

**PERCEIVED RISK OF VICTIMIZATION AND FEAR OF
CRIME: A CASE STUDY OF METU STUDENTS**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY**

**BY
Gökhan GÖKULU**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY**

SEPTEMBER 2011

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha ALTUNIŞIK
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Dr. Ayşe SAKTANBER
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Dr. Kayhan MUTLU
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members:

Prof.Dr. Halil İbrahim BAHAR	(Police Academy)	_____
Prof.Dr. Kayhan MUTLU	(METU, SOC)	_____
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Erdoğan YILDIRIM	(METU, SOC)	_____
Assist. Prof.Dr. Çağatay TOPAL	(METU, SOC)	_____
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ahmet UYSAL	(OGU, IR)	_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Lastname: GÖKHAN GÖKULU

Signature :

ABSTRACT

Perceived Risk of Victimization and Fear of Crime: a Case Study of Metu Students

Gökulu, Gökhan

Ph.D., Department of Sociology

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Kayhan Mutlu

September 2011 318 Pages

Fear of crime is a phenomenon which affects individuals' standard of living and influences their everyday behaviors. In this sense, it can be said that if a person has high fear of crime, this will have a negative effect on his or her standard of living. Fear of crime does not always bear resemblance to the crime rate of the society. From this standpoint, residents of a region where crime rate is high do not always have high fear of crime. Similarly, the residents of a region where crime rate is low may have high fear of crime. This situation points out the need of an extensive analysis on fear of crime as a significant variable regarding individuals' standard of living.

This study aims to examine the relationship between perceived risk of victimization and fear of crime. Studies about fear of crime mainly focus on gender differences, social inequalities and physical incivilities. all of this factor are important element to grasp its nature and dimensions of fear of crime. In addition to this factors fear of crime is affected by individuals risk perception of victimization. Our study aims to deal fear of crime concept among students in a multidimensional approach. In this respect, it will evaluate how much the students are afraid of and uncomfortable with being exposed to a crime rather than the assessing merely the possibility of being exposed to a crime.

The study will measure the concept of fear of crime over the concept of anticipated fear according to Ferraro's (1995) model. The advantage of this approach is that it allows the measurement of fear of crime the individuals show as a result of contacting other person and environment rather than the instantaneous fears. Our study will evaluate the Metu students' fear of crime in terms of specific crimes rather than a general evaluation of crime in line with the approach of risk perception. In this sense, our study seeks to measure the fear of crime over certain crimes such as theft, robbery, simple attack, serious attack and sexual abuse.

Keywords: Victimization, Indirect Victimization, Fear of Crime, Perceived Risk of Victimization, Constrained behavior.

ÖZ

Mağduriyet Risk Algısı ve Suç Korkusu: Odtü Öğrencilerine Yönelik Bir Uygulama

Gökulu, Gökhan

Doktora., Sosyoloji Bölümü

Danışman: Prof. Dr. Kayhan Mutlu

Eylül 2011 318 Sayfa

Suç korkusu, bireylerin yaşam kalitesini etkileyen onların günlük davranışları üzerinde etkili olan bir olgudur. Bu anlamda bir bireyin yüksek suç korkusuna sahip olması, onların yaşam kalitesini negatif bir biçimde etkilemektedir. Suç korkusu her zaman toplumdaki suç oranlarıyla benzerlik gösteren bir yapıda değildir. Bu anlamda yüksek suç oranlarına sahip bir bölgede yaşayanlar her zaman için yüksek suç korkusu taşımayabilirler. Benzer bir biçimde düşük bir suç oranına sahip bir bölgede yaşayanlar yüksek suç korkusu taşıyabilirler. Bu durum bireylerin yaşam kalitesi açısından önemli bir değişken olan suç korkusunun kapsamlı bir şekilde incelenmesi gerekliliğini göstermektedir.

