008). The framework studies how social status factors like
race, class and gender overlap and create intersections of multiple inequalities based on an individual’s everyday personalized experiences.

The term “intersectionality” is used in various ways in research by sociologists (McCall 2005; Prins 2006; Choo and Ferree 2010); therefore, the exact meaning of intersectionality varies depending on how researchers used the term in relation to social categories (McCall 2005; Shields 2008; Choo and Ferree 2010). “Intersectionality” as a concept denotes to the “interactivity of social identity structures such as race, class, and gender in fostering life experiences, especially experiences of privilege and oppression” (Gopaldas 2013: 90). There are at least three different ways intersectionality is applied in the literature (Jones, Misra, and McCurley 2013). Some theorists use intersectionality to discuss the “inclusion of the experiences of multiple marginalized persons and groups” (Choo and Ferree 2010: 131). Some researchers utilize the theory to demonstrate how social identities function together in a “non-additive process” to create “a transformative interactivity of effects” (Choo and Ferree 2010: 131), and others have taken a complex and historically grounded approach to understanding intersections as always co-constructing race, gender, class, and other statuses as systemic inequalities.” How researchers identify and describe “intersectionality” influences how the concept is used and defined in their study (Choo and Ferree 2010). This dissertation focuses on two of these models: Inclusion and Process.

The first way intersectionality is used and defined in this dissertation is by positioning multiple oppressed groups and their viewpoints at the heart of the research, which is sometimes referred to as a “group centered approach.” As Choo and Ferree (2010) state, the group-centered perspective focuses on centering marginalized voices while highlighting the multiple, intersecting inequalities of individual members. Secondly, intersectionality is used as Choo and
Ferree (2010: 134) defined as a “structural type process-centered analysis” which understands the changes that occur when multiple identities connect. Instead of considering race, gender and class as additively affecting the experiences, this approach is utilized in this dissertation by focusing on how religion, the labor market, education and the criminal justice system in African American communities interact with race to create different, intersectional experiences (Crenshaw 1991). In the relational/process model, race is able to simultaneously have its own effect on the lack of opportunity, as well as a separate influence on the interaction with social status factors (Jones, Misra, and McCurley 2013).

The intersectional perspective continues to improve our understanding of marginalized groups. In a recent article, Becker's (2012) ethnography study on community-based anticrime efforts in Gardner, reveals that social structural factors like race, gender, and age influence learning and involvement associated with anticrime work. For instance, White men from higher-class social settings experienced a huge amount of participation opportunities. In her study, White men were more likely to drive the squad car, serve as leaders, and teach other members. On the other hand, White women’s involvements were usually different. Women were frequently placed in victim roles and viewed as being less capable than men. However, women of color were also placed in the roles of victims but were frequently viewed as being capable of handling the risk of victimization. Men of color were also underrepresented, since they were less likely to experience the opportunities offered to White men.

Collins (2004) investigates the way that race, class, and gender shape our general social being. She discusses how these variables intersect to shape the experiences of African American men and women in several dissimilar ways, but with equivalent outcomes. She discovers how new systems of racism operate to oppress people of color, while feeding them with images of
freedom. Collins argues that the new forms of universal capitalism, which marginalize voters and drive policies by financial influence, structure the new strain of racism. The new racism is omnipresent but is not that easy to identify as slavery statutes and Jim Crow laws. She argues that the marginalized voices in the Black community need to be expressed in order to address the pressing social issues that affect their community. If we do not create the area for marginalized groups to express their perceptions as they please, then we will create a space of silence and deceitfulness.

Risman (2004) points out that researcher’s need to theorize gender as a social structure. By doing so, researchers can better examine the ways in which gender is rooted in the individual, interactional, and institutional aspects of our society. Risman (2004) justifies that by placing gender on the same level as politics and economics, we can explain gender as a social structure. She argues that structure is more than just incorporated standards and beliefs; however, it is visible, peripheral to the individual, and independent to the interest of the individual. Social structures are shaped by social action, and actor’s perception of their lives. In order to understand how these axes of domination intersect, we need to follow a both/and approach in appreciating gender structure, race structure, and other structures of inequality.

Analyzing class and race in relation to sexual harassment in rental housing, Tester (2008) study reveals that sexual oppression was normally the type of sexual harassment for women in rental housing. The author study also reveals the intersections of race, gender, and class in determining this harassment. In particular, the findings revealed that underprivileged women are mainly vulnerable to housing discrimination. In almost every situation, landowners used their power to misuse renter’s financial vulnerabilities and to sexually persuade them. Landowners
also used these approaches to protect themselves against complaints regarding sexual harassment.

In conclusion, the concept of intersectionality has anticipated an important place in research concerning marginalized groups. As a theory, intersectionality has assured a more precise way of considering race, class and gender issues. It has guaranteed an explanation as to why it is absurd to discuss gender and race or other social identities without discussing the other dimensions of social structural identities that play an influential role for each axes of oppression. Second, intersectionality is deemed an appropriate explanatory solution to the multiple social structures that construct and explain social structural identities. Here, I argue that intersectionality is an urgent issue because it allows scholars to go beyond their individually informed viewpoint that we each unavoidably transport to our research (Shields 2008).

**Intersectionality & the Fear of Crime**

The substantial amount of attention given to fear of crime research by criminologists over the past decade or so is to determine why certain individual characteristics have higher levels of fear than others (Pain 2001). However, the number of studies on fear of crime in which an intersectional lens is utilized is limited (Hollander 2001). Scholars that study fear of crime tend to discuss race, class and gender differences in relation to their fear of crime; yet, these variables are often treated as distinct or independent (Warr 2000; Pain 2001). Therefore, we need to discuss these factors in terms of intersectionality and how they work together to create more or less fear rather than studying them separately. The importance of seeing race, class, and gender as interlocking systems of oppression in fear of crime research encourages scholars to take into account other oppressions as well such as religion, age, ethnicity, and educational attainment (Collins 2000).
The limitation that continues to exist in current research is twofold: Fear of crime literature using an intersectionality approach is limited and research on intersectionality focusing on fear of crime is virtually nonexistent. As this dissertation highlights, few fear of crime researchers have used intersectional analysis in the past, but the focus was limited to the intersections of fear amongst women. For instance, Madriz (1997) used focus groups and in-depth interviews to explore the many ways in which fear of crime affected the lives of women throughout the United States. She argued that women's fear is intensified by socially constructed images of those who are considered as criminals and victims. Her findings revealed that regardless of the race and class setting of the respondents, the descriptions of criminals were poor men of color, and images of victims were largely vulnerable and innocent White, middle-class women. These socially constructed representations of criminals and victims explain to some degree, why domestic violence is not considered a serious offense. The images of the ideal victims suggest that when minority women are oppressed, they do not get the same compassion and trustworthiness that is given to White female victims. Likewise, Day’s (1999) research on women’s fear is built on in-depth interviews with White, Black, and Hispanic women in Orange County, California. The study investigates women’s fear in public areas. The author points out that a person’s gender, race or class alone cannot explain fear of crime. The findings indicated that men of color were constructed as criminals based on White women’s insights of their vulnerability partially in relation to the alleged risk of rape. Women were more likely to stay away from areas they linked with people of color.

To undertake the task of understanding fear through the lens of intersectionality, this dissertation explores how race interacts with other social identities—including religiosity, gender, ethnicity, educational attainment, income, and location shape fear of crime responses.
Overall, there are several interlocking categories that are more likely to be discussed in fear of crime research. It has been previously noted that these status characteristics often work as representatives for vulnerability (McCoy, Wooldredge, Cullen, Dubeck and Browning 1996). Focusing on these variables will allow constancy with prior studies. Furthermore, incorporating an intersectional approach will help future researchers move toward a better understanding of fear of crime. Previous studies have revealed some consistent and mixed findings in regards to individual characteristics and fear. Discussing these social status factors in terms of intersectionality and how they work together to create fear of crime differences rather than studying them separately can lead to a better understanding of why certain individuals are more or less likely to be concerned about crime.

**Context & Methodology**

This dissertation draws upon qualitative and quantitative data to examine how the interaction of race, sex and social class influence how afraid individuals are about being victimized by crime and how that fear influences their daily activities. Qualitative information was collected from residents residing in both the Mason Garden and Uptown Square\(^1\), which are two high crime areas located in one high crime urban city. The information garnered from these interviews are used in combination with the findings of previous research to develop multilevel logistical regression models that draw upon the Baton Rouge Social Survey (BRSS) to assess predictors of fear of crime in East Baton Rouge Parish. The results from the qualitative and quantitative analyses are combined to develop a better understanding of why fear of crime varies amongst groups.

\(^1\) Mason Gardens and Uptown Square are both pseudonyms used to protect residents’ identity. The naming of streets or neighborhoods could have exposed participants' confidentiality.
Study Area

Mason Garden and Uptown Square are two high crime areas located in one high crime southern city. The city serves as an interesting case study for fear of crime research for a few reasons. First, crime statistics showed that the city was one of the most violent cities in south between 2005 and 2013 as it was second only to New Orleans, a much larger city (Uniform Crime Report 2013). Second, the city is a highly segregated metropolitan area, which is important because research found that high crime areas are frequently populated by racial and ethnic minorities, and thus may impact fear of crime responses for African Americans differentially (Franklin and Franklin 2009). The two areas consist of under resourced schools, high unemployment rates, high incarceration rates and single parent households. The developing violent crime problem in the city has been widely acknowledged by the state and local law enforcement, the local government, and the mass media. The city has been gaining an unsavory reputation as being one of the most dangerous cities in the country. For instance, the city was ranked number ten in the most dangerous cities in the United States based on a population over 200,000 (Abbey-Lambertz 2014). Examining fear of crime within these areas allows a way to fully understand how residents identify, construct and describe fear based on their own direct and indirect knowledge.

Analysis

The qualitative component of the data analysis fosters a deeper understanding of how African American residents living in a high crime southern city cope, construct and react to fear of crime as well as how many social structures work simultaneously to generate fear. I collected qualitative research data through semi-structured interviews with 30 residents dwelling in two high crime areas viewed to be the most dangerous and unsafe neighborhoods within its local
area. The purpose of the interviews was to understand why some residents that reside in a high crime area are more or less fearful than other residents living in the same area by focusing on specific spatial and temporal locations identified by residents as safe and unsafe. The interviews were initially conducted during the fall semester of 2013. I used nonprobability-sampling techniques to contact participants for this research. The semi-structured interviews and field observations were based on a grounded theory approach (Glaser and Strauss 1967). Through open coding of events collected from field observations and interviews, specific themes were selected based on the findings that emerged. The qualitative approach gave residents an opportunity to discuss their own personalized practices in their community and help shed light on marginalized groups.

The quantitative component of the analyses assesses many of the same issues, but at a broader level. These analyses were conducted using the BRSS, an annual survey administered to the residents of East Baton Rouge Parish that asked questions about socially relevant attitudes, behaviors, and characteristics of residents living in East Baton Rouge. The survey has been conducted continuously since 2000. The data offered an opportunity to study the basic demographic characteristics associated with fear of crime in both high crime areas and throughout the East Baton Rouge Parish. Quantitative data was also analyzed through the process of triangulation by using face-to-face interviews to generate both qualitative and quantitative data by incorporating both open-ended and fixed-choice questions. These methods are discussed in more details in the chapters presented in this dissertation. The primary goal of this study is to take an intersectional approach to understand the relationships between gender, race, class, as well as other social identities in relation to fear to develop a more meaningful explanation of fear of crime, examine who and what is feared, and where and when people are most fearful of crime.
in addition to the reasons why. Focusing on these techniques allowed constancy with prior studies and an opportunity to move toward a better understanding of fear of crime from an intersectional lens.

**Synopsis & Chapter Outline**

As previously stated, this dissertation seeks to address four questions: How can the vulnerability model better explain fear of crime experiences through the incorporation of an intersectional approach? How do cultural practices/rituals mediate fear? When, where and how residents come to use mental maps to determine what areas are safe and what areas are not? What effect, if any, does religiosity, gender, age, ethnicity, educational attainment and income have on fear of crime for Blacks, and in what ways does structural factors account for crime amongst the Black community? To address the research questions posed, the dissertation is divided into three empirical chapters.

The first empirical chapter, “An Investigation into how the Vulnerability Model on Fear of Crime can be Advanced through the Inclusion of an Intersectional Lens,” explores fear of crime quantitatively using a large-scale longitudinal survey with an intersectional approach. This chapter contributes to research on fear of crime by testing the vulnerability model of fear by drawing upon data collected from the BRSS to explore the various ways that research on intersectionality can lead to a better understanding of why particular groups are more or less likely to be concerned about crime. Research has argued that quantitative methods are additive (e.g., Race + Class + Gender) rather than intersectional (e.g., Black Lower Class Highly Educated Woman) and are difficult to find a statistical interaction between effects (Bowleg 2008). Scholars have argued that none of the quantitative options are good models; furthermore, there has been major concerns regarding how to ask an intersectional quantitative question.
Similar to Dubrow’s (2008) study, this chapter uses logistic regression to test multiplicative interaction terms. This model is considered to be the best available way to measure an intersection as a social identity and the social inequalities related to these identities.

The second empirical chapter “Ritualization, Mental Mapping and the Fear of Crime: The Constructions of Physical Space and Social Actors in Two High Crime Areas,” examines fear of crime in one high crime southern city as components of an everyday ritual. The purpose of this chapter was to understand why some residents living in high crime areas are less fearful than other residents residing in the same area. In this paper, I focus on ritualization; a concept based on the notion that fears is a product of routines rather than a perception. Previous research that focuses on fear of crime has relied almost entirely upon quantitative data and few have incorporated an intersectional lens. Drawing upon thirty in-depth semi-structured interviews and 100 hours of ethnographic research over a two year period, this study uses an intersectional lens to examine three main questions: How do cultural practices/rituals mediate fear? When, where and how do residents come to use mental maps to determine what areas are safe and what areas are not? How social identities like race, class and gender impact fear of crime responses?

The third analytical chapter, “From Race to Religion: An Examination of Structural Factors Contributing to Fear of Crime in High Crime Neighborhoods,” grants further attention to why intersectionality is important in fear of crime research. This chapter seeks to understand fear of crime within the Black population, a group that is disproportionately entangled, scrutinized, and confined by the system (Lawrence 2011). Using intersectionality as a stepping stone, this chapter highlights various multiple inequalities that influence African Americans’ perceptions of crime provides a better explanation of who is feared and gives insight into the failing social institutions that exist within their community (Collins 2000). There is soaring evidence of the
continuing racial and economic divide in this high crime southeast city. This chapter demonstrates that lack of resources have adversely affected and contributed to crime. This chapter also addresses the limitation in fear of crime research by exploring how both the inclusion and relational models of intersectionality can be used to understand and explain fear. Together the models focus on residents’ shared experiences as low-income, African American, women and men who have been victims of racial discrimination in education, the criminal justice system, and in the labor market. Drawing upon semi-structured interviews, this chapter gives voice to the multiple marginalized factors and discusses how social institutions in particular offer different experiences for low income Black residents.

The dissertation concludes with a section fearlessly titled “Yea, Though I Walk Through the Valley of the Shadow of Death, I Will Fear No Evil: For Thou Art With Me,” in which I review key findings presented and consider suggestions for future research aimed at examining how the interplay of race, sex, social class and other social identities such as religion influence how concerned individuals are about being victimized by crime and how that concern influences the daily activities amongst marginalized groups.

Concluding Remarks

The aim of this dissertation is to develop a deeper understanding of how individuals cope, construct and react to fear of crime by examining how social structural identities such as race, gender and class work together to regulate fear. Understanding the intersection of race, class and gender gives scholars the ability to observe the points of divergence between Black and White, male and female, and low, middle and high-income residents. The goal of the chapters presented in this dissertation is to make sense of intersectionality and fear of crime through the use of mixed-methods. These approaches allowed me to make sense of fear by capturing the nuances of
residents' everyday lives. Furthermore, this work has effectively validated that the relationships and institutions of marginalized groups are complex—they experience these interactions and relationships through the simultaneity of their multiple political and social identities.

This dissertation is likely to create some debate and backlash given that many scholars do not agree that intersectionality is needed in discussing fear of crime. Additionally, some may find the topic of race, in relation to other multiple intersecting identities, to be an uncomfortable area to discuss. Nevertheless, I hope to convince sociological and criminological scholars that not only is intersectionality needed in discussing fear, but that this approach allows scholars to go beyond the individually informed viewpoints that we as scholars each inescapably transport to our research (Shields 2008). It is critical that researchers continue to examine and understand that race, class, and gender matter in the United States and to consider how the nature of one’s social position will bring forth new research questions, concerns and discussions. The concept of intersectionality has anticipated an important place in fear of crime literature. As a theory, intersectionality has assured a more precise and accountable way for tackling fear of crime differences. It has guaranteed an explanation as to why it is absurd to discuss fear or other social identities without discussing the other dimensions of social and structural identities that play an influential role to each axes of oppression. Intersectionality is deemed an appropriate explanatory solution to the multiple social structures that construct and explain social structural identities. As this dissertation unfolds, I lay the groundwork for understanding fear of crime and how socioeconomic factors interact to create group differences amongst races, classes and sexes.
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CHAPTER 2: AN INVESTIGATION INTO HOW THE VULNERABILITY MODEL ON FEAR OF CRIME CAN BE ADVANCED THROUGH THE INCLUSION OF AN INTERSECTIONAL LENS

Introduction

Data released by Gallup (2013) indicates that four out of ten Americans were concerned about walking alone in an area within one mile of their homes at night despite the fact that violent crime rates have been declining considerably since the mid-1990s. Such a high rate of fear has important implications as research found that individuals structure their daily activities by avoiding particular areas, purchasing weapons for safety, changing methods of transportation, forming organizations against crime and limiting their interaction with neighbors (Gates and Rohe 1987; Gordon and Riger 1988; Miethe 1995; Skogan 1995). A substantial amount of quantitative research has drawn upon the vulnerability model in explaining fear of crime differences (Franklin and Franklin 2009). The vulnerability model emphasized individual characteristics such as age, race, sex, and social class when explaining group differences regarding criminal victimization. While the vulnerability model has helped to highlight different identities associated with higher fear of crime, research is limited in exploring how individual axes of inequity (race, class and gender) interact to produce different levels of fear of crime. The current study addresses this limitation by examining fear of crime using quantitative data sources and an intersectional lens to better highlight causes of concern about crime. In doing so, this study draws upon data collected through a large-scale survey to address the following research questions: How to quantitatively examine intersectional fear of crime differences between multiple social categories? To what extent do intersections of disadvantage within race, sex and class groups influence fear of crime?
Research has argued that quantitative methods are additive (e.g., Race + Class + Gender) rather intersectional (e.g., Black Lower Class Highly Educated Woman) and are difficult to find a statistical interaction between effects (Bowleg 2008). Scholars have argued that none of the quantitative options are good models. Furthermore, there is confusion regarding how to ask an intersectional quantitative question. These issues have been points of contention amongst scholars who study this topic. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to use fear of crime data from the Baton Rouge Social Survey (BRSS), a representative survey that provides demographic characteristics, behaviors, and attitudes of the residents of East Baton Rouge parish and focuses on gender, race, class, and their intersections to explain fear. Given that intersectionality looks at multiple intersecting variables and how they interact with one another, similar to Dubrow’s (2008) study, this research uses logistic regression to test multiplicative interaction terms, which is considered to be the best available way to measure an intersection as a social identity, and the social inequalities related to these identities. The results indicate that examining two and three way interactions of individual characteristics provides a better explanation of those who are actually afraid of crime and of those who are not.

**Who Fears?**

**Fear of Crime**

Previous research on fear of crime has drawn heavily upon the vulnerability model (Franklin and Franklin 2009). The vulnerability model was introduced by Skogan and Maxfield in 1981 and is grounded on the notion that a neighborhood’s social dynamics can affect its residents’ fear of crime levels (Austin, Allen and Spine 2002). The data suggested that certain individuals are more vulnerable to others and may experience higher levels of fear than those who are less vulnerable (Franklin, Franklin and Fearn 2008). The vulnerability model emphasized
individual characteristics such as age, race, sex, and social class when explaining group differences in concern about criminal victimization. This model has been divided into two groups: physical and social vulnerability. Physical vulnerability relates to the perception of greater risk to criminal victimization. This type of vulnerability refers to not having the physical strength to fight off offenders due to one’s size or limited mobility, which is normally associated with women and the elderly. Social vulnerability assumes increased contact with crime and criminals as a result of various factors associated with race, poverty, education, income and lack of economic and material resources (Baumer 1978; Riger, Gordon, and LeBailly 1978; Taylor and Hale 1986; Bennett and Flavin 1994; Will and McGrath 1995; Borooah and Carcach 1997; Pantazis 2000). Assessments of this model, which are discussed in greater detail below, found that fear of criminal victimization, were higher among women, African Americans, and individuals with lower socio-economic status (Skogan 1990; Sutton and Farrell 2005; Schafer, Huebner, and Bynum 2006). This research also highlighted the importance of age, but findings were inconsistent with some studies reporting younger people were more likely to be concerned about crime (Miethe 1995) and others finding that the elderly were more fearful (Acierno Rheingold, Resnick and Kilpatrick 2004).