Bu çalışma mağduriyet risk algısı ve suç korkusu arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. suç korkusu ile ilgili çalışmalar genellikle cinsiyet farklılıkları, sosyal eşitsizlikler ve çevresel bozulma üzerinde durmaktadırlar. Bütün bu faktörler

suç korkusunun doğasını ve boyutlarını anlamamız açısından önemli unsurlardır. Bütün bu etkenlerin yanında suç korkusu bireylerin mağduriyet risk algılarından da etkilenen bir kavramdır. Çalışmamız öğrencilerin suç korkusu kavramını çok boyutlu bir biçimde ele almayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu anlamda öğrencilerin suç korkusu sadece bir suça maruz kalma olasılığından ziyade bu suça maruz kalmaktan ne derece korktuğunu ve rahatsız olduğunu ölçecektir.

Çalışmamız, Ferraro'nun (1995) modeline uygun olarak suç korkusu kavramını öngürülen korku kavramı üzerinden ölçecektir. Bu yaklaşımın avantajı bireylerin anlık korkularından ziyade çevresiyle iletişim kurması sonucu oluşturduğu suç korkusunu ölçmeyi olanaklı kılmıştır. Çalışmamız Odtü öğrencilerinin suç korkusunu risk algısı yaklaşımına uygun olarak genel suç değerlendirmesinden ziyade spesifik suçlar açısından değerlendirecektir. Bu anlamda çalışmamız suç korkusunu hırsızlık, gasp, basit saldırı, ciddi saldırı ve cinsel taciz gibi belirli suçlar üzerinden ölçmeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Mağduriyet, Dolaylı Mağduriyet, Suç Korkusu, Mağduriyet Risk Algısı, Kısıtlanan Davranışlar.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF THE TABLES	x
CHAPTER.....	1
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Outline of the Study	10
CHAPTER.....	17
2. FEAR OF CRIME: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES	17
2.1. Different Approaches on Definition of Concept of Crime.....	23
2.2. Different Approaches on Definition of Fear of Crime.....	31
2.3. Victimization Perspective	41
2.4. Vulnerability Perspective	51
2.5. Influence of Media on Fear of Crime.....	66
2.6. Incivilities Perspective	74
2.7. The Community Concern Perspective	86
2.7.1. Informal Social Control and Fear of Crime.....	90
2.7.2. Formal Social Control and Fear of Crime.....	94
2.8. Risk Assessment Perspective	97
2.9. Campus and Fear of Crime.....	121
2.10. METU Campus Structure.....	125
2.11. Kızılay City Center	130
CHAPTER.....	132
3. METHODOLOGY	132
3.1. Type of the Study.....	133
3.2. Design of the Questionnaire and Pilot Study	134
3.3. Sampling.....	136
3.4. Importance of Study and Benefits of Model Employed	138
3.5. Research Questions.....	140
3.6. Definitions of Variables and Hypotheses.....	145
3.6.1 Individual Characteristics.....	146
3.6.2. Victimization	150
3.6.3. Environmental Features (Neighborhood Disorder)	153
3.6.4. Perceived Risk of Victimization.....	157
3.6.5. Constrained Behaviors	160
CHAPTER.....	163
4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS.....	163
4.1. Demographic Characteristics.....	164
4.1.1. Studied Class	164
4.1.2. Gender	165
4.1.3. Age.....	166
4.1.4. Sheltering.....	167

4.2. Direct Victimization.....	168
4.3. Indirect Victimization	172
4.4. Environmental Features	175
4.5. Perceived Risk of Victimization.....	178
4.6. Fear of Crime.....	182
4.7. Constrained Behaviors	185
4.8. Data Analysis.....	188
4.8.1. Demographic Variables and Fear of Crime.....	189
4.8.1.1. Age and Fear of Crime	190
4.8.1.2. Gender and Fear of Crime	193
4.8.1.3. Studying Class and Fear of Crime	200
4.8.1.4. The Place of Residence and Fear of Crime	202
4.8.1.5. Frequency of Going to the Kızılay and Fear of Crime.....	204
4.8.1.6. Fear of Crime and Period of Time Spent in Kızılay	205
4.8.2. Direct Victimization and Fear of Crime.....	207
4.8.3. Indirect Victimization and Fear of Crime	215
4.8.4. Enviromental Disorder and Fear of Crime	217
4.8.5. Perceived Risk of Victimization and Fear of Crime	223
4.8.5.1. Perceived Risk and Gender.....	225
4.8.6. Constrained Behaviors and Fear of Crime	233
4.8.7. The Difference between Daytime and Nighttime Fear of Crime	236
4.8.8. The Difference between Campus and Kızılay Fear of Crime	238
4.9. Multivariate Analysis of Fear of Crime	241
4.9.1. Multiple Regression Analysis of Campus Fear of Crime	244
4.9.1.1. Perceived Risk of Victimization in Campus.....	246
4.9.1.2. Constrained Behaviors in Campus.....	247
4.9.2. Multiple Regression Analysis Kızılay Fear of Crime	251
4.9.2.1. Perceived Risk of Victimization in Kızılay.....	253
4.9.2.2. Constrained Behaviors in Kızılay	254
CHAPTER.....	259
5. CONCLUSION	259
REFERENCES	276
APPENDICES.....	292
A. SURVEY.....	292
B. TURKISH SUMMARY	305
C. CURRICULUM VITAE	318

LIST OF THE TABLES

TABLES

Table 1 Distribution of Sampling According to Classes	137
Table 2 Which grade are you studying	165
Table 3 Gender distribution	166
Table 4 Age distribution	167
Table 5 Residence type	168
Table 6 Direct victimization at the campus	169
Table 7 Direct victimization outside the campus	171
Table 8 Indirect victimization at the campus	173
Table 9 Indirect victimization outside the campus.....	174
Table 10 Enviromental characteristics of the campus	176
Table 11 Enviromental characteristics of the Kızılay.....	177
Table 12 Perceived risk of victimization at campus.....	179
Table 13 Perceived risk of victimization in Kızılay	181
Table 14 Campus fear of crime	183
Table 15 Kızılay fear of crime	184
Table 16 Campus constrained behavior.....	186
Table 17 Kızılay constrained behaviors.....	187
Table 18 Reliability analysis of scales.....	189
Table 19 Age and campus fear of crime correlation	191
Table 20 Age and Kızılay fear of crime correlation.....	192
Table 21 Campus fear of crime and gender	194
Table 22 Gender differences in campus fear of crime.....	195
Table 23 Fear of crime and gender in Kızılay.....	197
Table 24 Gender differences in Kızılay fear of crime	198
Table 25 Studied class and campus fear of crime correlation.....	201
Table 26 Studied class and Kızılay fear of crime correlation	202
Table 27 Campus fear of crime and residence	204
Table 28 Fear of crime in Kızılay and residence.....	204
Table 29 Frequency of students' going to the Kızılay	205
Table 30 Fear of crime and period of time spend in Kızılay	206
Table 31 Fear of crime and direct victimization experience in campus.....	209
Table 32 Fear of crime in campus and personal crime victimization experience	210
Table 33 Fear of crime in campus and property crime victimization.....	210
Table 34 Average fear of crime in campus, direct victimization and gender	212
Table 35 Fear of crime in Kızılay and direct victimization experience outside campus	213
Table 36 Fear of crime in Kızılay and personal crime victimization outside campus	213
Table 37 Fear of crime in Kızılay and property crime victimization experience outside campus	214
Table 38 Campus fear of crime and indirect victimization.....	216
Table 39 Fear of crime and indirect victimization experience outside campus.....	217