Among these variables, gender is considered to be one of the most leading predictors of fear of crime (Pain 2001; McGarrell, Giacomazzi and Thurman 1997). Research has consistently shown that women are more likely to report being fearful of criminal victimization than men (Ferraro 1995; Will and McGrath 1995; McGarrell, Giacomazzi and Thurman 1997; Pain 2001; Acierno, Rheingold, Resnick and Kilpatrick 2004; Reid and Konrad 2004; Schafer et al., 2006; Franklin and Franklin 2009), despite the preponderance of official statistics showing that males, particularly young males, are more likely than women to be an injured party of a personal crime
(Stanko 1995). Research has shown that women are less likely than men to be actual victims of a crime, dismissing acts of sexual and intimate partner violence (Madriz 1997; Day 1999). Although men are more likely than women to be an injured party of a crime, research points out that women are three times more fearful of crime than their male counterparts (Reid and Konrad 2004).

Scholars have argued that the predominant factor contributing to women’s fearfulness of crime is actually a result of their concern of being sexually assaulted (Stanko 1995; Madriz 1997; Rountree 1998); which is in fact the crime in which women are more likely to be victims of. Shared beliefs about gendered bodies have led women to create images of themselves as vulnerable (Madriz 1997; Hollander 2001), whereas images of men are perceived as threatening due to their larger physique and strength which causes them to be viewed as a potential mechanism of sexual assault (Hollander 2001). Feminists have considered these higher levels of fear of crime amongst women to be an indicator of gender oppression and a harmful system of control of females' everyday lives, mimicking traditional beliefs about women’s role in society (Hanmer and Saunders 1984; Valentine 1989; Pain 1991). As McCall (2005) and others have argued, intersectionality has changed how gender is discussed; in particular, gender must be understood in relation to power rooted in social identities (Collins 2000).

Race and class are also strong factors in determining an individual’s fear of crime (Pain 2001). Prior studies have revealed minorities, particularly African Americans, are usually more fearful than Whites. Research argues that African Americans tend to be more fearful than other groups because they are more likely to reside in disadvantaged neighborhoods where violent crime is more common (St. John and Healdmoore 1995; Skogan 1995; Day 1999). Studies have shown that when fear of crime is considered, individuals belonging to higher income statuses had
the lowest level of fear than those residents who are poor in all areas (Will and McGrath 1995; McGarrell, Giacomazzi and Thurman 1997) given that they are more equipped and have more resources to protect themselves (Biderman 1967). Citizens who reside in low-income neighborhoods are normally considered to be more fearful, since they are more likely to be challenged by certain community characteristics, such as ethnic heterogeneity and residential mobility (Taylor and Covington 1993).

Research has found inconsistent results in regards to the association of age and fearfulness of crime. For example, studies have revealed that older people report having a higher level of fear of crime than younger people, regardless of being significantly less at risk (Miethe 1995). On the other hand, several researchers have found that the elderly are less fearful than younger people (Wilson and Kelling 1982; Acierno et al. 2004). Current research, however, found that increases in the respondent’s age were associated with decreases in fear only among the female participants (Franklin and Franklin 2009). Age is one of the most argued factors in fear of crime research as well as another type of social identity that was studied independently. There has been a shifting in ideas from concentrating on fear of crime among the elderly towards a more current recognition that younger people are more likely at to be at risk of being victimized and affected by fear.

**Intersectionality**

Traditionally, fear of crime quantitative researchers have sought to understand fear by examining independent variables (e.g. race, class, gender) and considering only potential interconnectedness between these axes (Lupton 1999, Pain 2001, Rouhani 2014). The incorporation of intersectionality can facilitate the development of theoretical explanations of fear of crime and provide a better understanding of the experiences of marginalized group
members. Since research has shown that there is a link between demographic characteristics regarding crime-related fear, it is only appropriate to discuss fear of crime in relation to these multiple social categories to understand how residents create more or less fear rather than studying them separately. The incorporation of an intersectional lens can help to better distinguish those most troubled by fear of crime from those who are not. This study gives voice to the multiple marginalized when these identities crosscut multiple axes of oppression and/or domination.

Coined by Kimberly Crenshaw (1989), intersectionality denotes to the ways in which interconnected systems of power are constructed based on race, class, gender and other social factors as well as how they simultaneously affect the lives of all individuals with their interaction in society and its social institutions (Crenshaw, 1989, 1991). Although, it is necessary for researchers to consider individual social markers independently for the intentions of offering theoretical rationalizations, it is vital to understand that each identity intersects with one another (Collins 2000). Intersectionality is formed on the premise that individual social identities are interconnected and cannot be explained separately. Race, sex, and social class are inextricably interconnected and experienced differently based on one’s identity (Collins 2000).

**Why Should We Account for Intersectionality in Fear of Crime Quantitative Analysis?**

Intersectionality as a method offers quantitative researchers the opportunity to understand and conceptualize the social inequities that are embedded in the structural forces of society and the everyday embodied experiences of individuals (Veenstra 2011; Hankivsky 2012). To account for the conditional effects of multiple intersecting categories on fear of crime, two-way and three-way (or more) interactions in terms of individual characteristics are used. Rouhani (2014) offers the following equation in multiple regression analysis to summarize the approach:
Y = a + b1x1 + b2x2 + b3x3 + b4x4 + b5(x1x2) + b6(x1 x 3) + b7(x1 x 4) + b8(x2 x 3) + b9(x2 x 4) + b10(x3 x 4) + b11(x1 x 2 x 3) + e

Kohlman (2006) argues that traditional quantitative research does not represent the personal embodied experiences that are normally offered in qualitative methods. For example, in quantitative analysis, many questions are coded as 1 and 0 (Kohlman, 2006). To overcome this problem, Spiering (2012) recommends using a detailed categorization to create various groupings. This is achieved by checking for differences across social status factors and creating an intersectional identity matrix that overlaps each identity in order for each subgroup to be exclusively categorized. For instance, to understand the social position of a Black woman and man with respect to fear of crime, it is important to consider that differences exist between being White and Black, and understand that these disparities may be experienced differently amongst men and women. Consequently, four groups (Black women, Black men, White women, and White men) need to be distinguished and categorized. In doing so, Cole (2009) recommends that quantitative researchers who are employing the intersectional model to their analysis to always explain the data within the socio-historical environment surrounding the lived everyday experiences of disadvantaged and advantaged groups. Societal factors must then be included when investigating individual positions in a multiplicative logistic regression analysis.

This intersectional identity matrix of classifying social groups moves beyond traditional quantitative research of coding and sorting and allows the researcher to investigate other important interacting, individual axes that may be present and contributing to situations of oppression and privilege (Hancock 2007; Veenstra 2011; Hankivsky 2012). Intersectionality is important in studying fear of crime especially in high crime cities like Baton Rouge where crime is considered to be concentrated in a few areas. Many of the residents living in these high crime
areas are African American men and women whose voices are often unheard. The responses provided by the residents in the BRSS illustrate how there is no single identity category that acceptably depicts how residents react to fear within their social environment. The experiences of women in the ‘matrix of domination’ will differ in comparison to men or White women (Collins 2000). Adopting this approach can help foster a deeper understanding of how residents, especially African Americans and women, living in a high crime area react to fear of crime and how many social structures work simultaneously to generate fear. My main objective is to present intersectionality as a way of understanding several interactions of race, gender, and class in the context of fear amongst marginalized groups.

There are several studies in the fear of crime literature that have come close to employing the intersectional analysis by utilizing a multi-level approach to understanding potential interactions, but they do not actually employ the method or theoretical framework. In a recent study, Porter, Radar and Cossman (2012) offer an insight into the importance of examining variables simultaneously. In their study, the authors utilize a multi-level approach to understanding potential interactions between individual and contextual level variables. However, the authors focus solely on the interactions between marital status, female-headed households and violent crime rates to its effect on the respondent feelings of being unsafe. This study can only account for understanding the fear of crime experiences from those who are married in relation to crime.

Using survey data, Schafer and colleagues (2006) examined the perceptions of safety and the fear of personal and property crime amongst male and female participants. Their multi-level analyses suggested that males and females experienced fear based on different factors in that demographic. Characteristics such as race and class were consistently significant for men;
conversely those factors were not of significance for women. For both groups, perceptions of their neighborhood as orderly and acceptable had the largest influence on perceptions. Their findings suggest that neighborhood integration mattered for men while perception of neighborhood conditions mattered more for women. Their analyses did not use any interaction models to completely understand complex inequities between the two groups such as their class and race. This limitation is important in that it not only provides a more detailed explanation in understanding group differences but acknowledges the intersecting experience when gender interacts with other axes of oppression such as race and class.

Markowitz, Bellair, Liska, and Liu (2001) build on social disorganization research to understand the relationships between disorder, burglary, cohesion, and the fear of crime by utilizing data from the British Crime Survey. Markowitz and his colleagues found that disorder had an indirect effect on burglary through fear and neighborhood cohesion. While cohesion reduces disorder, the non-recursive models showed that disorder also reduces cohesion. The author’s study suggested that only a portion of the effect of disorder on cohesion was mediated by fear. Their overall findings reveal a feedback loop in that cohesion had an effect on disorder, which affected fear, which affected cohesion. The feedback loop suggests that these variables affect each other in a reciprocal manner. As previously acknowledged, the author's study did not account for any interaction models amongst individual aspects of social identity.

Additionally, existing research that uses demographic factors such as race, class, gender and age to predict the influence of physical and social vulnerability on fear of crime (Franklin and Franklin 2009) has tended to be dichotomized (Pain 2001). Research could benefit from testing the intersecting relationships associated amongst these multiple social categories because it is possible that certain groups may be more or less fearful than others (Franklin and Franklin
As the above literature implies, most studies that utilized a multilevel analytical approach or drew upon the vulnerability model to test group differences did not test two and three level interactions simultaneously. Furthermore, these studies did not apply the intersectional framework in theorizing fear of crime differences. This is important because intersectionality offers a distinctive and innovative way for quantitative researchers to understand and conceptualize social inequities embedded in the structural drivers of society and the everyday experiences of individuals within that society (Veenstra 2011; Hankivsky 2012). Although these findings are respected in confirming patterns of response across large groups of people and in recognizing certain variables such as controlling fear of crime responses, an important limitation of the vulnerability model is that scholars treated these risk factors as being independent of one another (Warr 2000; Pain 2001). Determining the multiplicative effects of fear related to gender, race, class and examining how they work together to create fear rather than studying them separately can lead to a better understanding of why particular groups are more or less likely to be concerned about crime. This study demonstrates how intersections of race, gender, and class overlap in shaping fear of crime responses and how intersections of multiple inequalities become major elements in examining fear.

**The Present Study**

Much of the quantitative research on fear of crime has examined race, gender and class as mutually exclusive and separable risk factors. As an outcome of this limited thinking, many researchers fail to capture the interactive effects of race, gender and class in order to fully understand fear, especially from those who are affected by multiple variables-Black lower-class women. While prior research provided a number of insights, there is much room for improvement in developing theoretical explanations for why individuals experience different
levels of concern. Rather than seeing fear of crime as a result of victimization, fear of crime in this analysis is studied within a more determined context of the person-environment, which considers the interaction between the person and their environment (Joseph 1997; Cole 2009). The current study contributes to research on fear of crime by testing the interactive effects of the vulnerability model. This project draws upon quantitative data to examine how the interplay of race, sex and social class influence how concerned individuals are about being victimized by crime and how interactions of categories offer different fear of crime experiences.

Why Baton Rouge City?

The city of Baton Rouge serves as an attractive case study for fear of crime research for several purposes. First, crime statistics show that Baton Rouge was one of the most violent cities in Louisiana between 2005 and 2013 as it was second only to New Orleans, which was a much larger city (Federal Bureau of Investigation 2013). Second, Baton Rouge is a highly segregated city, which is important because research found that segregation and high crime areas were frequently experienced by racial and ethnic minorities and thus may impact fear of crime responses for African Americans differentially (Franklin and Franklin 2009). By exploring fear of crime in a city where crime is most likely to occur, the data will be able to shed a light on residents’ fear based on their daily involvements.

Data Sources

The current study utilizes data from the BRSS, an annual survey of residents of East Baton Rouge Parish conducted by Dr. Frederick Weil in the Department of Sociology at Louisiana State University. The data gathered by the BRSS consists of information on socially relevant attitudes, behaviors, and characteristics of residents residing in East Baton Rouge. The survey has been conducted continuously since 2000. Quantitative data from the BRSS is
analyzed to determine fear of crime amongst residents. The data offers an opportunity to explore
the basic demographic characteristics associated with fear of crime throughout East Baton Rouge
Parish. Specifically, based on prior research, the BRSS is used to test the following hypotheses:

- There will be a significant difference observed between individual level characteristics
  of being a female, Black and lower-class in relation to fear of crime.
- There will be a significant difference observed between the intersecting identities of a
  resident being a Black male and Black female in relation to fear of crime.
- There will be a significant difference observed between the intersecting identities of a
  resident being a lower and middle-income male as well as a lower and middle-income
  female in relation to fear of crime.
- There will be a significant difference observed between the intersecting identities of a
  resident being a lower-income Black resident and a middle-income Black resident in
  relation to fear of crime.
- There will be a significant difference observed between the intersecting identities of a
  resident being a lower- income Black male, a middle-income Black male, a lower-
  income Black female and a middle-income Black female relation to fear of crime.

Analysis Strategy

Research on fear of crime has long focused on the importance of individual factors
(Franklin and Franklin 2009), but this research was limited in how different combinations of
individual factors predicted fear of crime (Madriz 1997). The current study addresses this by
assessing a series of logistic regression models. According to Dubrow (2008), using logistic
regression to test several multiplicative interaction terms and their main effects is the best way to
reveal intersecting inequalities. The outcome variable in each of the models is the odds ratio of
the likelihood that respondents report being afraid to walk alone at night in an area within one mile of their home. The first model examines fear of crime on individual level characteristics including race, sex, and class. Models 2 through 5 regress fear of crime on differing combinations of individual level characteristics including race*sex, class*sex, race*class and race*sex*class.

**Dependent Variables**

Fear of crime is measured by responses to the question: “Within one mile of your home are you afraid to walk alone in your neighborhood at night?” Responses were dichotomized as yes (1) or no (0). Because this measure of fear of crime is a dichotomous dependent variable, I used logistic regression to determine the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable.

**Independent Variables**

There are three primary independent variables for this study. The first model assesses individual characteristics independent of each other including the race, gender and class of respondents. In studying the interaction between different characteristics of social identity, the second, third, and fourth model incorporates all the two-way interactions between the intersecting identities of race and sex, class and sex and race and class. The fifth model contained all the three-way interactions of interest. These demographic characteristics are common socio-demographic measures in fear of crime literature.

**Results**

This section examines the difference between the interaction of residents’ race, gender and class using the BRSS data. To test the hypotheses, a series of frequencies, cross-tabulations, bivariate correlations and logistic regression models were analyzed. The results of the
interactions presented in this section highlight multiple identities in relation to fear amongst different groups of residents. The descriptive statistics for this study are shown in Table 1. Variables are examined descriptively to provide some information about the data in the study. About 66 percent of the BRSS respondents were female, roughly 30 percent were Black and about 63 percent were White. Household income measured the amount of income residents reported on a three-point scale (1 = low-income, 2 = middle-income, 3 = high-income). The mean value for the income measure (2.08) indicates BRSS respondents’ income tended to fall within the middle. Given the large sample size of the BRSS data, fear is significantly correlated with all of the independent variables.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>.5484</td>
<td>.49775</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.6688</td>
<td>.47074</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlations presented are used for exploratory purposes (See Appendix A) and the cross-tabulations and chi-square tests (Tables 2-5) are examined to verify any initial relationships identified amongst the variables and their interactions. Most women in the study reported being afraid of crime (62.9%) and 37.1 percent reported not being afraid of crime. Nonetheless, for the sample, the majority of men reported not being afraid of crime (61.2%) and 38.8 percent reported being afraid. For race, 50 percent of Black residents reported being afraid and 50% reported not being afraid whereas 43.3 percent of White residents reported not being afraid and 56.7 reported being afraid. Considering household income, 40.2 percent of low-income residents, 46.6 percent of middle-income residents and 46.5 percent of high-income residents reported not being afraid, whereas 59.8 percent of low-income residents, 53.4 percent of middle-income residents and 53.5
percent of high-income residents reported being afraid to walk alone in one’s neighborhood at night.

Table 2 Fear of Crime by Sex of Respondent (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Number of Cases 815 1630

($x^2 = 127.537, df=1, p=.000$)

Table 3 Fear of Crime for Black Respondent (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Number of Cases 1727 720

($x^2 = 9.660, df=1, p=.002$)

Table 4 Fear of Crime for White Respondent (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Number of Cases 892 1555

($x^2 = 5.663, df=1, p=.017$)

Table 5 Fear of Crime for Household Income (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Number of Cases 595 732 736

($x^2 = 6.926, df=2, p=.031$)

Logistic regression analyses were conducted to explore the predictors of fear of crime.

Regression models measuring fear of crime based on residents’ intersecting identities as well as predictors are shown. Tables 3-7 shows logistic regression coefficients, standard errors, Wald
statistics, and odd-ratios [Exp(β)] for fear amongst intersections of disadvantage within race, sex, and class groups. The odds ratio greater than 1 show an increase in the likelihood of someone with that characteristic of being afraid to walk in their neighborhood at night, controlling for all other variables. If the odds ratio is less than 1, then there is a decrease in the likelihood of someone with that characteristic of being afraid. The Wald Statistics is used to estimate the significance of relationships between the variables. According to the Wald criterion, in each of the models female had a significant effect on fear. The unstandardized coefficients (β) show that there are negative or inverse relationships with fear with each interaction model.

Table 6 shows results of the base model that assessed individual characteristics independent of each other including respondent race, gender and class. This regression was assessed to give readers an understanding of why it is important to examine fear based on the interaction of multiple categories rather than a single social category. The odds ratio shows a proportion increase of female residents and a proportion decrease for Black and low-income residents. As prior research has found, significant relationships were observed between individual level characteristics of being a female, Black and one’s income in relation to fear of crime (Skogan 1990; Sutton and Farrell 2005; Schafer, Huebner, and Bynum 2006).

Table 6 The Demographic Characteristics of the Vulnerability Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Exp(β)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>112.659***</td>
<td>2.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-.659</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>10.897**</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>5.150*</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>1.132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
Predicting Fear for Race and Sex

In Tables 7-9, an identity matrix was assessed so that each variable overlapped with one another in order for each subgroup to be exclusively categorized. Table 7 shows results of the interaction for RACE and SEX. Black males and females were the only significant interactions in predicting fear of walking alone in one’s neighborhood at night after controlling for the basic demographic characteristics. Black male residents were 52.5 percent (calculated as 1-.475 = .525 *100) less likely to report fear while walking alone in one’s neighborhood at night once controlling for all other variables. The odds ratio for Black female was 58.8 percent less likely to report fear while walking alone in one’s neighborhood at night. The negative coefficient for both Black males and females is significantly important given that it contradicts prior research that found Blacks and females were more likely to report fear of victimization (Skogan 1990; St. John and Healdmoore 1995; Day 1999; Schafer, Huebner, and Bynum 2006). Altogether, given the high percentages, the results indicate that because you are a member of the Black group and a female doesn’t necessarily mean you are afraid of crime.

Table 7 The Interaction Model for Race & Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Exp($\beta$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black*Male</td>
<td>-.744</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.328*</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*Female</td>
<td>-.886</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.270**</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White*Male</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White*Female</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>3.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002***</td>
<td>1.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.289</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Predicting Fear for Class and Sex

Table 8 (Model 3) reveals the importance of the interaction of CLASS and SEX highlighted by the vulnerability hypothesis. In Table 5 there were no significant relationships
worth noting. This finding was surprising given that research has highlighted the importance of gender and class in fear of crime research (Pain 2001). More specifically, Pantazis and Gordon (1998) study found that poor people suffer from a high level of fear regardless of whether or not they were victimized. Additionally, several studies have found that fear of criminal victimization were more common amongst women (Pain 2001; Reid and Konrad 2004; Schafer et al. 2006; Wyant 2008; Franklin and Franklin 2009). However, these findings may be the result of greater survey participation amongst female and residents belonging to higher income ranking.

Table 8 The Interaction Model for Class & Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Exp(( \beta ))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-income* Male</td>
<td>-.803</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>17.547</td>
<td>.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income* Female</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>1.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-income* Male</td>
<td>-1.044</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>41.333</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-income* Female</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-income* Male</td>
<td>-1.077</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>47.219</td>
<td>.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-income* Female</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>2.134</td>
<td>1.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>53.934***</td>
<td>2.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>25.557***</td>
<td>1.720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Predicting Fear for Race and Class

Table 9 shows the interaction of RACE and CLASS. Low-income and middle-income Black residents were the only significant interactions in predicting fear of walking alone in one’s neighborhood at night. Low-income Black residents were 60 percent less likely to report fear while walking alone in one’s neighborhood at night once controlling for all other variables. The odds ratio for middle-income Black residents was 58 percent less likely to report fear while walking alone in one’s neighborhood at night. Again, the negative coefficient for these intersecting variables is worth noting since earlier research has found that Blacks and low-
income residents are more likely to report higher levels of fear (St. John and Healdmoore 1995; Will and McGrath 1995; McGarrell, Giacomazzi and Thurman 1997; Day 1999; Brunton-Smith and Sturgis 2011). Altogether, these results reveal the importance of examining race and class simultaneously when examining fear of crime differences amongst groups. Low-income and middle-income Black residents had a substantially higher percentage of being less likely to report fear as opposed to prior quantitative research.