Table 40 Campus neighborhood disorder and campus fear of crime correlation	220
Table 41 Kızılay neighborhood disorder and Kızılay fear of crime correlation	221
Table 42 Campus neighborhood and campus constrained behaviors correlation	222
Table 43 Kızılay neighborhood disorder and Kızılay constrained behaviors correlation	223
Table 44 Perceived risk of victimization in campus and gender.....	225
Table 45 Gender differences in campus fear of crime.....	226
Table 46 Perceived risk of victimization in Kızılay and gender	228
Table 47 Gender differences in Kızılay fear of crime	229
Table 48 Campus perceived risk of victimization and campus fear of crime correlation	231
Table 49 Kızılay perceived risk of victimization and Kızılay fear of crime correlation	232
Table 50 Campus constrained behavior and campus fear of crime correlation	234
Table 51 Kızılay constrained behavior and Kızılay fear of crime correlation.....	235
Table 52 Fear of crime and period of time in campus.....	236
Table 53 Fear of crime and period of time in Kızılay	237
Table 54 Kızılay and campus fear of crime	239
Table 55 The difference between fear of crime in campus and Kızılay and types of crime	240
Table 56 Model summary fear of crime in campus.....	245
Table 57 ANOVA.....	245
Table 58 Fear of crime in campus coefficients	248
Table 59 Model summary	249
Table 60 Coefficients.....	250
Table 61 Model summary fear of crime in Kızılay	252
Table 62 ANOVA.....	252
Table 63 Fear of crime in Kızılay coefficients.....	255
Table 64 Model summary	256
Table 65 Coefficients.....	258

CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION

Crime is a phenomenon which has been observed in every society from the ancient times to our modern-day. The fact that crime phenomenon exists in every society does not mean that its content or its perception and its construal is the same in every society. While a behavior pattern can be treated as normal in a specific time period it can be treated as a behavior pattern which necessitates sanction in another time period. This relative structure of crime is not only based on the difference between different historical understandings about crime. It also reflects different understandings of different cultures and societies. In our day, while some societies evaluate some behavior patterns as crime, these patterns can be regarded as normal acts by other societies.

This relative structure of crime may reveal itself in execution of meanings and sanctions against crime. The difference between societies on which sanction will be executed as a result of recognizing an act as a crime, originates not only from the judicial process of crime but also from the socio-cultural quality of crime. This socio-cultural quality of crime brings along the difference between societies regarding the responses to crime and behaviors about crime.

When we evaluate the issue from this point of view, analyzing the reflections of fear of crime in developed countries as an element which influences individuals' standard of living and manifesting analogical and distinctive patterns of the concept becomes crucial in terms of both relating with the relevant literature and developing applicable policies about fear of crime. In an overall assessment, our study aims at analyzing

“fear of crime” concept in a context which has various socio-cultural dynamics and perceptions.

Fear of crime concept and relevant theoretical and empirical studies date back to the 1960s. Hale (1996) stated that criminal sociologists and policymakers increased his interest in fear of crime concept as from the 1960s. Judging from this point of view, we can affirm that studies on fear of crime analysis and concordantly state practices aimed at preventing fear of crime are quite recent.

Starting point of fear of crime studies is the negative effects resulting from high fear of crime on individuals' standards of living and in some cases even its role in preventing individuals' involvement in social life. To explain more specifically, some individuals who feel relatively vulnerable try to survive by isolating themselves from the society they live. The studies on fear of crime reveal that the reason why women have higher fear of crime compared to men is that women feel relatively more vulnerable (Warr 1985, Gardner 1995, Fisher and Sloan 2003).

Another segment of society whose standard of living affected negatively by fear of crime is elders. Despite the fact that elders are exposed to less crime they have high fear of crime and avoid being in public spheres. This is because in the case of a possible crime they are at a disadvantage regarding self-defense just like women. Studies on this issue prove that age is a factor which increases the fear of crime. (Clemente and Kleiman 1977)

Fear of crime problem does not only affect women and elders. The socio-economic status of individuals can also be regarded as a factor which increases the fear of crime in situations like being a member of a minority group in a society. In this

respect, the importance of developing practices and policies to prevent and decrease the fear of crime as a factor which affects an individual's standard of living has started to grow bigger and bigger in terms of social integration and the individuals' level of comfort with public policies. Dolu and etc (2010) emphasizes that the studies of fear of crime do not indicate that fear of crime does not decrease together with the decrease in the crime rates. In a similar way, Dolu and etc underlines the necessity of developing policies within the scope of fear of crime studies as follows;

“Although closely related concepts, fear of crime is independent of crime. Many studies in criminological literature suggest that fear of crime increases parallel to the increase in crime but it does not decrease with the decrease in crime. The fear of crime makes the fight against crime more difficult as it harms the social cohesion and trust which are among the most needed elements in preventing and controlling crime. For this reason, in addition to activities for the fight against crime, there is a great need to develop and implement programs specially designed to overcome fear of crime. However, there is not enough research initiatives and empirical knowledge in the Turkish context to guide the police and people who shape security policies. Even though many national and cross national studies on fear of crime have been conducted in the international arena it draws the attention that, there are only a few local studies and there is not any single national study to measure and assess the scope and nature of this problem in Turkey” (Dolu and etc 2010:57)

Fear of crime studies constitutes quite a new field for Turkey. While studies in national scale have been frequently carried out in United States and European countries, such studies have not been carried out in Turkey yet (Dolu and etc 2010:57). Nevertheless, the number of studies about the fear of crime as a post graduate or PhD thesis and as an article in national or international journals has been increasing recently, day by day. .

Analyzing fear of crime in terms of young population in parallel with general fear of crime studies in Turkey is quite a new area of study. The literature study which we carried out reveals that in Turkey only one study was carried out in this matter up to now. Fear of crime research conducted by Özaşçılar and Ziyalar (2009) on 554 university students aged 18-25 who live in Istanbul was based on the risk assessment model of Ferraro (1995). Nonetheless, this study evaluates university students' fear of crime constrictedly in respect of both scale questions and content of analysis. In this sense, a study analyzing university students' fear of crime at campus or in a city center on the basis of the crimes which they may be exposed to and discussing the results in detail is needed. In this respect, our study aims at analyzing fear of crime among university students aged between 18-24 by interpreting the differences between different localities in a more comprehensive way.

Ferraro's (1995) risk assessment approach has been taken as basis for our study examining the fear of crime of the undergraduate students at the Middle East Technical University. This approach measures the fear of crime of individuals over the concepts of individual characteristics, victimization, neighborhood features, perceived risk of victimization and constrained behavior. According to the risk assessment approach, socio-demographic traits such as age, gender, race, etc. are the factors influencing the fear of crime of the individuals. This study will examine whether the socio-demographic variables such as age, gender and studying class have an impact on fear of crime of the students.

For the purpose of finding out whether the socio-demographic traits of the students affect their fear of crime, the study tests the hypotheses concerning these variables. Our study has established the hypotheses relating to the individuals characteristics according to the literature on fear of crime and in compliance with the properties of the sample we examine. To illustrate, generally there is a positive association

between age and fear of crime in the studies on age and fear of crime. Besides, the studies investigating the fear of crime of young people reveal that the fear of crime decreases as the age increases (Melde, 2007).

Parallel to the related literature and academic works, the study examines the relationship between age and fear of crime over the hypothesis that the fear of crime decreases as the age increases. Nonetheless, we can propose based on the concerned analyses that the age variable does not have any influence on fear of crime of the students. The reason for this is that the age variable does not lead to social vulnerability as a result of the fact that the questionnaire has been applied on the age range of 18 - 24, and the ages of the students are close to each other.

Though the age variable is not determining and significant in terms of fear of crime in our study, it is remarkable that the studying class influences the fear of crime of students. In this regard, the increase in the time spent by students across the campus has a decreasing role in their fear of crime independent of the age variable. Thus, we can say that as the students become more familiar to their environment of friendship relations, their fear of crime reduces.

Another socio-demographic variables employed in the study is gender. The studies on fear of crime highlight that the women hold more fear of crime due to social vulnerability. Our study tests the hypothesis that women have more fear of crime compared to men for campus and Kızılay areas. In the analyses conducted, it has been seen that the women have more fear of crime in both the campus and Kızılay area compared to the men.

The second dimension of the risk assessment approach comprises victimization. Our study aims at measuring the victimization aspect over direct victimization and indirect victimization. The questions evaluating the direct victimization have been chosen among the crimes which higher probability of student exposure. From this

point, the questions on direct victimization include the questions about theft, robbery, simple assault, serious attack and sexual harassment.