Table 9 The Interaction Model for Race & Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Exp(( \beta ))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-income* White</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income* Black</td>
<td>-.923</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>7.860*</td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-income* White</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-income* Black</td>
<td>-.867</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>13.786***</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-income* White</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-income* Black</td>
<td>-.669</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>3.709</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>112.677***</td>
<td>2.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>12.528***</td>
<td>1.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Predicting Fear for Race, Class and Gender

Table 10 shows the odds ratio for the intersecting identities of residents’ race, class and gender. Model 5 measured the importance of the interactions of individual axes of inequity highlighted by the vulnerability hypothesis. Looking across this model, low-income Black female, middle-income Black male and middle-income Black female were the only significant interactions in predicting fear of walking alone in one’s neighborhood at night. The odds ratio for low-income Black female residents was 63.4 percent less likely to report fear while walking alone in one’s neighborhood at night. The odds ratio for middle-income Black male residents was 60.2 percent less likely to report fear while walking alone in one’s neighborhood at night.
Lastly, the odds ratio for middle-income Black female residents was 58.8 percent less likely to report fear while walking alone in one’s neighborhood at night. Taken together, the results provide a much more detailed understanding of how the intersection of race, sex and social class interact to produce different fear of crime experiences. For many decades, social scientists have examined these inequalities independently; thus, ignoring, and even erasing the fear of crime experiences of marginalized groups (Collins 2000; Pain 2001). Much of the findings contradict prior research that treats these characteristics as isolated variables. As the intersectionality theory argues; all individuals do not undergo the same experiences and obstacles. In order to truly understand these differences, an intersectional framework is needed.

Table 10 The Interaction Model for Race, Class & Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Exp($\beta$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-income* White*Male</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income* Black*Male</td>
<td>-.691</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>2.130</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income* White*Female</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income* Black*Female</td>
<td>-1.005</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>7.471*</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-income<em>White</em>Male</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-income<em>Black</em>Male</td>
<td>-.922</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>5.029*</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-income<em>White</em>Female</td>
<td>-.297</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-income<em>Black</em>Female</td>
<td>-.888</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>8.961*</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-income<em>White</em>Male</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-income<em>Black</em>Male</td>
<td>-.668</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>1.762</td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-income<em>White</em>Female</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-income<em>Black</em>Male</td>
<td>-.705</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>2.891</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>10.026*</td>
<td>3.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>12.055**</td>
<td>1.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
Discussion & Conclusion

Quantitative assessments in fear of crime research have come close to testing intersectionality but do not really employ the method or theory when explaining group differences. This study contributes to research on fear of crime by examining the importance of the interactions of demographic characteristics as well as the importance of intersectionality in quantitative fear of crime research. Intersectionality as a method allows scholars to understand and give a thorough explanation of the fear of crime concept by examining the interaction of multiple factors rather than just one. For each social factor (race, class, and sex) identity, I examined how each characteristic intersects to influence fear amongst the lives of residents located in Baton Rouge. The intersectionality model presented highlights the experiences of residents as well as those who are marginalized by a multiplicity of factors. The high levels of fear of victimization amongst Blacks, females and the impoverished groups were not assessed when interaction models were included.

Based on prior research, a sequence of five possible hypotheses was formed between the interaction variables chosen. With the exception of one, the hypotheses concerning fear of crime and interactions were all supported. Given that the vulnerability model argues that fear of criminal victimization was more common amongst women (Pain 2001; Reid and Konrad 2004; Schafer et al. 2006; Wyant 2008; Franklin and Franklin 2009), racial and ethnic minorities (St. John and Healdmoore 1995; Brunton-Smith and Sturgis 2011), and amongst lower class individuals (Will and McGrath 1995; McGarrell, Giacomazzi and Thurman 1997), I hypothesized that there would be a significant difference observed between individual level characteristics of being a female, Black and lower-class in relation to fear of crime which was supported by the logistic regression model (St. John and Healdmoore 1995; Pain 2001; Reid and
In regards to race and sex, I hypothesized that there would be a significant difference observed between the intersecting identities of a resident being a Black male and a Black female in relation to fear of crime. There were indeed significant differences observed for Black males and Black females; however, these findings were not supported by prior quantitative research. The results were contrary to my findings, which indicated that Black males and Black females were less likely to report fear as opposed to being more afraid. An abundance of research confirmed that women report greater fear (Snedker 2015). Earlier research also found that African Americans tend to be more fearful than other groups since they are more likely to reside in disadvantaged neighborhoods where violent crime is more common (St. John and Healdmoore 1995; Skogan 1995; Day 1999); subsequently, it is possible that African Americans are more aware of their space and know what locations and situations to avoid (Pantazis 2000; Carvalho and Lewis 2003).

The hypotheses concerning a significant relationship between the intersecting identities of a person’s class and sex in relation to fear of crime were not supported. This was surprising, given that research on fear argues that class and sex are strong predictors of fear (Again, these variables were examined independently). This finding highlights the danger of treating variables as isolated oppressions (Pain 2001). On the other hand, the hypotheses concerning a significant relationship between the intersecting identities of a person’s class and race in relation to fear of crime were supported. The findings revealed that there were significant relationships for low-income and middle-income Blacks in regards to fear. Both groups were highly likely to report not being afraid while walking alone in their neighborhood at night. This finding contradicts earlier research that found higher fear of crime levels amongst minorities and lower class people.
than middle class whites (Ferraro 1995; Melde 2009; Scarborough, Like-Haislip, Novak, Lucas and Alarid 2010).

The three-way interactions provided a more detailed understanding and explanation of fear in regards to the intersecting identities of a respondent's race, class and sex. Findings from the study indicated that low and middle-income Black residents, particularly females, were significantly less likely to be afraid of crime as opposed to earlier research. Single category descriptions do not reflect the reality that people have multiple layered identities. Taking on a quantitative intersectional approach reveals a much broader story and captures patterns that cut across multiple identities. Quantitative intersectionality has the aptitude to uncover often hidden anomalies (Hankivsky 2014).

This study contributes to the fear of crime literature by testing the intersecting relationships amongst individual axes of inequity. Intersectionality is used as a theoretical and methodical approach in this study to highlight individuals multiple, layered identities (Crenshaw 1991) in order to understand the unique lived experiences of residents. The models presented in this study addresses the most dominant theoretical concern within feminist and intersectionality research; ‘theorizing difference.’ Prior fear of crime studies consider multiple risk factors, but are limited in fully tackling the multi-level individual interacting identities that shape and influence fear. Intersectionality-informed quantitative data was useful in creating generalizable assessments in understanding fear for a larger population. Because the lives of low-income Black residents, particularly low-income Black women are rooted in structural inequalities based on the intersections of race, sex and class, Black residents are an ideal population in which to study fear and intersectionality. For every marginalized social identity there is an increase of being at a greater disadvantage and risk factor (Shields 2008). As a principle of intersectionality, it is
important to understand that race is classed and gendered, that gender is raced and classed, and
the class is raced and gendered (Collins 1989; Roberts 1998; Ellis 2001; Pollard and Welch
2006; Fasching-Varner, Mitchellll, Martin and Bennett-Haron 2014). The findings of the current
study reveal that examining the two and three way interactions of individual characteristics
provide a better explanation of those who are actually afraid of crime and of those who are not.

Limitations

While the current study makes significant contributions to research on fear of crime, it is
not without its limitations. A major limitation of this study was the inability to include measures
of disorder, as the Baton Rouge Social Survey did not include questions regarding residents’
perceptions of the quality of their neighborhood. Given that the disorder model is rooted in the
broken windows thesis, which argues that residents react negatively to signs of social and
physical disorder in their respective neighborhood (Kelling and Coles 1996; Taylor 2001), it is
important to understand marginalized groups fear in response to this disorder. Future research
should also examine fear utilizing integration models from an intersectional framework.
Although, the BRSS data asked questions regarding social integration, it was not analyzed here
in the current study due to the study's primary focus-understanding fear of crime amongst
individuals based on their race, class and gender identities that intersect. The integration model is
grounded in the social disorganization and collective efficacy frameworks, which state that
neighborhoods characterized by concentrated poverty, residential mobility, and heterogeneous
populations tend to feature weaker neighborhood communities which in turn increases crime and
fear (Skogan 1995; Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997; Sampson 2012). Future research
should examine these models simultaneously as they relate to the fear of crime.
Additionally, future research should examine other individual intersections as well such as age, marital-status and single parent households, which have also been linked to fear of crime from a national sample. Given that this study focuses on fear from one mid-sized city, which is more limited in comparison to a national sample size, Rouhani (2014) suggests limiting the number of intersections (e.g. only gender, race and class), and the content of its interactions. Since age was not a significant variable when other variables were included in the model such as sex and race, the variable age was not included. This was probably due to the fact that respondents in the sample were older and as a result, the sample was did not capture the true “young” population. Despite these limitations, this study contributes to the current literature on fear both theoretically and methodologically.

**Implications for Criminal Justice Policy & Practice in the United States**

The findings of this research have a few implications for criminal justice policies and practices in the United States as little research explicitly focuses on fear of crime in southern regions. This is concerning given the southern region of the United States has had a higher rate of criminal activity than the rest of the nation in the past decade (Ellison 1991; Huff-Corzine, Corzine, and Moore 1991, Uniform Crime Report 2012). Additionally, enhancing awareness about how people experience crime in southern areas is important information for criminologists concerned with addressing crime and fear of crime in the south.

One important implication of these findings is that by examining how individual characteristics intersect to produce different levels of fear, criminologists are given in depth insight into understanding the overall problem of fear of crime. Another implication of these findings is that criminologists will be provided a window for examining the relationship between social identities such as race, sex and social class which is relatively instrumental in crime
prevention policies, specifically in the arenas of local community policing and in improving community relations by interacting with the elderly, women and the economically marginalized. Because decreasing and controlling fear of crime is an important concern for local police officers, an intersectional quantitative analysis will provide policy makers with the data needed to identify social issues and policy concerns which can produce effective policy solutions (Bauer 2014; Scott and Siltanen 2012).
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CHAPTER 3: RITUALIZATION, MENTAL MAPPING AND THE FEAR OF CRIME: THE CONSTRUCTIONS OF PHYSICAL SPACE AND SOCIAL ACTORS IN TWO HIGH CRIME AREAS

Introduction

Fear of crime has increasingly become the focus of attention from criminologists interested in determining why residents have higher levels of fear than others. A significant amount of research argues that fear of crime is the highest amongst women, the lower class and minorities, particularly African Americans (Taylor and Covington 1993; Skogan 1995; Franklin and Franklin 2009). Additionally, prior research has found mixed results in regards to whether high crime areas are associated with greater or lesser fear of victimization (Lewis and Maxfield 1980; Taylor, Gottfredson, and Brower 1984; Miethe 1995). Previous research that focuses on fear of crime has relied almost entirely upon quantitative data and few have incorporated an intersectional lens. With few exceptions, research also fails to take into account reasons why citizens feel afraid and reasons why citizens are not afraid (Carvalho and Lewis 2003). Therefore, research is limited in addressing and examining the full everyday experiences of residents living in high crime areas. Using semi-structured interviews, this study addresses this gap by using an intersectional lens to examine fear of crime amongst residents living in high crime areas. In order to explain why some residents living in high crime areas are less fearful than other residents residing in the same area, this paper focuses on ritualization as a concept based on the notion that fears are a product of routines rather than a perception.

Drawing upon thirty in-depth semi-structured interviews and 100 hours of ethnographic research over two years in a high crime southern city, this study uses an intersectional lens to examine three main questions: How do cultural practices/rituals mediate fear? When, where and how?
how do residents come to use mental maps to determine what areas are safe and what areas are not? How do social identities like race, class and gender impact fear of crime responses?

The city was one of the most violent cities in the state between 2005 and 2013 according to statistics released by the uniform crime report (Federal Bureau of Investigation 2013). The high rate of violent crime in this city makes it an especially interesting place to examine fear of crime. By investigating fear of crime in high crime neighborhoods using an intersectional lens, this study provides an in-depth understanding of how residents use mental maps of specific spaces and people in those spaces to identify some areas as dangers and others as safe based on their intersecting identities and everyday routines.

This study contributes to the literature on fear of crime by examining fear of crime as part of an everyday ritual in the residents’ community and analyzing the experiences of fear amongst marginalized groups by highlighting social identities that makes them oppressed. Additionally, this study builds on the small, but growing body of qualitative scholarship on fear of crime by examining who and what is feared and where and when people are most fearful of crime within their person-environment setting. An important question in this study- and one that is still limited in prior research-has been why some residents living in high crime areas are less fearful than other residents residing in the same area? In order to address this concern properly, this study relies on the experiences of African American men and women living in low to middle-income high crime areas. The intersections of race, gender, class and location are examined and identified in order to explain how each identity intersects to influence fear and the ways in which residents identify specific spatial and temporal locations as safe and unsafe amongst the lives of residents located in the city.
Fear of Crime

Fear of crime as a research topic has received a huge amount of attention over the years; yet there is still much that remains unclear and unknown. In the spectrum of fear of crime, this topic has been an evolving social issue dating back to the mid-1960s when national public opinion surveys in the United States started to use open-ended questions regarding the public awareness of crime (McIntyre 1967; Poveda 1972; McConnell 1997). The findings from these public opinion surveys revealed that fear of crime are not always highest in areas with high crime rates (PCLEAJ 1967). Previous studies have shown that levels of fear of crime are highly constructed on several factors including the exposure to the media, personal demographic characteristics, neighborhood disorder and perception of risk (Liska, Sanchirico and Reed 1988; Ferraro 1995; Gibson, Zhao, Lovrich and Gaffney 2002).

One controversial issue in fear of crime discussions has been how to define fear. Scholars have highlighted the need for theoretical clarification of the meaning and methods used concerning the fear of crime concept since the early 1970s (Gabriel and Greve 2003). Although there is no complete agreement amongst scholars about how fear of crime should be defined, there are categories of fear of crime that many scholars would agree on. Generally speaking, fear of crime is associated with a wide range of emotions, anxieties, concerns, opinions, and attitudes (Ditton and Farall 2000; Mawby, Brunt, and Hambly 2000; Warr 2000). Therefore, fear is possibly best described as a multidimensional practice (Roundtree 1998). In this study, fear is referred to as a multifaceted concept of crime in which fear becomes an everyday practice based on three interlinked categories of experience: emotional (such as worrying or anxiety), behavioral (such as avoiding certain areas and purchasing equipment for protection) and cognitive (such as thinking one’s at risk or threat, and vulnerable to crime) (Roundtree 1998;
Gabriel and Greve 2003). All of these features are related to a person’s fear of becoming a victim of a crime (Gabriel and Greve 2003).

**Ritualization**

Fear is an important concept in research since fear has a tendency to affect people’s daily behaviors, emotions and cognitive being (Gabriel and Greve 2003; Radar, May, and Goodrum 2007). A common response to fear and crime is avoidance. By avoiding bodily contact with dangerous situations and people, individuals diminish their risks of becoming a victim in a criminal act (Miethe 1995; Madriz 1997) and as a result cause their behavior to become ritualized. Fearful individuals may engage in a host of avoidance behavioral strategies (Radar et al. 2007). These avoidance tactics often cause people to purchase weapons for safety, avoid contact with strangers and change their method of transportation and the route they travel (Skogan 1986; Miethe 1995; Altheide and Michalowski 1999). In addition, citizens frequently make choices regarding where to live, shop, and mingle based on practiced routines in different metropolitan areas.

*Ritualization,* in the context of this discussion, refers to those actions or activities performed by residents who personally avoid areas because of possible victimization and as a result their actions have become repetitious and routinized. Fear becomes mediated once residents become involved in a host of activities or actions performed as a result of possible victimization in a routinized manner. Consistent with Lawrence Cohen and Marcus Felson’s (1979) routine activities theory, residents’ daily routines regulate when and where criminal activities occurs since much behavior is repetitive and predictable in everyday life. The theory states that criminal actions result from motivated offenders, suitable targets, and the absence of capable guardians. Our daily social interactions, traveling routes, and activities influence the
possibility and frequency of criminal behavior. Skogan and Maxfield (1980) have proposed that routine crime prevention behaviors can be divided into two major groups: avoidance and risk-management practices. The authors argued that a person could decrease the likelihood of victimization by avoiding unsafe locations and situations, thus decreasing the possibility of encountering a potentially dangerous situation. Risk-management strategies are employed when he or she finds themselves in a possible risky and threatening situation and/or location and engage in precautionary measures in order to decrease the likelihood of victimization.

Ritualization is related to Routine Activities in that potential targets have the ability to avoid possible victimization by changing their actions or activities that put them in route of criminality. Therefore, the daily routine of the target determines the timing and location of the criminal acts by the motivated offender (Kennedy and Forde 1990). While prior studies have noticed several rituals that residents use to protect themselves against possible victimization and lower fear of crime levels (Madriz 1997; Carvalho and Lewis 2003); studies are limited in examining the different and similar rituals practiced amongst the entire group for whom researchers argue fear of crime is the highest (Taylor and Covington 1993; Skogan 1995; Franklin and Franklin 2009). Silva and Wright (2009) found that safety rituals helped women who were fearful of sexual violence feel powerful, in control, and less concerned.

Prior research on fear of crime and possible victimization has found mixed results. A number of studies focusing on direct victimization found that previous victimization is strongly related to fear of crime (Skogan and Maxfield 1981; Austin, Woolever, and Baba 1994; Gainey and Seyfrit 2001; Kanan and Pruitt 2002; Schafer, Huebner, and Bynum 2006; Wilcox, Jordan, and Pritchard 2007). Similar studies, however, have also found that previous victimization experiences have a small influence or no effect at all on an individual’s level of fear (Gates and
Studies have also revealed that fear of crime is determined by the type of victimization he or she has experienced (Bennett and Flavin 1994; Rountree 1998). On the other hand, studies focusing on indirect victimization and fear of crime argue that an individual does not have to be an actual victim to be fearful. A large number of individuals who lack direct knowledge about crime tend to rely on the media. It is acknowledged that the content of crime is an articulated attribute of mass media and misrepresents the truth of crime by disproportionately focusing on random violent crimes (Reiner 2007). Since an enormous number of Americans rely on the mass media for their information about crime rather than personal experience (Surette 2007), the frequent reporting of random crime in the media often raises individuals’ perception of crime, increases their consideration of risk, and causes them to become more fearful (Callanan 2012).

Whether directly or indirectly victimized, studies have shown that certain vulnerable groups are more likely to be fearful than others (Gainey and Seyfrit 2001). Looking across these studies, it is clear that much of this research has been gender, race and class specific. Research has consistently shown that women are still more likely to report being fearful of criminal victimization than men (Ferraro 1995; Will and McGrath 1995; McGarrell et al. 1997; Pain 2001; Acierno, Rheingold, Resnick and Kilpatrick 2004; Reid and Konrad 2004; Schafer et al. 2006; Franklin and Franklin 2009), in spite of all the official statistics showing that males are more likely than females to be an injured party of a personal crime (Stanko 1995). Additionally, research has shown that minorities, particularly African Americans, are usually more fearful than Whites since they are more likely to be victims of a crime and reside in disadvantaged neighborhoods where violent crime is more common (Taylor and Covington 1993; Skogan 1995).
Research has linked the behavioral patterns that residents carry out to community spaces that display signs of criminality such as trash, graffiti, and un-kept lots. Research has shown that the observant sense “bad areas” based on the way the space is perceived and imagined (Tanusree 2011). Residents perceive a location as a “bad area” when the space occupies abandoned storefronts, burned-out buildings, unfamiliar faces, drunks, loiterers, noise, overcrowding, heated words, dirt, disgusting odors and any other incivilities (Lagrange, Ferraro and Supancic 1992). This indication that a particular area has unappealing and intimidating features is related to Wilson and Kelling’s (1982) Broken Windows Thesis. The theory states that to some extent, undesirable characteristics of the neighborhood environment are correlated to criminal behavior. Research focusing on disorder and fear has produced mixed results. For example, Hinkle and Weisburd (2008) found strong evidence that fear of crime was higher in communities that characterized disorder whereas Carvalho and Lewis (2003), Schafer and colleagues (2006) and Wyant (2008) found that fear of criminal victimization was not related to signs of disorder in residents' communities. However, how residents react to signs of social and physical disorder based on their race, sex and social class that intersects to create different fear of crime experiences is largely under-explored.