Our study contains questions measuring the in-campus and off-campus victimization of the students. The purpose for such differentiation is to assess the impact of campus victimization on campus fear of crime, and impact of off-campus victimization on Kızılay area separately. In this respect, the influence of victimization variable in different regions and what types of crimes result in fear of crime in which areas are analyzed in detail.

The outcomes of the analyses show that the crimes such theft of goods in campus area increase the campus fear of crime. Looking at the descriptive data regarding the campus direct victimization, theft is the most common type of victimization. Therefore, we can argue that there is an accord between the campus fear of victimization of students and type of crime being exposed. On the other hand, it is seen for Kızılay area that the students are more afraid of crimes against individuals. The fact that Kızılay is a less protected area in contrast to the campus, that the construct is composed of various social parts and a heterogeneous one can be counted as the factors affecting the fear of crime of students directed at person.

Our study looks into the impacts of indirect victimization phenomenon on fear of crime along with direct victimization as well. In this respect, our study contains questions on both campus indirect victimization and off-campus indirect victimization. The in-campus and off-campus indirect victimization questions ask whether any acquaintance of the student has ever been a victim of theft, robbery, simple assault, severe assault and sexual harassment. When we dig out the analyses relating to indirect victimization, it is seen that the rate of indirect victimization does not affect the fear of crime as much as direct victimization though the rate of the former is higher.

The risk assessment approach does not examine the effect of only the individual characteristics on fear of crime. This approach investigates the environmental disorder on fear of crime in addition to the socio-demographic variables such as age and gender. One other property of this approach relating to the environmental disorder is that it measures the environmental disorder over the perceptions of the individuals rather than the objective criteria. In this regard, how the individuals perceive their environment and the impacts of such perception on fear of crime are one of the properties of the risk assessment approach. In this sense, the individual differences of perception pertaining to environmental disorder and the effects of such differences on fear of crime are one of the issues that the risk assessment approach deals with.

Our study aims to measure the perceived environmental disorder of the individuals over the campus and Kızılay. For this point, there are questions in our study measuring the environmental disorder perception of the students relating to the campus and Kızılay. The perceived environmental disorder is categorized as social and physical environmental disorder. The social environmental disorder contains the questions with respect to the social environment such as the existence of drunken people around, where there are street sellers, and noisemaker people. On the other hand, the physical environmental disorder includes questions relating to physical disorder such as uncollected garbage, insufficient street lighting and desolate buildings.

Our study measures the campus and Kızılay environmental disorder perceptions with the questions about physical and social environmental disorder. In this aspect, there are questions asked to the students to find out to what degree the features about the campus and Kızılay are considered as a problem for them. In the analyses carried out, the stray dogs are the most significant problem as the environmental disorder by the students across the campus. As for the Kızılay environmental disorder, drunken people wandering in streets are seen as a major problem.

When we assess the environmental disorder perception for the campus and Kızılay area, we can say that there is a significant difference in terms of the campus and Kızılay environmental disorder perception of the students. It can be suggested that generally the students hold a lower environmental disorder perception regarding the campus. In contrast to this, the perceived environmental disorder is higher for the Kızılay area.

One of the innovations brought by the risk assessment approach to the studies on fear of crime is that it differentiates between the perceived risk of victimization and fear of crime. The studies on fear of crime made prior to this approach do not make a discrimination of perceived risk and fear of crime, and the fear of crime was equated with the risk of exposure to crime. In this regard, the risk perception approach is one of first of studies differentiating between the fear of crime of the individuals and the risk of exposure to crime.

Differentiating risk of exposure to crime of the individuals and their fear of victimization enables to better measure the fear of crime. Even though an individual considers his/her risk of being exposure as low, that person might be very scared of being exposed to such crime. Thus, measurement of fear of crime of the individuals by asking the risk of victimization will prevent making correct analyses. For example, the old and women may be afraid of a crime despite they assess their risk of exposure a crime because they feel vulnerable.

Another advantage of the differentiation between the perceived risk of victimization and fear of crime is that it allows more correctly measuring the fear of crime of the individuals of the criminal sub-culture. The individuals with higher risk of exposure to a crime under the influence of the criminal sub-culture raised may not be that afraid of exposure to such crime. In brief, the differentiation between the fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization states that the fear of exposure to a crime cannot be measured by means of the probability of exposure to that crime, and the fear has a rather different meaning than risk.

The study intends to measure the concept of perceived risk of victimization with questions similar to those used for measuring the fear of crime to conduct sounder analyses, and thus it contains questions measuring the students' probabilities for being exposed to theft, robbery, simple attack, severe attack and sexual harassment. The study requires the students to separately evaluate the probability of exposure to any of these crimes types both at the campus and in Kızılay area.

When we examine the evaluations of the students regarding the perceived risk of victimization, we can utter there is a significant difference between the campus and Kızılay. The students perceive quite higher risk of exposure to a crime in Kızılay area. On the other hand, for the campus, the perceived risk of victimization of the students is lower as parallel to the campus fear of crime.

Constrained behavior is another concept, which the risk assessment approach deals with as an independent variable influencing the fear of crime. This concept refers to the behaviors that the individuals exhibit due to the fear of crime in a certain region. Constrained behavior is seen as defense and avoidance behaviors. Defense includes the precautions taken by an individual against the fear of crime. Avoidance behaviors on the other side are the acts the individuals do not realize because of fear of crime. To illustrate, carrying cutlery such as a knife is a defensive behavior, and likewise, not to decide to go to a specific location due to fear of crime is an indicator of avoidance behavior.

The study we have done measures the concept of constrained behavior for both the campus and the Kızılay area. When we examine the analyses made, we see that the average constrained behavior for the Kızılay area is higher than the campus constrained area. The top constrained behavior in Kızılay is requesting from an acquaintance to keep an eye on personal belongings while going somewhere as is the case in the campus. Considered from this point of view, the primary security precaution for the campus and Kızılay is taken against the victimization of theft.

1.1. Outline of the Study

Our study includes different subchapters like any scientific research. This chapter broadly includes brief information about the unity and the scientific side of the study as well as what is desired to be done in following parts. The first chapter of the study includes different approaches on definition of crime and fear of crime concepts and provides justification on which definition is taken within the scope of this study.

When crime and fear of crime are concerned, recognition of concepts as an essential procedure in a scientific research becomes an obligation, gaining a more prominent position. Because there is not any consensus on the meaning of the concept of crime but various ideas are discussed regarding the concept of crime. The reason behind this fact is that as crime is a relative concept, it has been differentiated culturally in the course of time.

Our study will discuss the different ideas in pursuit of the explanation of crime concept and present these ideas' point of view on crime concept. In this respect, after briefly mentioning macro-social theories which try to explain crime phenomenon, the study will evaluate the strengths and blind sides of these theories. This effort aims to underline the fact that crime is a social and complex reality which cannot be explained with a sole dimension.

Our study analyzes macro-social theories relevant to crime under 3 main headings. To state briefly, responding positively to crime phenomenon in terms of union of society, consensus approach explains that when the union of society is damaged,

severe sanctions are applied against the crime committed. Conklin (2006:6) emphasizes that consensus approach explains that criminal behaviors includes elements against public interest.

Social process theory is one of the macro-social theories in pursuit of explanation the crime phenomenon. In accordance with this view, crime is a learned phenomenon and individuals internalize to commit crime interacting with subcultures such as family and social circle. In this context, an individual turns into crime as a result of his or her integration and transmission with various resources. Internet, television, peer group, and in some cases even family members play active roles on turning and individual into crime.

Conflict theory is another main approach in pursuit of explanation of crime. Contrary to consensus approach, this theory does not consider crime as a consensual phenomenon at the general society level and sets the sanctions to the crime accordingly. But according to conflict theories, the criminal issues are designed to enable the privileged class in societies imposes their own values and norms to society to protect their interests. Conflict theorists claim that in order to understand the nonconsensual nature of criminal issues, it is obligatory to recognize the legislators of the crime laws.