**Mental Mapping**

Through ritualization, residents acquire a mental mapping practice. Mental mapping refers to the mental decision-making process by which residents collect, save, display, translate, and understand information concerning the physical appearance of the surrounding environment (Downs and Stea 2011). Through mental mapping residents assign a set of meanings to the environment in which they live and travel. Therefore, maps are not fixed, but change depending on the meaning an individual gives to a particular space and the reasoning at stake. So, maps are
constructed on an individual basis, as residents come to define new fears and anxieties by learning their neighborhood and the residents within it better.

Fearful individuals use mental maps as the basis for deciding upon and implementing any strategy of spatial and temporal behavior (Downs and Stea 2011). Through social constructionism, “people create reality—the world they believe exists—based on either their personal knowledge or from knowledge gained through social interactions” (Surette 2007:32). Consequently, all activities and actions that have been socially constructed have particular spatial and temporal characteristics that are critical to understanding residents’ daily activities (Kwan 2007). Mental maps are composed of peripheral boundaries of a person’s preferred activity area, which can be described as the space that includes the majority of the persons traveling or an area of the individual’s personal territory. This mental map is a representation or reflection of the characteristics of an area that consist of unfamiliar and unwanted terrains spreading away from preferred spaces (Schönfelder and Axhausen 2004).

Residents are active negotiators in constructing their space through spatial behavioral routines (Raanan and Shoval 2014). Research has revealed that an individual’s race, socio-economic status and gender all affect residents’ routines and the mental maps that people create of their surrounding environments (Madanipour 1996). Thus, understanding when, where and how residents come to use mental maps to determine what areas are safe and what areas are not is an essential aspect for this study. Raanan and Shoval (2014) examine the relationship between perceived territorial boundaries and actual spatial activity in a pilot study of 18 women living in Jerusalem. The authors found a strong relationship between perceived personal territory and actual spatial activity. The results of these findings point out that the construction of territorial limitations corresponds with everyday practices in the city. Additionally, Curtis (2012)
acknowledges that understanding the spatial dimension of fear of crime is significant to understanding residents’ behaviors in response to that fear.

**Intersectionality**

The term “intersectionality” was originated in the work of U.S. critical race theorist Kimberlé Crenshaw (1995) and is utilized extensively across many disciplines (Gillborn 2015). Intersectionality is based on the idea that individuals have several social identities such as race, gender, and class that intersect with one another (Collins 2000). Intersectionality highlights the way socially constructed identities overlap and create intersections of multiple inequalities based on individuals’ everyday embodied experiences. How intersectionality is used in scholarly research determines its definition. Intersectionality is identified at least three different ways in the literature. For instance, some theorists use intersectionality to discuss the “inclusion of the experiences of multiple marginalized persons and groups” to give voice to their daily practices and perceptions (Choo and Ferree 2010: 131). Some scholars apply this theory to show how social identities function together in a “non-additive process” to create “a transformative interactivity of effects” (Choo and Ferree 2010: 131) and others have taken a complex and historically grounded approach to understanding intersections as always co-constructing race, gender, class, and other statuses as systemic inequalities.” How researchers identify and describe “intersectionality” influences how the concept is used and defined in their study (Choo & Ferree 2010). Intersectionality in this study focuses on the inclusion of marginalized voices of African American residents residing in high crime areas.

As earlier research has acknowledged, research on fear of crime using an intersectional lens is limited and as a result, fails to fully address the differences amongst various categories (Madriz 1997). Human lives cannot be fully explained by focusing solely on single categories.
(Hankivsky 2014). Therefore, it is inappropriate to continue to treat gender, race, class, and any other social structural factors merely as descriptive groups in fear of crime research. Rather, in each context, we need to discuss fear of crime in relation to these social structural identities and understand how they work together to create fear rather than studying them independently. When gender, race, class and other social identities are incorporated based upon unequal distributions, research can begin to explain exactly who, where and when residents are most troubled by fear of crime (Pain 2001).

Several researchers have used an intersectional analysis in the past to explain fear but are limited to focusing on the intersections amongst women fear. For instance, Madriz's (1997) study used both focus groups and in-depth interviews to explore the many ways in which fear of crime affect the lives of women throughout the United States. Her findings revealed that regardless of the race and class setting of the respondents, the images of criminals were poor men of color, and images of victims were largely vulnerable and innocent White middle-class women. Similarly, Day’s (1999) study investigates the experiences of women in relation to fear in public areas amongst a group of White, Black, and Hispanic women in Orange County, California. The author's results indicated that men of color were viewed as criminals based on White women’s understandings of their vulnerability partially in relation to the alleged risk of rape. Women were more likely to stay away from areas they linked to people of color. Since these studies, fear of crime research is still narrowed in that scholars rarely utilize an intersectional framework when addressing fear of crime differences.

Prior research has revealed that certain groups are more likely to be fearful than others (Gainey and Seyfrit 2001) and as a result, fearful people are more likely to restructure their daily activities and lifestyles (Skogan 1986; Miethe 1995). However, prior fear of crime research is
limited in examining how a resident's social status—his or her race, gender, and class, for example—interacts to impact fear of crime responses. Therefore in order to move forward, it is only right to apply an intersectional approach to understand when, where and how residents living in high crime areas practice ritualization based on their intersecting identities. Results indicate that many residents have learned to cope within their dangerous environment through ritualization practices as they engineer their activity around and within their mental maps of community space. For this reason, in-depth semi-structured interviews and 100 hours of ethnographic research with an intersectional lens provide an intricate understanding to determine why residents living in high crime areas are less fearful than others.

**Studying High Crime Areas: Context & Methods**

This research project contributes to the literature on fear of crime by utilizing semi-structured interviews to examine why some residents living in high crime areas are less fearful than other residents residing in the same area. A qualitative approach was the appropriate research method, giving residents an opportunity to discuss their own personalized practices in their community and help shed light on marginalized groups. The qualitative component of this study uncovered the ways in which residents understood and dealt with their daily fears and worries about themselves and others. I employed a three-pronged qualitative approach consisting of in-depth interviews, field notes, and participant observation. Utilizing qualitative techniques in studying fear allows researchers to understand fear by listening to the voices and explanations of those most affected which is rarely achieved by using survey questionnaires (Madriz 1997). Not only does qualitative methods help shed light on residents’ voices but also offers ways of examining the “dark figure of crime” (Noaks and Wincup 2005:11). By drawing upon semi-
structured interviews and taking extensive field notes, this study seeks to understand why some residents living in high crime areas are less fearful than other residents residing in the same area.

**Study Area**

Still rich in its history and full of excitement for college football, this southern city is beginning to be known for its high crime rates. The city has been gaining an unsavory reputation as being one of the most dangerous cities in the state according to the Uniform Crime Report (Federal Bureau of Investigation 2013). Due to the high rate of violent crime in this southern city, examining fear of crime as an everyday ritual in residents’ neighborhoods makes this an interesting place to do so. Mason Gardens and Uptown Square are the two high crime areas located in the southern city that are plagued with an enormous amount of poverty (roughly one in five), under resourced schools, high unemployment rates and single-parent households, all of which are linked to criminality (Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997; Sampson 2012).

**In-Depth Interviews**

I limited my analyses to African-American men and women who reside in low to middle-income areas given that a substantial amount of research, with few exceptions (Lupton 1999; Carvalho and Lewis 2003), has identified them as a group who experience high levels of fear (Taylor and Covington 1993; Skogan 1995; Franklin and Franklin 2009). This research is based on 30 in-depth interviews with residents who lived in Mason Gardens and Uptown Square, where crime is considered to be the most dangerous and unsafe areas in the city. The interviews were initially conducted during the fall semester of 2013. I used nonprobability-sampling techniques to contact participants for this research. First, I visited local parks in the areas to

---

2 Mason Gardens and Uptown Square are both pseudonyms used to protect residents’ identity. The naming of streets or neighborhoods could have exposed participants' confidentiality.
become familiar with some of people in the neighborhoods. After visiting the parks for several
days, I came into contact with a female acquaintance that lived in one of the areas. Her husband
worked at a local store in the area. Both introduced me to residents of their community by
accompanying me to their homes as we went door to door so that I may interview residents they
knew. Secondly, through the use of convenience and snowball sampling, I asked each
interviewee to introduce me to other members. This technique allowed me to collect data on a
few members in the area and then ask those individuals to provide the information needed to
locate other members of the population whom they happened to know. Finally, after only 30
interviews, I started getting a lot of redundancy in residents’ responses. Once I started
transcribing, I noticed similar responses regarding residents’ daily practices. In order to have a
more in-depth understanding of how respondents sense bad areas as well as the physical
appearance of the areas they avoid, additional questions regarding residents’ everyday practices
and the physical appearance of the areas found frightening were added to the survey. Residents
were contacted for follow-up interviews during the spring of 2014 and fall of 2015. The
interviews were conducted individually with each interviewee either at a local coffee shop,
public meeting room or over the telephone when needed for convenience.

I asked respondents to provide their own answers to the questions asked, rather than
selecting responses from a predetermined list (Babbie 2010). Questions were guided through the
use of a list of topics to address. Questions differed slightly based on the responses provided by
the participant in order to gain additional information to the answers provided. The semi-
structured interviews asked questions about the following topics: 1) daily routine, 2) specific
places and spaces of danger, 3) sources of knowledge, 4) physical characteristics of the areas
found threatening, and 5) safety (See Appendix B). To ensure residents were at least 18 years or
older, residents were asked to give their age from their last birthday. Residents were also asked other demographic questions such as race, class, gender and marital status to help identify specific characteristics of the sample surveyed from the population. Each interview ranged between 45 minutes to 80 minutes. There was no compensation provided for participants in the interview; prior to agreeing to take part in the research, the respondents were notified that participation was completely voluntary, and that they could withdraw at any time without penalty. To ensure privacy, pseudonyms and unique ID numbers replaced all of the participants’ names in the transcripts of the audio recording and field notes. All of the residents in the interviews were African American men and women who resided in the areas during the time of the interview. The age range of the respondents was from eighteen to seventy years old. Of the thirty interviews, fifty percent were women and fifty percent were men. Half of the respondents were never married and half were currently married.

**Reflexivity & Field Observations**

My experience in the research site provides support to one of my major findings: once residents are able to map out safe and unsafe areas, they become accustomed to their habitual routines and as a result, are likely to report that they are not afraid. When I first started going into the areas of Mason Gardens and Uptown Square, I was very nervous, uncomfortable and worried about crime and criminals. I found myself adjusting to the environment due to participant’s low refusal rates. Residents were likely to take part in the survey and accepted me as an individual who understood their challenges. Many of the participants in the study stated that they were very ecstatic that I was doing research in their area since their voices are often unheard. My research participants were more open to discuss their feelings of safety, understandings of crime and criminals and spaces of danger. While in these areas, I became accustomed to taking certain
routes, locking doors, hiding enticing objects left in the car such as my purse and jewelry and not carrying money and valuable items while out in the areas. Similar to residents in the study, once these actions became habitual, I was no longer afraid or nervous. I became a member at one of the local churches in the area, which also significantly reduced my feelings of vulnerability.

During the two years of participant observation in Mason Gardens and Uptown Square, I endeavored to become part of the social life of the project. I spent approximately one hundred hours on the streets, in homes, at churches and at parks, observing patterns of social relations and regular patterns of interaction. I arranged meeting dates, times, and spaces that were convenient and comfortable for each participant. The majority of the interviews were conducted at residents’ homes, public parks, libraries and meeting rooms at local churches. Before and after each interview, I took detailed notes and audio recordings of the physical and social sceneries of participants’ residence and neighborhood. An account of each neighborhood and surrounding adjacent environments was documented. These accounts included any smells or sounds of the physical environment in addition to the appearance and feel of the locale as well as the people within it. In both Mason Gardens and Uptown Square, I observed characteristics such as trash, graffiti, abandoned buildings, loiterers, overcrowding, and other social activities. These accounts provided much description that was used to understand the environmental conditions of residents’ everyday lives.

Analysis

Given that the primary purpose of this study was to uncover the reasons why residents living in high crime areas are less fearful than other residents based on their lived experiences within the local area, this study takes a middle ground approach by relying heavily on inductive and deductive analyses. Data analysis occurred in two phases. In phase I, I began my analysis by
gathering scholarly research on fear of crime in order to develop a deeper and fuller understanding of the research topic. This search yielded numerous articles that helped me to determine several factors researchers have continuously found to have an effect on fear of crime including: race, gender and socioeconomic status. My preliminary research uncovered consistent themes and limitations discovered in the literature by prior scholars (Babbie 2010). Through the use of qualitative in-depth interviews, I was able to ask specific questions found in the quantitative literature up front and then allowed participants to elaborate and share their experiences as people of color. I identified residents as they identified themselves in the interviews (i.e., Black or African American).

In Phase II, the field observations and residents’ accounts and explanations from the semi-structured interviews were based on a grounded theory approach (Glaser and Strauss 1967). This inductive strategy was beneficial for capturing under-theorized themes and practices found in the qualitative interviews. I searched for patterns and themes that emerged as being important from the participants’ discussions (Daly, Kellehear, and Gliksman 1997). This process involved identifying themes through “careful reading and re-reading of the data” (Rice and Ezzy 1999:258) and by recognizing a meaningful moment and coding it before the process of interpretation (Boyatzis 1998). I did not hypothesize about what I may find; however, I looked for patterns that could tell me something about why residents living in high crime areas are less fearful than other residents. The patterns and themes I found included participants’ daily practices within their neighborhood, particular areas of high risk and the appearance of the areas in which residents were likely to avoid in addition to why.

The initial purpose of this project was to understand why residents living in high crime areas are less fearful than other residents. As the study evolved, I began to notice that residents
followed a set of routines. In the follow-up interviews, residents were asked several additional questions: How often do you abide by your daily routines? What is the purpose of these routines? When, where and how do you determine what areas are safe and what areas are not? The purposes of these questions were to have a more in depth understanding of how social identities like race, class and gender interact to create different fear of crime responses. Through an open coding of events collected from direct field observations and follow-up interviews, major categories were selected based on the findings that emerged: awareness of the condition of the neighborhood, ritualization and mental mapping. The theme “awareness of the condition of the neighborhood” includes sub-codes that covered the various ways in which the residents spoke of their feelings of safety in their community. The theme “routines” includes sub-codes that referred to the actions or activities performed by residents who personally avoid areas because of crime or possible victimization and as a result their actions become repetitious and routinized. The theme “mental mapping” includes sub-codes that described how residents assigned a set of meanings to the environment in which they live and travel based on their direct and indirect knowledge of an area such as dangerous and safe.

**Constructions of Physical Space: How Everyday Behaviors Become Ritualized**

Fear of crime has been a dominant concern in urban neighborhoods for decades (Toet and van Schaik 2012). In order to understand residents’ fear of crime in this urban area, participants were asked “Are you afraid to walk in your neighborhood at night?” Although the question is criticized for being limited to nighttime, failing to mention crime and only measuring intensity, this particular question is most likely practiced by social scientists given that it has been routinely used by the Gallup Organization and the National Opinion Research Center to measure fear since the 1960s. By using open-ended questions, I was able to address some of these points
of contention by asking residents to elaborate on the responses provided in order to gain additional information. Forty percent of women (n=6) reported being afraid to walk alone in their neighborhood at night. For instance, Ann, a fifty-four-year-old, lower-class Black woman who lives in the area of Mason Gardens, states: “Yes there are several areas around here that I would be afraid to walk alone at night. I don’t feel safe inside this neighborhood at all.” Alice, a thirty-five-year-old resident who resides in Uptown Square, similarly acknowledges:

Yes, not only am I afraid to walk alone in this area but in a lot of areas in the city. I try not to go anywhere alone and I try not to go anywhere by myself too late at night.

On the other hand, sixty percent of women (n=9) reported that they were not afraid to walk alone in their neighborhood at night but would not do so because of precautionary measures. Illustrating this point, Betty-Ann, a fifty-six-year-old, lower-class female minister in the community stated:

Well nah, [giggles], I wouldn’t just walk around here late at night nah, when I’m on the street ministering with my church; we are off the street by 8 o’clock at night and then we go home. That’s no problem but oh no, I wouldn’t just walk around the neighborhoods, I don’t think its real safe to just walk around the neighborhoods at night.

While a majority of women reported that they were not afraid and a little under half reported that they were, this evidence shows that fear is socially constructed quite independently amongst women (Hollander 2001). In contrast, all of men in the study reported not being afraid to walk alone in their neighborhood at night even though they are at a significantly greater risk than women to be victims of crime (Brownlow 2005). Two of these men reported that they weren’t afraid to walk alone at night because they were equipped with years of law enforcement experiences. For instance, Billy, a sixty-five-year-old male resident who was sitting on a bench at the park, explained, “I don’t worry about my safety or protection for myself because I’m ex-military, I can take care of myself but everybody is not like me.” Acquiring these skills meant
that they were in a better position to defend themselves if possible harm occurred. Similar to Stroud’s (2012) study, these men carried concealed firearms to protect their family, to compensate for the loss of strength as they aged, and to defend themselves from situations and spaces they viewed as dangerous. The idea of using guns to protect oneself against violence or “bad guys” is not only viewed as an acceptable form of violence in U.S culture but it is also praised (Gibson 1994).

Many of the men in the interview also spoke of their knowledge of the local area as a reason for not being afraid. For instance, Marvin, a thirty-three-year-old resident, stated: “I’m not afraid to go into any of the areas to be honest with you. I grew up in this neighborhood, so this is my neighborhood!” Although men stated that they were not afraid, similarly to women, they stated that they would not walk the area at night because of the high crime rate in the neighborhood. As Cube, a lower-class Black man in his early forties, residing in the area of Uptown Square explains:

Crime is occurring everywhere really. I wouldn’t dare walk these streets at certain times of the night anyway. When the night falls, it’s time to move on.

Though many of the participants stated that they would not walk alone in the area at night because of precautionary reasons, many of their responses denote to the “doing gender” and “doing difference” notions. “Doing gender” represents the differences between men and women and boys and girls. These differences are not natural, essential or biological, but are socially constructed and used to reinforce the “essentialness” of gender (West and Zimmerman 1987). In West and Fenstermaker’s (1995), they describe “doing difference” as an ongoing routine, methodical, and interactional accomplishment. Differences along the lines of race, class, and gender are simultaneously practiced and viewed as “normal” and “natural” ways of everyday social life. The body is often seen as an important mechanism through which people perform and
understand difference. As a result, shared beliefs about gendered bodies have led women to create images of themselves as being more vulnerable and men as less vulnerable (Madriz 1997; Hollander 2001). Female bodies are viewed by society as being less threatening to others because of their smaller physique, lack of strength, and vulnerability (Hollander 2001; Pain 2001; Tester 2008). Male images, contrarily, are perceived as threatening to others due to their bigger size, greater strength, and considered as a potential mechanism of sexual assault (Hollander 2001). Not only were men “doing gender” but they were also “doing age.” For instance, younger men were more likely to make reference to their ability to know how to fight, size, and who they know as a reason for not being afraid. On the contrary, older men made reference to their knowledge of the area and previous experiences (victimization, law enforcement and direct interactions) as a reason for not being afraid. Age is similar to other individual axes of inequality, but is unique in that group membership fluctuates as time changes (Utrata 2011). In the cases examined here, older men were more likely to discuss past involvements and experiences whereas younger men frequently made reference to their physical strength.

Many respondents made it clear to me from the very beginning that it was not the idea that they were afraid to walk alone at night, but the fact that they would not do so because they were aware of the types of crimes that take place in their neighborhood. During the discussions on fear of crime, residents frequently spoke of their feeling of safety. With many residents reporting not being afraid to walk alone in their neighborhoods, which featured the highest homicide rates (Johnson 2013); a majority of the residents also stated that they felt safe inside and around areas of familiarity in their neighborhood. Residents frequently stated that “crime is everywhere” and a person(s) must always be aware and take precautionary measures regardless
of what neighborhood you are in. Case in point, Buddy, a fifty-four-year-old resident indicated:

“I feel about as safe as I do in any neighborhood. Crime is everywhere! You just have to be cautious.” Jim, a thirty-year-old resident who recently moved to Mason Gardens from a rural area shared a similar view:

I feel really safe on my street because I haven’t had any bad business with anyone. Well actually in other neighborhoods outside this one, it’s to me it’s kind of worse than this one to me. You know what I’m saying cause this is like home and you like uh when you go somewhere else in a neighborhood not over here, like other guys may get the wrong perception of you and whatever and think different and think you over there trying to approach they neighborhood. Maybe considered in the wrong neighborhood or something.

The saying “My street is a safe area” was often used as an explanation for feeling safe walking alone in one's neighborhood (Lupton 1999). Scholars have argued that the predominant factor contributing to women’s fearfulness of crime is actually a result of their concern of being sexually assaulted (Stanko 1995; Madriz 1997; Rountree 1998; Day 1999); however, the major safety concern for women in this study was armed robbery. Women reported that they do not carry purses when having to leave out the house, especially at night. All of the women reported that they do not put themselves in vulnerable situations and always take precautionary measures such as looking out the window before going outside, locking car doors, only carrying a certain amount of money and keeping cell phones on at all times. In contrast, male participants frequently made reference to their ability to physically defend themselves and as well as to their size as a reason for feeling safe and not being afraid to walk in the neighborhood during the day or at night. Shared ideas about gender, whether it’s from prior victimization experiences, media representations or everyday harassment, affect factual realities (Hollander 2001). A majority of the respondent’s narratives demonstrate that their sense of safety occurs in personal spaces and locations such as the street their homes are located on and awareness of their surroundings,
regardless of feeling afraid to walk alone in one’s neighborhood or not. Elaine, a forty-nine-year-old resident who recently moved back to Mason Gardens stated:

I feel safe. I have always been very very aware of my surroundings, one thing I don’t do regardless of what area I’m in is carry a purse. I don’t carry a purse out like if I’m going to the store, especially around the holidays. You can be anywhere and get mugged or whatever. I’m just very aware of my surroundings. I’m just not going to walk to my car at night and not look around. I always look out my window before going outside at night and have someone watch me walk to my car.

Alice, similarly states:

Some precautionary measures I use for myself is that I try not to carry a purse so I won’t be as vulnerable to something happening to me or to someone trying to attack me. I also try not to go to the ATM to late in the afternoons and in the evenings when most crime occurs.

Other women, however, felt unsafe or more worried about crime when they had previous experience of victimization and concern about police protection. For instance, Mary, a fifty-six-year-old resident, described how violated she felt when someone came into her personal space. She stated:

I used to feel safe but now I don’t know because I had to go get an alarm system put in and for somebody to break in your house and just traumatize your life, that’s, that’s hard to deal with. You can’t sleep good cause you’re listening for something, thinking if they gone come back. You just feel violated, and I feel like my life has been violated even though I wasn’t at home when it happened. The police told me that since they didn’t steal thousands and thousands of worth from me that it was the last thing on their list.

Renee, a fifty-five-year-old resident shared with me the following narrative:

I feel um, on a scale of 1 through 10, I will say a 5. This area needs more security and more patrolling. The police need to circulate more in this area. They need more police cars out at designated times for the protection of people in their homes from vandalism, from robberies and from some of the prostitution that walks up and down the streets.

Empirical research has consistently shown that women are more likely to report being fearful of criminal victimization than men (Ferraro 1995; Will and McGrath 1995; McGarrell et al.1997; Pain 2001; Acierno et al. 2004; Reid and Konrad 2004; Schafer et al. 2006; Franklin and
Franklin 2009). However, this is not the case for these women, residents regardless of gender, accounts suggest that fearfulness and sense of safety is influenced by several factors, such as familiarity with specific places and spaces, previous experience with victimization and the social interaction with other residents as well as the local police officers.

**Ritualization**

During the interviews residents constructed a particular understanding of their environment, crime, and criminals. Crime is everywhere, it’s not random, they argue. However, they are aware of the areas to avoid within their own local environment. Through everyday practices, residents consistently reported that they avoided certain parts of the area due to crime and possible victimization; as a result of their actions, they became repetitious and routinized. Residents become accustomed to day-to-day activities under their control to explicit calculations of perceived environmental dangers and other vulnerabilities (Rengifo and Bolton 2012). Of the women who were afraid, their narratives demonstrated that they were aware of the high crime areas but did not have a particular routine. On the other hand, women who were not afraid were more likely to report that they followed a daily routine. For instance, Crystal, a principal and former schoolteacher in the area discussed specific protocols they followed as a result of crime in the area:

Yes, the school that I taught at and later was an administrator at was both in the middle of the area. So, we had specific protocols after 5 p.m. In the fall the doors would automatically lock, the security lighting would come on around the school. They actually asked me not to stay there after six without someone else being on campus or security being there. When I would drive in the mornings its fine but in the evenings when I would leave, I would take a different route. This was my normal daily routine. Dia, a fifty-five-year-old resident in particular stated that she not only had one routine but several.

Well I always try to change my routine no matter where I live because my dad will always tell us, you need to learn more than one way to come home and go to
wherever it is you have to go and always keep your doors lock. Giggles. So yes, I know what areas to avoid, and I have my preferred routes I travel.

Additionally, a few residents also acknowledged that although they haven’t changed their daily routines due to crime, they have considered it. For example, Renee, a 55 year-old resident who moved to the local area in 2006 as a result of a bad hurricane and its subsequent flooding, stated:

I haven’t had to change my routines. Due to the circumstances and the way that crime is, sometimes I have thought about changing my routines, my in and out routines of where I need to be. Finding another way to travel and using another pattern.

In contrast, all of the men in the study reported that they did not change their daily routines because of their concern for safety. Men were more likely to consider changing routines and avoidance as two separate entities. Demonstrating this point, Billy, a sixty-five-year-old resident, stated: “No I do not change my routines but I avoid areas that are real dangerous. It’s one area in particular though that I avoid.” While men were least likely to state that they change their usual daily routines because of concern for safety, they frequently spoke of the areas they were likely to avoid. Therefore, the majority of the participants in the study practiced a routine even if they had several routines or was not aware of avoidance as being linked to changes in one’s everyday routines. Male’s lower levels of fear and their failure to admit that they adopt routines can be understood as performing masculinity or “doing gender” (West and Zimmerman 1987; Stanko 1995; Hollander 2001). Men in the study “do difference” in a way that separates their behaviors from women. Men understanding of changing routines were viewed as being weak, scared, and incompetent whereas avoidance were understood as staying away from particular situations, people and activities where crime is likely to occur for precautionary reasons. Several studies have discovered that men may show greater levels of personal fear in unfamiliar neighborhoods or when males are in contact with a group of strange men (Brownlow 2005; Sutton and Farrall 2005), which in fact may be reasons why they admit to avoiding certain
areas. Goodey (1997) argues that voicing fear of crime is perceived as being inconsistent with one’s masculinity, which discourages articulating feelings of vulnerability and leads to dishonesty.

Overall, men as well as women living in Mason Gardens and Uptown Square were less fearful of crime when their activities and actions became a part of their cultural practice; thus, causing their behavior to be ritualized. Residents who have developed ritualistic habits in high crime areas are less likely to be suitable targets. Because they are more likely to be aware of their surroundings, they are more likely to think about how they might best guard themselves or their possessions. This section explains the aspects of ritualization of certain behaviors with the focus to develop a more meaningful understanding of fear of crime, examine who and what is feared, and where and when people are most fearful of crime.

**Mental Mapping**

Through ritualization, residents relied on their mental maps to determine dangerous and unsafe areas. When asked about the areas in which they are afraid to walk alone, many of the respondents shared similar narratives of the social conditions that plague the communities they live, shop, and mingle in. The majority of the interviewees relied on their mental maps to pinpoint the areas they frequently avoided and viewed as dangerous or crime hot spots. The mental maps was used to determine the safeness of an area based on perceived territorial boundaries, which are established through direct or indirect knowledge about spaces and people within those spaces. Regardless of gender or age, the five most mentioned places that residents stated they avoided were Timber, Biscotto, Creek Town, Spirit Town and Dixieland. These areas were seen to have enormous amounts of criminal activities such as muggings, thefts, assaults,
burglaries and robberies. For instance, Mary explains how crimes such as burglary, limits her routes:

Crime on my street has gotten really bad and I just hear about the other parts of the city on the news, I don’t go in those neighborhoods. I feel comfortable just going to work and back home.

When the explanations given for these responses are studied more in detailed, several factors appeared as matters of importance in residents’ mental mapping processes. Certain areas within the Mason Gardens and Uptown Square are deemed dangerous based on how many people hang out in the area at night, areas that are discussed the most on the news as far as crime is concern and how well the person knows people from the area. For instance, Shae, thirty-five-year-old resident who recently moved out of Mason Gardens but now only attends church in the area, stated:

I’m afraid to go into Dixieland and Creek Town because you always find people hanging outside, especially at nighttime there. On the corner and stuff you can’t go into the stores without soliciting outside. So, I find that it’s not safe for me. Couldn’t go to the stores because they had people everywhere and there wasn’t enough police patrol or anything. Now as far as where I go to church, I feel very safe and comfortable. I don’t know if it’s just because it’s a Christian surrounding and you don’t see as much hanging out.

Another respondent, thirty-three-year-old Marvin who lives in the area of Uptown Square, similarly explains how he avoids areas where there are a lot of people assembling:

I do tend to avoid a lot of situations where I see a lot of people congregating at the same time. If there appears to be a lot of alcohol involved and things like that, I just don’t see that as a good recipe for this area. I know how to avoid areas and situations that are not inviting and can lead to something criminal.

Residents relied on certain signs to determine the safeness of any given area. For instance, residents linked areas with unfamiliar faces, drunks, loiterers, overcrowding and any other incivilities to unsafe spaces. African American women practiced similar but different rituals than African American men living in Mason Gardens and Uptown Square. Race, gender
class and location intersect to influence mental mapping amongst the lives of African American men and women in different ways but similar outcomes. Schafer and colleagues (2006) pointed out that males and females experienced fear based upon different factors. For instance, both women and men were likely to develop routines around areas that were unfamiliar and where people were assembling late at night. Several studies have discovered that men may show greater levels of personal fear in unfamiliar neighborhoods or when males are in contact with a group of strange men (Brownlow 2005; Sutton and Farrall 2005).

However, women in particular, also developed rituals around areas that displayed additional “signs of danger” such as trash, graffiti, un-kept lots and high crime areas discussed in the media regardless of the time of the day. This indication that a particular area has unappetizing and threatening features is related to Wilson and Kelling’s (1982) Broken Windows Thesis. Nevertheless, regardless what route one may take, men and women in these areas both practice ritualization as a concern of possible victimization. While the mass media has some impact on people's perceptions of safe and unsafe areas in their local neighborhood, the media was not by any means the main source of knowledge about vulnerability and crime. Personal experience and awareness of the violent subculture strongly influenced residents’ mental mapping. AJ, an 18-year old resident I met at Ward Park, explains how unfamiliarity with the makeup of the areas and the people within it is unsafe to outsiders:

Based on what a lot of young adults tell me and from what I hear, Spirit-town which is where we at right now um you don’t want to walk down the street at night cause you will either get jumped or robbed. Um and in a lot of cases that did happen. But none of that stuff never happened to me cause um a lot of people know me and they know where I’ve been and they know what I can do. But I don’t want to say all that but um you know. Any neighborhood is not too, too rough for me. But for people that don’t know the neighborhood or are not a familiar face in the area, it’s bad at night.
In giving explanations of the areas residents avoid, two women reported that they also avoid certain spaces where family members were victimized. As Eri, a 36 year-old resident, expresses:

I particularly avoid a gas station in this area because my little brother was robbed there at gunpoint. Other people I know have been robbed at that same gas station. I do not go to that gas station at a certain time at night. This had an effect on my life. They robbed my brother at gunpoint, and he was literally just pumping gas. The boy put the gun up and when we called the police, the police was like: “Hey, I’m about to get off, I don’t have time for this. Let me see if I can get somebody else to help you.”

Jade, a 35 year-old resident, similarly explains:

Yes, there are two particular areas I’m likely to avoid. The store on the corner of Timber, my cousin got robbed there during Christmas about 3 years ago so I don’t ever go there. Also the gas station by that little shopping area, cause a friend’s brother got robbed there. Also my purse got stolen at my job, which is on the corner of The South and LA, so I really don’t frequent that area. Other than that, I feel safe in the areas I grew up in. All the people know me there.

As respondents described the characteristics of the areas they are likely to avoid, all of the participants also reported that Mason Gardens and Uptown Square have some decent areas that are not as violent as others. Residents reported that some areas in the neighborhoods are family-oriented and within those areas they are not afraid of crime and felt safe. Women were more likely to report that they monitor themselves by avoiding certain areas of their neighborhood because of the anxiety about potential violence and using more safety precautions than men. Consistent with prior research, women are more likely to state that they practice multiple precautionary measures than men (Madriz 1997). For instance, women were more likely to state that they lock themselves inside their homes, refrain from carrying purses, and avoid areas where they themselves or their family members were victimized. While men also practiced precautionary measures, studies show that women employ more avoidance strategies (Stanko 1995). Overall, the overwhelming majority of residents use mental maps of specific spaces and people in those spaces to identify what areas to avoid based on either their knowledge
gained from the media, social interactions with residents and physical characteristics of the area. Residents’ spatial and temporal behavior was constructed based on the individuals’ mental mapping process, which is used to determine what areas are safe and unsafe within their local spatial environment. With mental mapping, residents used their cognitive thinking skills to create mental maps of the environment to determine the appropriate path to travel as part of their daily routine. The meaning of this space is created and negotiated mainly by residents living in or around it (Harvey 1989) in order to assign meaning to the environment in which they live, travel, shop and mingle. Residents’ mental maps allowed them to develop protection rituals and elicit precautions without consuming too much of their time or energy worrying about crime (Madriz 1997; Carvalho and Lewis 2003). Findings reveal that a sense of safety, not fear, is the dominant reaction to crime by residents (Carvalho and Lewis 2003).

**What it Boils Down to: Making Sense of Intersectionality & Fear of Crime**

Prior fear of crime research focused on individual characteristics associated with vulnerability, but much of this research analyzed the characteristics independently. For instance, a significant amount of research argues that fear of crime is the highest amongst women, the lower class and minorities, particularly African Americans (Taylor and Covington 1993; Skogan 1995; Franklin and Franklin 2009). Consistent with Carvalho and Lewis (2003), the vast majority of respondents in this study reported that they are not afraid to walk alone in their neighborhood at night, including women. However, the current study contributes to fear of crime research by highlighting the importance of how identities intersect and overlap with one another based on individual’s everyday personalized experiences. Together, these social identities work to collectively influence the nature and layout of fear of crime; thus, providing a more detailed
explanation to why some residents living in high crime areas are less fearful than other residents residing in the same area.

Instead of being fearful, respondents’ answers indicated that they mark specific areas as dangerous and unsafe. Additionally, residents engineer their activity around and within those mental maps of community spaces (Carvalho and Lewis 2003). Although women were more likely to state that they practice protection rituals, avoidance became a consistent theme throughout the interview process for both women and men, demonstrating their feelings of vulnerability to violence regardless of gender or age. The series of actions performed by residents were based on a variety of sources, including personal experience, hearsay and the media. As a result, residents avoid certain areas based upon their mental map of safe and unsafe areas within their neighborhood.

The slogan “This is a safe area” was often used as a justification for being “street smart.” For example, in Elijah Anderson’s research, the author revealed that some of the behaviors and actions of resident’s in the inner city were a result of being “street smart.” Through adaptation residents learned behaviors that kept them feeling safe in unsafe areas. In this study, safety was regularly described as an area of personal space where a lot of people are not hanging out. Those who were afraid frequently discussed their past experiences of victimization around their neighborhood when providing explanations of how safe they felt walking in it. Overall, African American residents living in high crime areas reported that they were not fearful of crime; although, they felt like crime was a major problem in the areas.

**Discussion**

Much of the research that focuses on fear of crime has relied almost entirely upon quantitative data. By providing a qualitative component, I was able to collect more in-depth
insights into residents’ understandings of crime in disadvantaged areas. My objective was to
examine why some residents living in high crime areas are less fearful than other residents
residing in the same area. By examining fear of crime in high crime neighborhoods using an
intersectional lens to better explain who is feared and where and when people are afraid the
most, this study helps to explain how residents use mental maps of specific spaces and people in
those spaces to identify some areas as dangers and others as safe based on their intersecting
identities and everyday rituals.

Parallel to the findings discussed in the previous section, the interviews showed that it is
not solely the fact that an individual feeling either safe or unsafe is related to their neighborhood
alone. The feeling of safety amongst residents is related to a number of factors which include the
time of day and night, different areas located in their neighborhood, the amount of people
hanging around a specific area, previous experience of victimization, awareness with and past
experience of the area and areas discussed a lot in the media. Nevertheless, there were well-
defined patterns in the ways in which the residents in this study distinguished and recognized
certain places and people as a source of danger. As part of a coping strategy for dealing with
crime and safety, residents created mental diagrams of areas within their neighborhood,
identifying certain places as likely to be safer and others as violent. This mental diagram relied
heavily on direct and indirect knowledge about social relations and the kinds of people who
dwell and hang out in these areas at certain times throughout the day. The knowledge that
residents acquire derived mostly from personal and vicarious experiences while the mass media
only played a small role.

A majority of men and women both reported not being afraid to walk alone in their
neighborhood at night in these poor high crime areas. Sixty percent of women reported that they
felt safe within the area and were not afraid to walk alone in their neighborhood at night but would not do so because of precautionary measures. In contrast, all of the men in the study reported not being afraid to walk alone in their neighborhood at night. Therefore, the overall findings suggest that not all individuals with characteristics associated with higher fear levels of crime are actually afraid of crime. The everyday embodied practices of residents illustrate how there is no single identity category that adequately determines how residents react to fear within their social environment.
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CHAPTER 4: FROM RACE TO RELIGION: AN EXAMINATION OF STRUCTURAL FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO FEAR OF CRIME IN HIGH CRIME NEIGHBORHOODS

Introduction

Crime is a serious social problem in America’s modern society and remains a dominant issue of the African-American experience (Miethe 1995; Quillian and Pager 2001). Nearly one-fourth of United States families are affected by crime every year, and almost one-half of our nation’s residents will be a victim of a violent crime in their lifetime (Warr 2000) and as a result, an enormous amount of residents are fearful of criminal victimization (Jackson and Stafford 2009). Research on fear of crime-defined as an “emotional response of dread or anxiety to crime or symbols that a person associates with crime” (Ferraro 1995:23) has been an evolving social issue for many decades (McConnell 1997). To explain the variations in fear of crime responses, research has drawn upon both individual and neighborhood level factors. Throughout the years, scholars have consistently found that fear of crime is the highest amongst minorities, particularly African Americans, the poor and women than any other social group (Skogan 1990; Skogan 1995; Sutton and Farrell 2005; Schafer, Huebner, and Bynum 2006), revealing some of the racial inequalities that still exist amongst the lives of poor Blacks who are multiple marginalized by their intersecting positions. In addition, research found that social structural conditions like poverty, unemployment, and residential instability correlates to crime and causes heightened levels of fear (Sampson and Grove 1989; Woldoff 2006; Becker 2012).

Missing from the research on fear of crime is an understanding of within group differences despite the fact that the Black population is very diverse in terms of religiosity, gender, age, educational attainment, and income. Additionally, little research is dedicated to the role that religion, a dominant supporter in the Black community, can play in controlling fear of
crime levels and coping with challenges from an intersectional approach. Scholars have rarely examined how underprivileged groups are more or less likely to be concerned about crime based on their adherence to religion combined with one’s social identities. This gap is quite astounding given the dominant role religion plays in shaping the attitudes and viewpoints of congregants (Matthews, Johnson and Jenks 2011). The purpose of this study is to understand what effect, if any, do the aforementioned variables have on fear of crime for Blacks, and in what ways does structural factors account for crime amongst the Black community? My contention is that research on crime and racial differences is hampered by its persistent efforts to control for community-level conditions, which are not similar across all groups (Sampson and Bean 2006). Therefore, I seek to understand how institutions such as education, the criminal justice system, the labor market and the church have adversely affected and contributed to fear in African Americans high-crime neighborhoods.

Residents living in deprived and under resourced neighborhoods are confronted with many challenges (Kliwer, Goodman, and Reid-Quinones 2013) and in order to fully comprehend, situate, and give voice to marginalized groups, an intersectional analysis is needed. Intersectionality as a concept is utilized for many different purposes, including giving voice to the disadvantage group, recognizing ways certain groups are offered more or less opportunities in certain situations and understanding categories as artificial and exclusionary (Jones, Misra and McCurley 2013). This study contributes to the fear of crime literature by utilizing the inclusion and relational approaches of intersectionality offered by Choo and Ferree (2010) and McCall (2005) to reveal the hidden dimensions of oppression that affect residents within their community. The inclusion model is utilized to give voice to the multiplicity of marginalized factors by allowing African American residents from impoverished areas the opportunity to tell
their own stories based on their personal experiences. This approach revealed how residents’ experiences are shaped by their religion, race, class and gender and how each of these identities intersected; creating multiple inequalities. The relational model is utilized to draw attention to how different social institutions such as education and its socio-cultural context offer dramatically different opportunities for African Americans in comparison to their White counterparts. This study looks at the intersection of each sub-concept of race, class, gender, and religion in addition to their relationship with one another and how these identities together interact to shape Black Americans’ everyday personalized experiences in crime-ridden neighborhoods.

The implications from these findings suggest that researchers should continue to explain fear of crime from an intersectional framework. Increasing awareness about how different groups experience fear based on their intersecting social identities is important information for criminologist and sociologists concerned with addressing crime and fear of crime in high crime areas. Examining these relationships also provide important insight into understanding the neighborhood factors that contribute to the overall problem of fear and crime. By confronting the contemporary issues that continue to facilitate the perpetuation of racial, class, and gender inequality, scholars are much more likely to ask new and different questions that might, in turn, create more discussions on fear of crime in addition to how social institutions like education and the criminal justice system contribute to and reinforce race, class and gender differences based on residents’ intersecting identities.
Understanding Fear of Crime & Intersectionality

The Fear of Crime

Since the earliest analyses (McLaughlin 2001), numerous studies have revealed that fear of crime is a problem that needs to be taken very seriously. The fear of crime literature highlights America’s continuing racial divide. For instance, prior research on this issue has constantly found that only certain groups of people are more vulnerable to crime and are likely to be more fearful than others. Over the past several decades, fear of crime coupled with race, class and gender represents one of the most well-known topics of discussion in fear of crime literature; however, these variables are often treated as distinct or independent (Warr 2000; Pain 2001). In addition, and perhaps most critical, religious variables are rarely included amongst these independent factors when examining fear (Matthews, Johnson and Jenks 2011). Absent from the research on fear of crime, is an understanding of within group differences despite the fact that the Black population is very diverse in terms of religiosity, gender, age, educational attainment, and income. The importance of seeing race, class, and gender as interlocking systems of oppression in fear of crime research encourages scholars to take into account other oppressions as well such as religion, age, and education (Collins 2000).

Despite these limitations, several scholars have contributed to this intersectional phenomenon in earlier studies. Madriz (1997), for example, examines the intersecting social positions of race, class, and gender and how these identities play a role in a woman's sense of vulnerability. Utilizing focus groups and in-depth interviews, the author’s study found that regardless of the race and social status of the respondents, images of offenders are those of Black poor men, and images of victims are mostly middle-class White women. Similarly, Day’s (1999) study on women’s fear investigates women’s experiences in relation to the interaction of race,
gender and class and their fear in public spaces in an urban area of California. White women’s fears of sexual violence were constructed in relation to the apparent threat of sexual assault committed by men of color. Women of color who fear crime were also interpreted by race but also related to the fears of sexual assault; consequently, they viewed themselves at risk for racist harassment and victimization or in other words, double discrimination (Day 1999; Pain 2001). Day demonstrates how women’s use of public space and location replicates and shapes their knowledge on race and of fear (Day 1999). For example, women avoided and viewed public areas in some cities as safe (White cities) and others as unsafe or risky (areas they linked with people of color). The author suggests that in reality, White women are more likely to be victimized by White men that they are intimate with or are acquainted with than the Black men their fear of crime is connected with (Pain 2001).

I hope to advance the literature by providing detailed insight to the lived experiences of the Black population in terms of their religiosity, gender, age, educational attainment, and income in relation to fear. With few exceptions (Madriz 1997; Day 1999), research that examined within group differences has examined these identities independent of each other. For instance, scholars who have examined fear of crime within groups have focused on Whites (Skogan 1995), women (Stanko 1995; Wilcox, Jordan and Pritchard 2007), men (Brownlow 2005), the elderly (McCoy, Wooldredge, Cullen, Dubeck and Browning 1996; Joseph 1997; Aciermo, Rheingold, Resnick, Kilpatrick 2004); class (Will and McGrath 1995) and welfare recipient’s (Carvalho and Lewis 2003). Looking across these studies, it is clear that examining fear of crime within groups and from an intersectional framework is limited in addressing the differences amongst different categories within the Black population (Madriz 1997) including omission of variables, such as religion, which is critically important given the religiosity of
Black women (Gillum 2009). As noted above, it is quite surprising that religion is rarely discussed in fear of crime and intersectional research due to its central role in the lives of Blacks (Gillum 2009; Matthews, Johnson and Jenks 2011). Clearly, more studies are needed to understand the differences and to give voice to the Black population who are marginalized by their social markers. Adopting the intersectional approach for analysis reveals how social identities work together to produce different fear of crime experiences for Black residents residing in high crime areas.

**Intersectionality**

In light of these issues, many of the residents in communities of color remain disproportionately marginalized, segregated and incarcerated (Quillian and Pager 2011; Saito 2015), indicating serious inequalities and systemic racism within our institutions. The idea that America is living in a post-racial society has contributed to many concerns, including a fear of crime (Martin, Fasching-Varner, Quinn and Jackson 2014). In many instances, Black lower class residents are more likely to be victimized targets of racism and discrimination, which allows them to be marginalized from mainstream opportunities; therefore, controlling and influencing fear of crime levels. As scholars, we cannot continue to limit our focus solely on independent variables; we need to approach the issue of fear from an intersectional perspective and vice versa.

Kimberlé Crenshaw used the paradigm to discuss how race and gender shaped women differently, particularly women of color in employment and is credited for introducing the term “intersectionality” (Gopaldas 2013). The concept is based on the idea that individuals have multiple, layered social identities such as race, gender and class as well as other social structural characteristics that simultaneously impact the lives of all people as they engage in socially
mediated relationships and in their interaction with society and its institutions (Crenshaw 1989
1991; Collins 2000). These multiple layered identities originated from social relations, history
and the configurations of power (Crenshaw 1991). During the 1980’s and 1990’s, the idea of
intersectionality as a methodological approach began to gain attention (Crenshaw 1989). Critical
race scholars and Black feminists began to take the lead in enhancing an intersectional
methodological approach once they discovered that much of prior feminist research concentrated
highly on educated middle-class White women; thus, failing to take into account how Black

Since its inception, the exact definition of intersectionality varies depending on
researchers’ stance in relation to social categories (McCall 2005; Shields 2008; Choo and Ferree
2010). Some theorists use intersectionality to discuss the “inclusion of the experiences of
multiple marginalized persons and groups” (Choo and Ferree 2010:131). Some researchers
utilize the theory to demonstrate how social identities function together in a “non-additive
process” to create “a transformative interactivity of effects” (Choo and Ferree 2010:131) and
others have taken “a complex and historically grounded approach to understanding intersections
as always co-constructing race, gender, class, and other statuses as systemic inequalities” (Choo
and Ferree 2010; Jones, Misra and McCurley 2013:2). The definition of “intersectionality” is
based on how researchers identify and describe the term (Choo and Ferree 2010). In order to
better explain who is feared, where and when people are afraid the most, this study focuses on
both the inclusion of marginalized voices and how social institutions offer different experiences
for low income Blacks. Taking this approach is an important extension to understanding fear of
crime causes and reasons based on intersecting identities of the marginalized while explicitly
linking the micro (individual) level and macro (societal) levels of analyses.
Intersectionality is important in studying fear of crime especially in a high crime, southeast city where crime is located within two of the most dangerous and unsafe neighborhoods in the metropolitan area. Qualitative data, when analyzed with an intersectional lens, provides an intricate view of fear of crime amongst the marginalized and how social institutions are linked to privileged and disadvantaged groups. The theory itself represents the system of oppression that continues to privilege non-marginalized groups and oppress others. In short, this approach provides a new way to study the underlying causes of fear in disadvantaged, low-income neighborhoods.

**Inclusion**

The first way intersectionality is utilized in the current study is by positioning multiple oppressed groups and their viewpoints at the heart of the research, sometimes called a group-centered approach. As Choo and Ferree (2010) state, this perspective focuses on centering marginalized voices while highlighting the multiple, intersecting inequalities of oppressed groups. McCall (2005) describes this approach as “intracategorical,” which generally focuses on a “particular social identity at a neglected point of intersection of multiple categories or a particular social setting or both” (p. 1774) in order to understand the complexity of lived everyday personalized experiences. The inclusion approach argues that a specific social status is created by multiple identities; researchers using this approach must first identify a single social group or group type that is represented by an individual omitted from the initial analysis of intersection of master categories (Few-Demo 2014). Taking this approach in this study gives voice to the Black residents whose voices were often ignored. In the African American Policy Forum, Crenshaw describes intersectionality as a framework that empowers us to identify the fact that socially constructed “group membership can make people vulnerable to various forms
of bias, yet because we are simultaneously members of many groups, our complex identities can shape the specific way we each experience that bias” (African American Policy Forum 2013). Therefore, Black men and women can often experience fear of crime differently, just as women of different races can experience sexism differently, and so on. The majority of fear of crime research has tended to treat these characteristics as independent variables (Pain 2001). In order to address pressing social issues affecting Black communities, their marginalized voices need to be expressed and heard. By creating this space, residents are able to tell their own stories and share their experiences as Black low-income residents.

Utilizing this approach revealed how socially constructed identities overlap in shaping fear of crime experiences/perceptions and how intersections of multiple inequalities become major elements in examining fear. In order to accomplish this task, I focused on specific social statuses like poor Black men and women residing in low to middle-income areas. For each identity, I examined the intersections of race and gender and how each social structural characteristic intersects to influence fear amongst the lives of residents located in the south. The inclusion model helps individuals raise their voice against marginalization.

**Relational/Process Model**

Another way intersectionality is used and defined in this study is by focusing on power as relational, seeing the connections among factors as reproducing oppressions at various points of intersection, and drawing attention to unmarked groups (process centered). This model is identified as the relational/process model. As Choo and Ferree (2010:134) note, a “structural type process-centered analysis” recognizes the changes that occur when multiple identities link. In other words, the model looks at how systems and structures in society affect individuals and groups differently by privileging some while oppressing others (Crenshaw 1991). Scholars, who
use this approach, also refer to it as “intercategorical” (McCall 2005). This model also focuses on complex relationships between social groups rather than focusing on a single dimension or category to identify patterns of relations that exist among them. Utilizing this approach highlights the social inequalities that remain for low-income African American men and women across social institutions like education, the criminal justice system and labor market. The failure of so many institutions in our society produces dire consequences for millions of children and families of color who are already marginalized (Lawrence 2011). In these areas, education, incarceration and the labor force (among low-income Blacks) interact with race as well as other social markers to create different, intersectional experiences.

The two high crime African American communities in the south that this study focuses on are plagued with an enormous amount of poverty, low-quality schools, high unemployment rates and single-parent households, all of which are linked to criminality (Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997; Sampson 2012). The narratives in this study highlight how disadvantage Black Americans are overrepresented in high crime areas, prisons, failing schools, and amongst the poor. Consequently in order to fully understand the fear and crime amongst oppressed groups, the study examines how structural factors account for variations in fear of crime within a high-crime, Black community in southeast Louisiana. Additionally, the study examines whether residents attribute their fear of crime and victimization to individual shortcomings or institutional practices. Research has shown that poor Black residents do not benefit from the social institutions offered by society; therefore, the intersection of race, class and gender cannot be disentangled (Bell 1992; Curry 2008; Martin, et al. 2014).
An Account of One High Crime Southern City

The crises facing today’s education, correctional facilities, and labor market are closely intertwined in Black communities. In American society, it is the Black population that is strongly portrayed as violent criminals (Alderman 1994; Pain 2001; Welch 2007), not only is this true in the south, but in the United States in general. People of color make up somewhere between 12 to 13% of the general population in the United States; however, they are accounted for more than half of all arrests for violent crimes, and almost half of all inmates in state and federal correctional facilities. Without even trying to investigate the causes behind such data (Meier 1994; Hacker 1995), it is fair to assume that the Black communities provide some of the best evidence that we are not living in a post racial society. It is the Black community in which crime is high, poor social services and dilapidated housing exists, as well as an area frequently viewed as dangerous and unsafe to the general public (Woldoff 2006). Subsequently, it is only right to examine fear of crime within the environments it is likely to occur.

The city represents some of the poorest, uneducated, high violent, segregated areas (Yee 2015). The city in which this study focuses on, therefore, serves as a remarkable case study in studying fear of crime. The city itself is a symbol of racial inequality and is symbolic to the unequal opportunities made available to Black residents and the challenges associated with racial disparities among social institutions. Similar to the U.S. in general, the two high-crime areas represent the continuing racial divide, particularly with respect to education, employment, and the prison system.

Segregated, Uneducated, & Underprivileged

Many areas in the United States remain racially segregated, including the south. The high crime southern city is ranked amongst the top ten cities of the most segregated areas in the
United States, clearly showing the racial divide amongst Blacks and Whites (Yee 2015). For instance, nearly a third of African American residents are living in neighborhoods comprised of 90 percent or more Blacks, and over 50 percent of the White population reside in neighborhoods that are more than 90 percent White (Quinn and Pawasarat 2003). The city is so racially segregated that recently residents proposed to bring in a new town known as Augustine ³ within the parish. Although unsuccessful, the city would have brought an independent school district in the southeastern area where 65 percent of students would have been White and less than 25 percent would have been Black. The median household income of a house in Augustine would have been $30,000 higher than that of the high crime southern city (Allen 2014).

Not only is the high crime southern city racially segregated, but the city is segregated in a way in which an enormous amount of crime often occurs in neighborhoods composed of poverty, under resourced schools, and single-parent households. In a recent interview on the Brady Morning ⁴ radio show, the parish district attorney stated that poverty, inadequate education and low performing schools are major factors influencing crime in the city (The City Advocate 2016). According to data from the U.S. Census Bureau, there are an increasing number of these residents remaining in poverty; roughly one in five. In 2013, there was only a slight increase to the families in poverty, from 14 percent in 2012 to only 14.3 percent in 2013. In 2013, there were 32.5 percent (40,195 residents) of 46 percent of Black residents who were living with an income below the poverty level, in comparison to 18.8 percent (14, 607 residents) of Whites. Of those living in poverty, 77.2% are single women with no husband present and 28 percent of those families had children under the age of 5 (Lane 2014). Existing research implies that children

³ Augustine is a pseudonym used to protect the city identity.
⁴ The Brady Morning Radio Show is a pseudonym used to protect the city identity.
from single parent households are more likely to be schools dropouts, teenage parents and experience cognitive, emotional and social problems (Wilson 2009).

**Correctional System**

In addition to the racial disparity in the educational system, the criminal justice system is yet another institution where Blacks are misrepresented in the southern city which contributes to the data on single-parent households. The city represents the parish with one of the largest racial disparities for drug offenses (ACLU 2013). Blacks are 2.7 times more likely to be arrested than any other race (Handelsman 2014) in the local area. Additionally, Black residents are linked to majority of the violent crimes in the city and represent an enormous amount of all inmates in local and state prisons. The more resources spent on incarceration mean less money going towards education, housing, healthcare and any other institution that can help improve poverty. To ensure harsh punishments for criminal offenses and to get more convicts sent to their own facilities, private companies lobby, fund, and give rise to a vicious cycle (Chang 2012; Micah 2012). In 2011, the Sheriffs’ Association rejected a bill that would have allowed inmates to be eligible for parole based on good conduct. During that same year, the District Attorney blocked a bill that would have reduced the amount of time spent in jail for people who committed non-violent offenses before approaching parole. Over time, these types of changes could have saved the city millions of dollars. The allure of money has caused prisons to become the most expensive form of punishment. In the state of Louisiana, having three drug convictions could give an individual life without the possibility of parole. Also, having three nonviolent criminal offenses such as car burglaries with verdicts of 12 years or more also means life in prison without early release (Micah 2012).
Research shows that an enormous amount of Blacks are swept into the criminal justice system by local police officers that conduct drug operations primarily in impoverished communities of color. The mass incarceration of poor people of color in the United States amounts to a new caste system that locks Black and Brown bodies not only behind actual bars in actual prisons, but also behind walls that are unrecognizable (Alexander 2012). This system was designed to remove African Americans from the competitive labor force in society, which allows more jobs to be available for Whites (Smith and Hattery 2006). Rather than rely on social structural identities such as race, class, and gender, the criminal justice system labels people of color as "criminals" and then it engages in all the practices that we supposedly left behind (Alexander 2012).

Labor Force

Once labeled as a felon, the old forms of discrimination in employment, housing, and education are surprisingly legal. African American men are part of a growing under-caste in which they are locked up and locked out of mainstream society, which in turn has a devastating impact on African American communities (Roberts 2004; Alexander 2012). According to Elizabeth Kneebone, a Brookings senior research associate, residents living in extremely-poor areas shoulder a double burden.” Kneebone further states that, “Not only do they struggle with their own poverty, but their surrounding communities have fewer job opportunities, lower-performing schools, higher crime rates, and more public health problems. Being poor in a very poor neighborhood makes it that much harder to get out of poverty” (Ward 2011). In other words, being taught in a poorly preforming public school means that many low-income residents often enter the job force lacking the basic tools needed (Wilson 2009). While African-Americans have made significant growth in the labor force since slavery, there are still major disparities that
continue to exist amongst Blacks and Whites (Bertrand and Mullainathan 2004; Pager and Quillian 2005). Research has shown that African American high school graduates are 70% more likely to experience job loss than their White counterparts, and when they do find a job they are often in job sectors with few benefits (Wilson 1996; Smith 2002). The unemployment rate for African Americans is consistently twice that of Whites (Wellers and Fields 2011).

**Religion**

In dealing with the everyday challenges that exists in communities of color, African Americans frequently turn to their religious belief to deal with life stressors, including discrimination (Brome, Owens, Allen, and Vevaina 2000; Constantine, Wilton, Gainor, and Lewis 2002; Scott 2003; Lawson and Thomas 2007; Casarez and Miles 2008). The church is one social institution that is regarded as a source of strength, comfort, and an institution that actually benefits poor Black residents (Gillum 2009). Despite a sizeable amount of literature in this regard, fear of crime research rarely examines how religion might control fear of crime responses for African American residents based on their intersecting identity. Such an oversight is perplexing given the longstanding history of African American’s devotion to religion (Matthews, Johnson and Jenks 2011). In fact, Gillum’s (2009) highlights the significant role of religion in the Black community. The study points out that Blacks living in violent settings are more likely to engage in prayer as a means for coping, healing, and breaking free from situations than any other racial groups. Dating back to slavery, to the Jim Crow Era, and up to the Civil Rights Movement, this article provides some of the best evidence that because of its significance and influence, the adherence of Blacks to their spiritual beliefs play a remarkable role in addressing fear and violence in the African American community.
Studies that have examined the civic aspects of social life characteristics typically focus on specific institutions (Lee 2008) such as churches without simultaneously taking into account how other institutions contribute to the marginalization of certain groups. In response to the limitations that exist, the current study provides a deeper understanding of how institutions are created and designed in a way in which there will always be a subordinate group in order for the dominant group or those with power, to benefit (Delgado and Stefancic 2001). The overrepresentation of African Americans in failing schools, correctional facilities and labor markets has not been clearly identified in fear of crime literature to explain at least part of the racial disparities that continue to exist.

Intersectionality challenges the myth that America is living in a post-racial society in which socially constructed identities are no longer influenced or impacted by those in power (Covarrubias 2011). Unlike traditional approaches that examine status factors independently in relation to fear, race, religion, class, and other social constructions are placed at the center of this analysis. Race is foundational to understanding America’s enduring racial divide, particularly as it relates to fear of crime (Martin, et al., 2014). Additionally, it suggests that institutions are controlled and maintained for political economic interest at the expense of vulnerable populations within these intersections of differences. Consequently, this intersectionality occurs at the macro stages of society and its institutions, which are simultaneously played out at the micro level in the everyday lived experiences of individuals (Covarrubias 2011).

**The Study & Participants**

To address the gaps in the literature the current study utilizes a qualitative approach to examine how race, gender, class and religion matter in terms of fear within the Black population. The qualitative component of this study gives voice to the multiple marginalized by examining
residents’ perceptions of crime and fear. Drawing upon qualitative data, this study seeks to answer two main questions: To what extent is there a difference of fear within the Black group population based on the intersecting identities of one’s religiosity, gender, age, educational attainment, and income and in what ways do structural factors account for crime amongst the Black population? Taken together, the results of the qualitative approach not only gave voice to the multiple marginalized, but also highlighted the challenges Blacks are faced with daily. These challenges consist of, but are not limited to, poverty, lack of job opportunities, under resourced schools, and witnessing and becoming victims of community violence, all of which can cause high levels of fear and crime (Attar, Guerra, and Tolan 1994; Tolan, Guerra, and Montaini-Klovdahl 1997; Allison, Burton, Marshall, Perez-Febles, Yarrington, Kirsh and Merriwether-DeVries 1999; Furstenberg, Cook, Eccles, Elder, and Sameroff 1999; Evans 2004). The information gained from these interviews helped facilitate an understanding of how America is not living in a “post-racial society” and how members of marginalized groups are less likely to benefit from a system that was not designed to support them.

Study Area

Mason Gardens and Uptown Square are two extremely lower-middle incomes, African-American neighborhoods located in the high crime southern city that is traditionally known as an area of high poverty and crime rates. The target neighborhoods are deemed a deep-rooted, violent crime problem by the media and law enforcement. These neighborhoods are particularly disadvantaged, highly disorganized and are often considered to be “hot spots” that account for almost 50% of the city’s crime rate. More interestingly, as the crime rate goes up in one high
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5 Mason Gardens and Uptown Square are both pseudonyms used to protect residents’ identity. The naming of streets or neighborhoods could have exposed participants' confidentiality.
crime area, it goes down in the others and vice versa. The factors that determine these deep-rooted crime issues include high poverty rates, low educational opportunities, unemployment, and limited infrastructure. Both areas are virtually identical in terms of its demographics, social settings and scarcity rates along with a host of other social problems.

Participants

The fieldwork took place in two high crime neighborhoods located in a high crime southern city known as Mason Gardens and Uptown Square. After receiving approval by the Institutional Review Board at my university to initiate research involving human subjects, I explained to each participant the purpose of my study. Before agreeing to take part in the research, the respondents were informed that participation in the survey was completely voluntary, and that they may choose to stop at any point. There was no compensation provided for partaking in the interview. Residents were also informed that they could not be identified as a result of answering questions in the survey; therefore, each participant’s name and location were replaced with pseudonyms for privacy. Revealing the names of the neighborhood could possibly endanger participants’ confidentiality, since many of them discussed perceptions and incidents regarding social institutions, such as the criminal justice system.

Given that previous research has shown that women, lower class and minorities, particularly Blacks are more fearful of crime, I intentionally recruited equal numbers of Black women and men in order to understand within group differences and to give special attention to their marginalized voices. All the participants ranged in age and occupation. All the participants were lower to middle class, broadly defined by education (at least a high school diploma) and household income (under $45,000). Half of the respondents were never married and half were currently married. In previous studies the terms African American and people of color are used
interchangeably with the term Black, these terms are used interchangeably throughout this study as well.

Nonprobability-sampling techniques were used to contact participants for this study. I constructed a sample of 30 subjects (15 women and 15 men), solicited through the use of convenience and snowball sampling. Once I became acquainted with the local areas, participants were identified by stopping people on the street, at local crime events, churches, and libraries in both in Mason Gardens and Uptown Square area. Prior to the start of each interview, participants were given a short screening interview to confirm their area of residency. Following the screening process, the potential participants were asked if they were still willing to participate in the study. Once the potential party agreed and confirmed their participation, I gathered their contact information to set up an interview for a future date. The timeframe for each interview ranged from 45 minutes to over an hour. These techniques allowed me to collect data on a few members in the area and then ask those individuals to provide the information needed to locate other members of the population whom they happen to know. Some of the residents had been informed of my research topic through third parties and wanted to be involved.

The questions in the interviews were geared towards understanding fear of crime differences and the challenges low-income African American residents are faced with in high crime areas. All the interviews began with the following question: Is there any area right around here - that is, within a mile - where you would be afraid to walk alone at night? Although there is some scholarly dispute concerning whether or not this specific question actually measures fear of crime, it is the most routinely used public opinion polling question by the National Opinion Research Center and the Gallup Organization, and so I used it here to measure the same episode in these high crime southern areas. I also posed questions to them regarding their community
satisfaction, safety, religious attitudes, causes of crime, and trust with local officers. Residents were asked demographic questions such as their religiosity, sex, marital status, age, educational attainment, and income to help identify specific characteristics of the sample surveyed from the population.

From this stage, I began transcribing and analyzing the interviews from audiotaped recordings. I focused on major themes throughout the interview to develop different coding schemes. I used open coding to uncover the thoughts, ideas, and meanings contained therein (Babbie 2010). Several questions were used to structure the explanation of the transcripts, including: How satisfied are you with each of the following: economy, government, education, infrastructure, available housing, job market and your church within your neighborhood? What neighborhood attribute is the most important to you? How much trust do you have in the local police in your community? What is your current religious preference? Was religion an important part of your upbringing? How important is religion in your life? Do you pray for or about your community? After all the interviews were sorted into emerging themes, each topic was carefully studied for differences and similarities. Passages and quotes were chosen based on reiterated answers.

Findings

The semi-structured interviews with African American residents residing in two high crime areas have only reconfirmed that we are living in a society where not only does race matter but other intersecting social identities as well. This study seeks to develop a deeper understanding and explanation of residents’ perceptions and attitudes toward fear of crime as well as their perceptions of crime, the criminal justice system and the labor market. The findings were summarized by research questions and the reiterated themes that emerged. I was devoted to
residents’ voices by not editing participant accounts. The study found that fear of crime was not equally dispersed in these high crime areas. Each interviewee regardless of their intersecting identities (race* gender * class *age * religious background) shared personal stories about crime and the lack of opportunities available in their local area. In the interviews, all of the residents stated that the major cause of crime was poverty, lack of education and unemployment. Additionally, most of the participants stated that race was the main factor for crime and that they had little, if any, trust with local officers in their community.

**Residents’ Perceptions of Crime**

Residents must first recognize that crime is a problem within their neighborhood before they can assume any activity in response to their perception (Hipp 2013). In the case of the community perception of crime in the local neighborhood, the perceptions of residents differed. Participants in the study stated the following in regards to crime in their neighborhood: prevalent but not as bad as it used to be, did not occur on their street or it has gotten worse. Residents who stated that crime is prevalent but not as bad as it used to be (thirty percent) were likely to make reference to a crime-fighting program in the area as a reason. Several residents who were aware of a program known as BRAND\(^6\) stated that crime was still present; however, crime was decreasing since the program took place. These partakers varied in age and were aware of the program through their local church. The BRAND Project is a program designed to reduce crime committed by juveniles through the strengthening of police and community interactions, encouraging school engagement and linking families to community resources. AJ, an eighteen-year-old male who grew up in the area stated:

\(^6\) BRAND is a pseudonym used to protect the neighborhoods of residents. Since the program targets high crime areas; the naming of the program could have exposed participants' confidentiality.
Mason Gardens and Uptown Square are the bad areas. By the killings, I know crime is still prevalent. I had a friend affected by crime these past two weeks. Some kids rode up on him on a bike and shot him and then a car hit him and then he’s dead. So, I know that crime is still going on. It’s just… I think it’s slowing down, especially now since BRAND entered. The program’s main focus is about violence and trying to get the young adults into something positive, so I think it’s making a change.

Billy, a fifty-six-year-old male resident who was sitting on a bench at the park, explained that,

Before the BRAND team got in especially in the Mason Gardens and Uptown Square, they were pretty rough. Certain areas you cannot walk after dark. Certain areas stores were being broken into. Kids were afraid to play in the yards and stuff in the neighborhood. But because of what has happen in the last five months the program has gotten started, a lot of things have changed. A lot of people feel more secure now in their homes. At one particular time, the area I lived in was pretty rough. Right now it’s not at its best, but it’s not at its worst either. You still have certain areas were crime is a big concern here.

On the other hand residents that stated that crime was not a major issue on their street, tended to locate crime to other spaces within the same neighborhood. These respondents were mainly women who were married or living with a partner from different age groups. For example, Dia, a fifty-five-year-old female resident who lives in the area stated:

Well, crime was pretty bad at one point. That’s all you would hear on TV. Somebody getting killed, somebody getting shot up, somebody getting raped, somebody getting beat up, cut up, and none of that is good. We really don’t hear much about crime on this particular street but on the next street and at that corner store down the street, crime is worse.

Jade, a thirty-five-year-old female resident I met at the library, stated:

My perception of crime in the Mason Garden neighborhood is that crime is not getting better, it’s getting worse. Over the years, I grew up in the Mason Garden neighborhood as a child I remember just playing in my yard, and my parents wouldn’t let me walk the streets or go around the block by myself. The street around the block has always been that street where crime was bad. When we got out at corner stores my mom would say “lock the doors we live in a high crime neighborhood.

In contrast, virtually all of the narratives that identified crime in their neighborhood as bad focused on particular individuals. These respondents lived in the area for many years and were forty years of age and older. For example Mary, a fifty-six-year-old female resident, whom I met at the park with her child, noted that:
It’s a lot of crime here and it’s all over the city, not just this area; but they make it seem like it’s all here but it’s not. It’s just focused here. Crime is bad it’s bad here because of these teenagers. It’s a lot of crime with the teenagers. I’ve been staying in this area for twelve years and within those twelve years my home never had been broken into. I had my house broken into twice within two weeks’ time so it’s just the teenagers is getting worse cause they can’t be in one place, they have to be everywhere.

Regardless of one’s gender, age, income and educational attainment, the majority of the residents relied on the media, personal experience and third parties for their information about crime. Many of the respondents blamed the media for blowing crime out of proportion in their neighborhood. One would get the impression that crime mainly occurs in Mason Gardens and Uptown Square. Certainly, crime occurs in these areas; however, Mason Gardens and Uptown Square receive disproportionate emphasis in media’s representations about crime and criminals. For instance, Erica stated, “The crime is bad. There’s a large amount of crime in this area. I think it’s blown out of proportion a lot, you know in the media. Crime is everywhere and they only focus on crime in this area.” Listening to the voices of those most affected, I noticed a sense of hope and faith as the residents shared their stories. This was evident in their facial expressions and body movement. For instance, Betty-Ann, a fifty-six-year-old, lower-class female minister in the community told me that she loved her area and has hopes that it too will become a better and safer place for inhabitants, just like other areas in the city. “Too be honest, I love Mason Gardens. I’ve never tried to move out of it but I don’t like the crime. I believe in God that it’s gone get better. If crime gets any worse, then it’s gone get worse to get better.”

Where there’s an Absence of God, There’s a Presence of Fear

Fear of crime differences within the Black group population is related to a number of factors ranging from personal experiences, religious background and duration in one’s neighborhood. The vast majority of participants (eighty percent), despite one’s gender, age and education, stated that they were not afraid to walk alone in their neighborhood at night or during
the day. Of these, participants who have been residing in the area for 10 years or more, regardless of gender and age, spoke of their religious background as a reason for not being afraid of crime. For example, Robert, a fifty-four-year-old resident stated, “No I’m not afraid, I do believe wherever I go, I have God with me. So the bible, and yes I’m going to get biblical, says “no weapon that is formed against me shall prosper.” Cube, a Black male in his early forties who lives in the area of Uptown Square shared similar thoughts, “No, I don’t worry about crime, I just watch my surroundings and keep trusting in God that nothing will happen to me and my family.” Pat, a seventy-year-old pastor at a local church in the community, shared with me the following narrative:

I’m not afraid of crime because we were put here for the people. We’re here to teach, train and disciple people. To teach the people that they can do better, have better, and live better. So we can’t run from what we are called to. We were called to this area for that very purpose. When we first came here, they would shoot during bible study, breaking in cars and everything. But guess what, we didn’t run, we faced the problem. You’re afraid when God is absent from your life.

Residents’ narratives suggested that fear becomes a strong element when God is absent. Mark, a thirty-year-old resident noted, “If you don’t know Jesus, it is highly likely that you are afraid of crime here.” Residents’ words reflected how spirituality and religious involvement is of particular importance within high crime African American communities. Prior research has suggested that religious involvement is generally higher amongst African Americans in comparison to Whites (Levin, Taylor, and Chatters 1994; Taylor, Chatters, Jayakody, and Levin 1996; Chatters, Taylor, and Lincoln 1999). The absence of such involvement expressed in these narratives suggests that fear is likely to occur amongst the lives of the disadvantage. In addition to their religious beliefs, residents also stated that they were not afraid of crime because they are aware of their surroundings and knew which areas to avoid. Consider the following statement made by Robert:
Wherever I go I feel safe, but yet in the same sense, I am aware of my surroundings. You can’t make yourself vulnerable or over expose yourself to different things or carry yourself in a way where you become a target. So as long as I don’t present myself as a target or carry myself in a way where people know what I have or own and what’s going on, I feel that I am safe. But when you begin to share different things with different people about what you have or possess or being careless with what you have, then harm will come.

While a majority of residents, both men and women reported that they were not afraid; twenty percent (six participants-all women) reported that they were afraid to walk alone in their neighborhood, which was related to their concern of being robbed or experience from previous victimization and police protection. These individuals were all women, young in age (35 and younger) and did not make reference to their religious background.

Although some residents did not attend church on a weekly basis, religion was found to play a significant role in shaping the attitudes and perceptions of African American residents residing in these high crime areas. Research has shown that religion has been a major source for coping with daily encounters amongst African Americans. The Lee and Bartkowski (2004) study, for example, examines the links between civic participation, regional subcultures of violence, and age-specific homicide rates. In their study, the authors acknowledge the important role of religion. They argued that religion is an “open civic resource because it is widely available to community members regardless of age” (32). Throughout African American history, dating back to slavery, Jim Crow Era and the Civil Rights Movement, the church has been a place to receive wisdom, strength, and security in the Black community (Gillum 2009). Given the high volume of crime and poverty in Mason Gardens and Uptown Square, it is not surprising that residents relied on their spiritual roots for strength and support when coping with crime and fear. The intersections of residents’ race, gender, class and religion play an enormous role in respondents’ fear of crime responses, and these intersections have been consistently disregarded.
Our Neighborhood can be Just as Safe as the Next Neighborhood

Lack of opportunity was deeply associated with crime in participants’ narratives regarding their respective communities. When asked about the major cause of crime in one’s area, many of the participants (80 percent) in the interview stated that the major cause of crime in Mason Gardens and Uptown Square was a result of a lack of education, unemployment and poverty that has submerged their community. Betty-Ann, a fifty-six-year-old, lower-class, female minister made the following statement regarding crime in her neighborhood:

Our neighborhood can be just as safe as the next neighborhood. Lack of education, drugs, joblessness and the killings all play a big part of the crime problem here. Some of them will tell you that they don’t have a job and can’t get a job. They don’t have the education to get a job. I pray for my neighborhood. I go on the street with different ministers to minister to them and let them know about the love of God. And I’m going to do my best to do whatever I need to do to make it a better place.”

Pat, a seventy-year-old pastor made the following statement:

You know a dog going to bark, a cat going to meow, so a person with inadequate education who has no job is going to break in and steal. That’s just what they do due to the lack of opportunities we as Black people are provided with.

Residents reported that homicides, drugs and robbery were amongst the major types of crimes that the community was most worried about. However, residents strongly inserted that their neighborhood could be just as safe as the next neighborhood if they had the adequate resources and were offered the same opportunities.

Additionally, residents reported that the majority of crime is caused by young teens that have learned the behavior from others in the neighborhood; therefore, it’s a cycle. For example, Crystal, a principal and former schoolteacher in Mason Gardens stated,

The major cause of crime is poverty. By not having the income to support the basic needs and by not having the ability and skills to obtain a job to get those things you need, these kids don’t see a way out of here so they turn to crime. It’s a cycle.
Respondents argued that young African American teenagers were a product of their environment; children become who they are based on the opportunities made available to them. Illustrating this point, Robert made the following comment:

Being an African American member from a poor community offers inadequate education and unemployment, which in fact plays a serious role in residents’ fear and crime levels. White residents, for example, do not experience the same obstacles.

Participants’ responses indicated that Blacks in the city did not experience the same opportunities as White residents. In almost every social institution, the intersections of race, gender, and class in determining education, employment, and job opportunities are greater for Whites than they are for Blacks. Residents stated that many of the young teens in the area are raised in a single parent household without a father figure, and as a result, they turn to other figures within their subculture. In explaining this, Robert continued:

Most of these criminals are young teens who come from a single family home where the father is not around or in jail, so they are acting out on hurt or pain that is taking place. You become who you are by your environment.

Elaine agreed, Robert’s wife, and interrupted the conversation by stating, “I’m worried about these innocent children and the lack of education that’s available in our community. The reality is that children are a product of what they live and see.” Due to the inadequate opportunities available, respondents stated the many adolescents tend to turn to criminal activities. Research argues that kids of color who attend failing under-resourced schools are limited to their true potential in the marketplace (Tonry 2012) and therefore turn to crime. This investigation revealed that an overwhelming majority of the residents (seventy percent) believed that their neighborhood could be just as safe as the next neighborhood if they were offered the same opportunities. Although crime and criminals receive a disproportionate amount of attention in the media, the link between high crime areas and the lack of opportunities are not.
The Community is more Afraid of the Police than the Actual Criminals

The community’s perception of their local police officials was influenced by the amount of trust they had with them based on previous experiences and the amount of patrolling in the local community. A majority of the residents (seventy percent), despite age, gender, education attainment and religious belief stated, that they had no trust in their local officers. For instance, a local pastor in the community stated:

The local officers are never going to know anything around here because they are just rude and have a nasty attitude with people. One day I stopped to tell them I was glad to see someone parked on the corner and they asked me what I want, what you looking for?

Buddy, a fifty-four-year-old male respondent stated:

The police need to address real crime. If they want crime to stop coming in the neighborhood then they need to stop it from coming into this country. It’s bigger than this neighborhood. And no I don’t trust them; they never come on time when you call them.

Jada, a thirty-five-year-old resident, similarly explains:

Most people who lives here are African American and the perception of the police officers are bad because of the way they handle crime and treat people. People have different experiences in other areas.

Many of these residents believe Mason Gardens and Uptown Square is a major focus by law enforcement because of the racial makeup in the areas. For example, Betty Ann stated: “You want to believe that the police are not focusing on this area because of race, but that’s hard to believe. I’m sure that they too may have a fear when they come here; they have families to go home too. There’s both good and bad people in the police force, just like every institution. You just never know who is which.”

As these narratives illustrate and as research has confirmed, in communities that are economically disadvantage, residents are likely to experience neglect and rudeness at the hands of the police (Fagan and Davies 2000; Kane 2002; Terrill and Reisig 2003; Ingram 2007). As a
result of negative encounters with local police officers, residents tend to construct an undesirable perception (Tyler and Wakslak 2004; Brunson and Miller 2006; Gau and Brunson 2010). These unconstructive evaluations of the police are more usual amongst residents of communities with high levels of poverty and crime (Sampson and Bartusch 1998; Weitzer and Tuch 2004; Weitzer, Tuch and Skogan 2008).

On the other hand, thirty percent of respondents, both men and women, regardless of age, reported that they have trust in their officers, but there needs to be more patrolling in the community so that people can see them more and build better relationships. For instance, several residents made similar statements regarding their local officers:

Erica stated:

If they start patrolling a little more and getting in the community instead of hiding behind a badge they could build a better relationship. Instead of making this community feels like they are looking down on us, they should let us know that they are here to protect and serve us. Even when you call about something minor they have attitudes.

Elaine explained:

I do have some faith in the police officers but I don’t see them riding around a lot like they should. If they ride in the neighborhood, people in the neighborhood would see them more and may not commit as much crimes. I remember they use to ride bikes and talk to people who walk down the street and get their perspective of their neighborhood. If they go back to doing that then people will see them more and trust them more.

AJ similarly justifies:

I just want them to be more involved, not just with the law but be a mentor type so that we the people in the neighborhood can see them different. They need to start showing us and teaching us hey we not all about locking you up, we can be your friends too. They need to be a mentor for the young adults. Having a conversation with us and referring us to something positive like a mentor group, or sports instead of just locking us up.

These cases illustrates that some members of the high crime population do have faith in the police department. Numerous residents also made it very clear that some of the residents in the
neighborhood are more afraid of the presence of the police than they are of the actual crime rates. Billy, for example, made the following statement:

Residents will see something going on and not report it because they don’t trust the police department because they don’t come on time and in many instances the victims are treated as criminals. The community is actually more afraid of the police than they are of the actual criminals. Now that’s sad to say, but it’s true.

Taken together, existing research confirms that when it comes to crime and the criminal justice system, Black and Brown Americans remain at the forefront. As Sampson and Wilson (1995) noted, “the evidence is clear that African Americans face dismal and worsening odds when it comes to crime in the streets and the risk of incarceration.” These dismal odds continue to exist in today’s society. Research shows that African Americans are six times more likely to be killed than their White counterparts; nonetheless, homicide continues to be the leading cause of death amongst young African American teens. Police reports and self-reported surveys both reveal how a disproportionate number of Blacks continue to be involved in serious violent crimes, and how roughly one in three Black men are likely to be incarcerated during his lifespan in comparison to less than 5 percent of White men (Sampson and Wilson 1995). Although crime rates have been declining since the 1990s, African Americans are still at a greater risk of being incarcerated as well as having a weak attachment to the labor market which reinforces the marginalization of Blacks and their attachment to crime (Sampson and Wilson 1995; Saad 2011). As Crystal, one of the resident’s explains, “it’s a continuous cycle.” As these narratives reveal, religion linked with intersecting individual factors plays an enormous role in residents’ fear of crime responses. Additionally, resident narratives demonstrated how the failure of institutions have adversely affected and contributed to crime.
Discussion

As Scarborough, Like-Haislip, Novak, Lucas, and Alarid (2010) note, “scholars are drawn to the fear of crime topic because it is among the most overt social reactions to crime and because its consequences are so prevalent, potentially severe, and easily demonstrable” (819). In order to provide a better explanation of who is feared, where and when people are afraid the most, this study focuses on both the inclusion of marginalized voices and how social institutions like education and the criminal justice system offer different experiences for low income Black residents. Taking this approach is an important extension to understanding fear of crime causes and reasons based on intersecting identities of the marginalized while explicitly linking the micro (individual) level and macro (societal) levels of analyses. This study reveals that despite the challenges faced in these communities, religion—at least in the cases examined here—is significantly associated with residents’ lower levels of fear which is an area that is rarely explored in criminological literature. It also strongly reveals the intersections of race, gender and class in shaping this fear. Consistent with Lupton (1999) and Carvalho and Lewis (2003) study, my findings reveal that majority of residents residing in high crime areas reported not being afraid to walk alone in their neighborhood at night. However, my findings also reveal how religion, a dominant supporter in the Black community, is a key component in controlling this fear. In almost every case, residents made reference to their religious belief as a reason for not being afraid of crime. This research contributes to the fear of crime literature by not only highlighting the reasons why some people feel safe and the reasons why some do not, but also demonstrating the importance of analyzing the experiences of Blacks and the lack of opportunities that exists in high crime areas. Furthermore, the findings of my study suggest that poverty, lack of education and labor opportunities in African Americans high crime
neighborhoods often take place at the intersection of multiple inequalities, particularly gender, race, and social class.

As the fear of crime literature and history has proven, the color of one’s skin can play a huge role in whether or not one is seated in a place of advantage or disadvantage economically, politically, and socially. The challenges African American communities are confronted with consist of, but are not limited to: crime, poverty, racial profiling by police officers, under-resourced schools, crime-ridden neighborhoods and high unemployment rates. The disparities that continue to exist in this southeast city among social institutions provide evidence of the continuing significance of race and racism. The idea that we are living in a post-racial society has contributed to a number of issues, including a fear of crime, negative labeling of people of color as criminal and blaming the victim (Martin 2013; Martin et al. 2014), all of which has blinded us from the realities of race in our society. If race no longer matters, then the poverty, crime, and under resourced schools that exists in low-income African Americans respective communities are due to individual shortcomings and not structural factors of a racialized (Martin et al. 2014) social system.

We have never lived in a time where race did not matter (Martin et al. 2014); nor have we ever lived in a time where the intersections of social status factors like race, class, and gender did not matter as well. Day (1999) makes an interesting point that a person’s gender, race or class alone cannot explain fear of crime. I suggest that these intersecting identities are also important when examining the overrepresentation of Blacks in high crime areas, prisons, failing schools, and amongst the poor in relation to fear. Therefore, different characteristics of social identity work collectively in different ways to influence the nature and layout of fear of crime (Day 1999; Pain 2001). Additionally, the educational and criminal justice system and the labor force (among
low-income Blacks) interact with race as well as other social markers to create different, intersectional experiences. It is suggested here that fear of crime amongst the marginalized should not be studied in isolation to the failing institutions that exist in their neighborhoods.

Overall the results reveal that through an intersectional lens, it further becomes clear that the Black group is not homogeneous and that different identities like race, gender, class, age and religion together play a role in determining fear amongst Blacks. Considering the research on fear of crime using an intersectionality approach and research on intersectionality focusing on fear of crime are both limited, future research should continue to examine fear of crime and intersectionality simultaneously. Future research should also continue to examine how social status factors like gender, race, social class and religion shape residents’ experiences in high crime areas as well as the experiences of other socially vulnerable groups. Although religious institutions can play an enormous role in addressing fear within communities of color, fear-reduction programs that recognize the intersection of the marginalized is also needed.
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CHAPTER 5: “YEA, THOUGH I WALK THROUGH THE VALLEY OF THE SHADOW OF DEATH, I WILL FEAR NO EVIL: FOR THOU ART WITH ME”

Discussion/Conclusion

The dissertation concludes with a section fearlessly titled “Yea, Though I Walk Through the Valley of the Shadow of Death, I will Fear no Evil.” This title suggests that “though in the midst of dangers, deep as a valley, dark as a shadow, and dreadful as death itself,” I will fear no evil (Psalms 23:4, King James Bible). Residents did not give way to their fears, but confidently relied upon their spiritual roots and frequently took precautionary measures to cope with crime.

This dissertation advocates for intersectionality in explaining fear of crime by drawing upon semi-structured interviews with African American residents and data from a large-scale survey. Although fear of crime researchers has enthusiastically studied fear of crime differences, they have not given much attention to how intersectionality can provide a more critical and nuanced understanding of fear of crime differences. I was taken aback when I realized that quantitative assessments in fear of crime research have come close to testing intersectionality but do not truly employ the method when explaining group differences. Additionally, qualitative approaches are used slightly to address concerns of fear of crime although they have much to offer in terms of providing detailed insight about complex relationships, experiences, and practices of marginalized individuals. The results from the mixed method approach assists the understanding of how the intersection of race, sex and social class together influence how concerned residents are about being victimized by crime and how that concern influences residents’ daily activities and lived experiences.

The key findings from the quantitative component of the dissertation reveals that examining two and three way interactions of individual characteristics provide a better explanation of those who are actually afraid of crime and of those who are not. On the other
hand, the qualitative component of the dissertation reveals how both men and women use mental maps of specific spaces and people in those spaces to identify some areas as dangerous and others as safe. Furthermore, the qualitative component showed how religion, a dominant supporter in the Black community, linked with intersecting individual factors and played an enormous role in residents’ fear of crime responses. Together, both methods indicate that the overwhelming majority of Black residents do not report feeling afraid. As a result, not all individuals with characteristics associated with higher fear of crime are actually afraid of crime.

The use of a mixed method approach is an important extension in understanding African Americans’ daily experiences based on their intersecting identities. Each axes of oppression produces a different experience (Collins 2000), which is important in understanding one’s fear. Collins (2000) refers to this classification as the matrix of domination. This matrix of domination houses multiple groups with diverse personalized experiences; thus, this multi-layered approach is necessary if we, as scholars, are to assemble a meaningful set of answers to one of the most dominant concerns in America’s society: the fear of crime. All in all, the intersectional perspective allows scholars to move away from one’s own research comfort zone to discuss how individual characteristics reinforce one another at the same time while creating dissimilar effects for different people in their social settings (Shields 2008; Becker 2012).

Policy makers who are committed to seriously fighting the problems of fear and crime in impoverished communities and who recognized the importance of social status factors like race, class and gender are confronted with two challenges. The first challenge is figuring out how to create legislation that is proposed to tackle crime and social institutions that create and reinforce inequality. In many instances, poor African Americans are more likely to be victimized targets of racism, classism, and sexism which allows them to be marginalized from mainstream
opportunities and therefore may control fear of crime levels. The overrepresentation of Black Americans in high crime neighborhoods, correctional facilities and under resourced schools make the issue of race (Martin, Fasching-Varner, Quinn and Jackson 2014) as well as the interactions of other social identities highly noticeable. The high crime southern area that this dissertation focuses on is home to some of the poorest and least educated Black Americans in the country; as a result, residents are multiple marginalized by their intersectional identity as a person of color, as a lower class, and as being undereducated along with a host of other deprived identities. The second challenge that policy makers face is how to form public support from lawmakers who tend to place more emphasis on individual behavior than on structural inequities in explaining fear and crime in high crime marginalized communities.

In moving forward to address fear of crime, future research should continue to examine how the interplay of race, sex and social class influence how concerned individuals are about being victimized by crime and how that concern influences their daily activities amongst other marginalized groups in high crime areas such as Latinos, Asian Americans and Native Americans. By continuing in this discourse, we can better explain the issues that continue to exist in the world around us.
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APPENDIX A: CORRELATIONS & CROSS-TABULATIONS

Correlations

Table 11 Bivariate Correlations of all variables in the Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Fear Walking</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>.228**</td>
<td>2445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.063**</td>
<td>2447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>.048*</td>
<td>2447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>.042*</td>
<td>2422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.049*</td>
<td>2063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross-Tabulations

Table 12 Fear of Crime for White Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race*Gender</th>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Not White*Male</th>
<th>White*Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($\chi^2=54.751$, df=1, p=.000)

Table 13 Fear of Crime for Black Males (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race*Gender</th>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Not Black*Male</th>
<th>Black*Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($\chi^2=46.918$, df=1, p=.000)

Table 14 Fear of Crime for White Females (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race*Gender</th>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Not White*Female</th>
<th>White*Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($\chi^2=75.446$, df=1, p=.000)
Table 15 Fear of Crime for Black Females (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Race*Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Not Black*Female</td>
<td>Black*Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2=0.789$, df=1, p=.375

Table 16 Fear of Crime for Low-income Males (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class*Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Not Low-income*Male</td>
<td>Low-income*Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>2292</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2=7.125$, df=1, p=.008

Table 17 Fear of Crime for Middle-income Males (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class*Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Not Middle-income*Male</td>
<td>Middle-income*Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>2190</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2=30.976$, df=1, p=.000

Table 18 Fear of Crime for High-income Males (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class*Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Not High-income*Male</td>
<td>High-income*Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>2161</td>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2=39.728$, df=1, p=.000

Table 19 Fear of Crime for Low-income Females (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class*Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Not Low-income*Female</td>
<td>Low-income*Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2=23.360$, df=1, p=.000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 20 Fear of Crime for Middle-income Females (In Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class*Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (x^2=10.455, \text{ df}=1, \text{ p}=.001) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 21 Fear of Crime for High-income Females (In Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class*Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (x^2=17.775, \text{ df}=1, \text{ p}=.000) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 22 Fear of Crime for Low-income White Males (In Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class<em>Race</em>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (x^2=1.883, \text{ df}=1, \text{ p}=.170) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 23 Fear of Crime for Middle-income White Males (In Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class<em>Race</em>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (x^2=13.640, \text{ df}=1, \text{ p}=.000) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 24 Fear of Crime for High-income White Males (In Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class<em>Race</em>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (x^2=27.487, \text{ df}=1, \text{ p}=.000) \)
Table 25 Fear of Crime for Low-income Black Males (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class<em>Race</em>Gender</th>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Not Low-income* Black*Male</th>
<th>Low-income* Black*Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[(x^2=5.757, \text{df}=1, p=.016)\]

Table 26 Fear of Crime for Middle-income Black Males (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class<em>Race</em>Gender</th>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Not Middle-income* Black*Male</th>
<th>Middle-income* Black*Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td>2392</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[(x^2=16.361, \text{df}=1, p=.000)\]

Table 27 Fear of Crime for High-income Black Males (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class<em>Race</em>Gender</th>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Not High-income* Black*Male</th>
<th>High-income* Black*Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td>2410</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[(x^2=11.737, \text{df}=1, p=.001)\]

Table 28 Fear of Crime for Low-income White Females (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class<em>Race</em>Gender</th>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Not Low-income* White*Female</th>
<th>Low-income* White*Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td>2264</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[(x^2=20.949, \text{df}=1, p=.000)\]

Table 29 Fear of Crime for Middle-income White Females (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class<em>Race</em>Gender</th>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Not Middle-income* White* Female</th>
<th>Middle-income* White* Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td>2169</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[(x^2=10.386, \text{df}=1, p=.001)\]
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Table 30 Fear of Crime for High-income White Females (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class<em>Race</em>Gender</th>
<th>Not High-income* White* Female</th>
<th>High-income<em>White</em>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>2099</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($x^2 = 19.685, \text{df}=1, p=.000$)

Table 31 Fear of Crime for Low-income Black Females (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class<em>Race</em>Gender</th>
<th>Not Low-income* Black*Female</th>
<th>Low-income<em>Black</em>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>2222</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($x^2 = 1.463, \text{df}=1, p=.226$)

Table 32 Fear of Crime for Middle-income Black Females (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class<em>Race</em>Gender</th>
<th>Not Middle-income* Black*Female</th>
<th>Middle-income<em>Black</em>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>2273</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($x^2 = .029, \text{df}=1, p=.864$)

Table 33 Fear of Crime for High-income Black Females (In Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class<em>Race</em>Gender</th>
<th>Not Low-income* White*Female</th>
<th>Low-income<em>White</em>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>2370</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($x^2 = .003, \text{df}=1, p=.958$)
APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM, SURVEY & IRB

Informed Consent

Study Title: “Making Sense of Intersectionality and Fear of Crime Amongst Blacks in High Crime Neighborhoods”

Introduction: You are being asked to partake in a research study. The purpose of this form is to provide you information that may affect your decision as to whether or not to participate in this research study. The person performing the research will answer any of your questions. Read the information below and ask any questions you might have before deciding whether or not to take part. If you decide to be involved in this study, this form will be used to record your consent.

Purpose: The purpose of the project is to foster a deeper understanding of how residents living in a high crime area cope, construct, and react to fear by using qualitative and quantitative data to examine how social structural identities work together to generate fear. Additionally, this project seeks to develop a more meaningful understanding of fear of crime, examine who and what is feared, and where and when people are most fearful of crime. The study seeks participation from 50 or more individuals in the research to explore their experiences to crime, perceptions of fear and risk, and strategies for staying safe from the perspectives of residents residing in the 70805 and 70802 zip codes. Findings from this research study may be used to create a better understanding of fear of crime from a mixed method intersectional approach.

What will you be asked to do? If you agree to participate in this study, I will ask you questions about how you view crime in your community, about your daily routines, safety, and previous experience with victimization and whether you know people who were victims of a crime. With your permission, I would also like to tape-record the interview. Each interview will last roughly one hour.

Number of Subjects: 30

Risks and Benefits: You are unlikely to experience any major direct benefit or harm as a result of this project. This study is completely voluntary and you may choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time without any penalty.

Do you have to participate? No, this study is completely voluntary and participants may choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time without any penalty. Signing this form indicates that you are at least 18 years of age and that you voluntarily consent to participate in the survey. Withdrawal or refusing to participate will not affect your relationship with Louisiana State University in anyway.

Your answers will be confidential: The records of this study will be kept private. At no time will your name be identified with any response. The following steps will be taken to protect the identity of all participants: a) names in the transcripts of the audio recording and field notes will be replaced by pseudonyms and unique ID numbers, b) all audio recordings will be erased after
transcribed and checked for errors, c) all written field notes will be destroyed after typed and saved.

**If you have questions:** If you have any questions regarding this study or your participation in this study, please contact the primary investigator, Melinda Jackson at (985) 247-1109 or my supervisors, Dr. Becker at (225) 226-0587 and Dr. Barton at (225) 578-5311.

**Questions and concerns about research participants right can be directed to:** Robert Matthews Chair, Louisiana State Institutional Review Board Office, 131 David Boyd Hall, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, Phone: 225-578-8692. Email: [irb@lsu.edu](mailto:irb@lsu.edu).

Thank you very much!

You will be given a copy of this form for your records.

I agree to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the investigator's obligation to provide me with a signed copy of this consent form.

Subject Printed Name: ____________________________
Subject Signature: ________________________________ Date: ____________________

In addition to agreeing to participate, I also consent to having the interview tape recorded.

Subject Signature: ________________________________ Date: ____________________

Principal Investigator Signature: ________________________ Date: __________________
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Fear of Crime Survey

Participation in this survey is VOLUNTARY, and you may choose to stop at any point. You cannot be identified as a result of answering questions in this survey.

1. How long have you lived in the 70805 or 70802 neighborhood in Baton Rouge? (Respondent will pick one zip code).
2. What area in the 70805 or 70802 neighborhood you live?
3. What is your perception of crime in the 70805 or 70802 area? (Respondent will pick one zip code).
4. How serious is the crime problem in your neighborhood? Why or Why not?
5. How likely is it that you will move away from this neighborhood within the next year? (If say likely/not likely ask why)?

Questions about safety.

6. Is there any area right around here - that is, within a mile - where you would be afraid to walk alone at night?
7. (If answer yes to number 6) Where is that area? Why are you afraid to walk alone at night there?
8. (If answer yes to number 6) Did you change your usual daily routines because of concern for your safety, like avoiding certain parts of town or staying at home?
9. On a scale of 1 to 10, as far as crime is concerned, how safe do you feel in Baton Rouge, outside your neighborhood? If respondent asks for clarification: (1 being not safe at all and 10 being very safe). Why?
10. How about your neighborhood? On a scale of 1 to 10, how safe do you feel it is during the day? If respondent asks for clarification: (1 being not safe at all and 10 being very safe). Why do you feel it is?
11. Do you think that people in this neighborhood are safe inside their homes at night? Why?
12. What types of crime have you been victimized by in your community? How many times did you experience each type of victimization?
13. On a scale of 1 to 10, how likely do you think it is that you may be the victim of a crime in the next 12 months? (1 being very unlikely and 10 being very likely). (If likely/not likely, WHY do you think you are likely/not likely to be the victim of a crime in the next 12 months).
14. Have any of your family or friends that live in Baton Rouge been victimized by crime in the last year?
15. Compared to a year ago, do you personally feel more worried, less worried, or not much different about your personal safety on the streets? What about others safety? Why or why not?
16. Thinking about your local area, on a scale of 1 to 10 how fearful are you of the following: 1 being Not at all fearful and 10 being Very fearful (Ask why for each question).
• Someone breaking into your house while you are away
• Someone breaking into your house while you are there
• Having items from your car stolen
• Having your car stolen
• The safety of children in public spaces such as the park or their journey to school
• People misusing drugs
• People dealing in or selling drugs
• Being robbed or mugged on the street
• Being physically attacked
• Being insulted or verbally abused
• People working as prostitutes

17. On a scale of 1 to 10, how often would you say purse snatching, robbery, or other street crimes occur around your neighborhood? (1 being not often and 10 very often) (How do you know?)

18. On a scale of 1 to 10, how often do you see drug dealers or users on the streets around your neighborhood? (1 being not often and 10 very often) (If often, how do you know they are drug dealers?)

19. Are there any other types of crime that you are particularly worried about? If yes, why are you worried about (type of crime they mention)? If no, why aren’t you?

20. What do you feel is the major cause of crime in your community? What characteristics would you use to describe criminals in your area?

21. Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 10 how media reports affect your fear of crime in your neighborhood. Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Much

22. Have you purchased a gun for protection from crime?

23. Do you own a dog for protection from crime?

24. In the past year, would you say the level of crime in your community has increased, stayed about the same, or decreased?

25. Do you think your neighborhood in Baton Rouge will get better or worse as a place to live in the next 12 months, or will it stay the same? Why?

26. If you could choose one word to describe the 70805 or 70802 neighborhoods, what would it be?

General questions about the police in your community.

27. Would you say the level of police protection in your community has increased, stayed about the same, or decreased over the past year? Why?

28. How much trust do you have in the local police in your community? Why?

29. On a scale of 1 to 10, how often do you see police officers in your neighborhood? (1 being not often and 10 very often)

30. On a scale of 1 to 10, how often do you see police officers talking to people in your neighborhood? (1 being not often and 10 very often)

31. On a scale of 1 to 10, how often have you seen police officers searching people in your neighborhood? (1 being not often and 10 very often)
32. On a scale of 1 to 10, how often do you see police officers arresting someone in your neighborhood? (1 being not often and 10 very often)

33. Do you feel there need to be more police patrols, about the same number of police patrols or less patrols in your community? Why?

34. What do you know about the BRAVE (Baton Rouge Area Violence Elimination Project) Program in your area? What do you think about the program and why?

35. (If aware of the program) How has the program changed your perception of crime in your neighborhood?

36. What kind of crime reduction activities would you like the program to implement?

37. Have you ever been in jail or in prison? [if no] SKIP TO #39

38. Why were you in prison?

39. Is this area a major focus by law enforcement? If so, why do you think it is?

Overall Community

40. Can people in your neighborhood be trusted?

41. Do people in your neighborhood normally get along with each other?

42. Would you say people in your neighborhood share the same values?

43. What neighborhood value is the most important to you? (Choose 1) Why?
   a. Housing opportunities for all income levels
   b. Funds for home improvement projects
   c. Crime prevention
   d. Positive activities for youth
   e. Transportation options
   f. Shopping opportunities
   g. Support for businesses
   h. Environmental issues
   i. Historic preservation
   j. Other (Please specify): Child-friendliness, Community spaces, Schools, Community

44. How satisfied are you with each of the following in Baton Rouge before and after Hurricane Katrina? Would you say Very Satisfied, Satisfied, In the Middle, Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied
   • The Economy
   • The Government
   • School System
   • Infrastructure
   • Local Media
   • Your Neighborhood
   • Your Church/Religious community
   • The Job Market
   • Available Housing

45. Are people in your neighborhood willing to help others? Why or Why not?

46. Scenario: You or your family is going to go out of town for a week. Would you alert your neighbors? Would you ask your neighbors to collect your mail or watch your property?

47. Scenario: If there was a fight in front of your home and someone was being beaten up or threatened how likely is it that one of your neighbors would break it up? Would you attempt to intervene?

48. Have you ever worked with your neighbors to improve your neighborhood? (If yes, what kind of work have you done? [and why?])
49. Do you have a Neighborhood Watch program in your neighborhood? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Don’t know; If not, are you interested in organizing a Neighborhood Watch? ( ) Yes ( ) No Why or Why not?

Religious Attitudes

50. What is your current religious preference? Was religion an important part of your upbringing?

51. Are you a member of a local church, synagogue, or other religious or spiritual community?

52. Not including weddings and funerals, how often do you attend religious service? Every week, Almost every week, Once or twice a month, A few times per year, Less often than that, Don’t know or Refused.

53. How important is religion in your life? Very important, Fairly important, not important at all

54. Do you pray about your community? If so, how often do you pray? Daily, Once a week, Once a month, Other

55. Have you spoken to a local religious leader about doing something to improve your neighborhood?

Demographic Characteristics:

56. [If unsure, ask] Are you male or female?

57. Do you consider yourself to be: African American, Asian, Hispanic, White, Other (Please specify) _______________

58. What is your age?

59. Are you currently married, living with a partner, separated, divorced, widowed, or have you never been married?

60. Do you have children that live with?

61. What is the highest grade of schooling that you have completed? Less than High School, High School Diploma or GED, Some College, College Degree or Graduate Level Degree

62. Just one more question: I’m going to read you a series of income categories. Please stop me when I get to the category that includes the totally income that you and all other members of your household earned before taxes during 2013, from all sources.

   a. Under $15,000
   b. Under $25,000
   c. Under $35,000
   d. Under $50,000
   e. Under 75,000
   f. Under 100,000
   g. More than 100,000
   h. Don’t Know or No Response
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