These studies, aimed at explaining crime phenomenon, purport all incidents related to crime by dealing a certain aspect of social reality. In the meantime, crime is a complex phenomenon which cannot be degraded into a single reason. When we handle crime in relation with an incident but not as a general concept, we may observe the existence of various types of criminal cases about which all classes of society agree or the existence of cases such as white collar crimes which are less penalized in order to protect the interests of a certain class.

Analyzing crime phenomenon on macro level on the basis of types of crime and supporting theories in pursuit of explaining these types of crimes eliminates the possible problems arising out of generalizations. In this respect, our study prefers to handle crime and crime phenomenon in terms of types of crime on micro level rather than generalizing them. From this point of view, our survey tries to assess crime victimization on the basis of more specific crimes rather than asking generic questions such as "Have you ever been exposed to a crime?" Similarly, instead of assessing fear of crime phenomenon by asking questions such as "How much are you afraid of being exposed to a crime while you are outside?", the study includes questions such as how much people are afraid of being victim in the cases of theft, robbery, or assault.

After explaining approaches regarding fear of crime, our study will provide approaches to different definitions of crime. After specifying how crime phenomenon is defined and what these approaches are, our study will point out the handicaps of approaching crime solely in terms of judicial definition and highlight the utilization of crime phenomenon in parallel with deviance sociology in broad terms.

Another subject that we would like to explore after providing approaches about the definition of crime in first chapter is the different approaches defining the fear of crime phenomenon. The characteristics of the definition of the fear of crime in these approaches will be analyzed in parallel with the methods which fear of crime studies applied and the underlying theoretical acceptances. In this context, the way how fear of concept is defined is not simply a choice. This study analytically examines the theoretical and methodological ground by which the fear of crime is assessed.

Our study will illustrate that defining fear of crime on the basis of anxiety, behavior, risk perception, and threat is inaccurate and deficient. After highlighting the theoretical and methodological inaccuracies of these approaches, the study will put forward that fear of crime should be assessed in terms of specific crimes rather than common crimes. From this point of view, our study will assess fear of crime in accordance with the risk perception approach of Ferraro (1995) on the basis of fear of being the victim in specific types of crime rather than general fear of crime perception or threat approach.

The second chapter of the study handles broadly the approaches applied in fear of crime studies and theoretical infrastructure of these approaches. In this sense, this chapter will analyze the method and the theoretical structure used in fear of crime phenomenon studies during period from 1960s to modern fear of crime studies of our day. Theoretical infrastructure of these approaches, which has been used in analyzing the fear of crime, will be examined in relevant research. The chapter will also include views which either support or criticize these approaches.

One of the elements which require attention while developing a theoretical structure on fear of crime is trying to show the relationship between theory and method rather than merely giving information on theory. In this regard, the study does not make a sharp distinction between theory and method. It justifies that these two domains are linked each other. Therefore, after putting theoretical knowledge on fear of crime, our study analyzes researches based on this approach and includes criticism against the approach.

After analyzing victimization, vulnerability, incivilities and community concern approaches concerned with fear of crime, our study will examine the risk approach it used, in detail. Our study will briefly examine symbolic interactionism, incivility hypothesis and routine activities theories used by Ferraro (1995) while he was developing risk assessment approach. Afterwards it will explain how these theoretical views are applied to risk assessment approach. Such issues on what kind of innovations this approach brings in terms of fear of crime, why distinction between fear of crime and risk perception is needed, will also be examined and the importance of this approach in terms of this study will be put forward as well.

After discussing the approaches applied within fear of crime studies in the second chapter, general information on the structure of METU's campus and Kızılay will be provided. This part will include information on the reason why the METU and Kızılay regions are significant in terms of field of study. The reasons why METU campus was chosen later with the inclusion of Kızılay region for this study in pursuit of assessing fear of crime among university students will be included.

In the third chapter of our study, the information on the methodological aspect of the study will be included. Information regarding the content of the method used in the research which we conducted in this part will be provided and the extent of this method in terms of fear of crime will be discussed. Method part will include the content and formation process of the survey which we used for the research as a data technique. In this respect such information regarding the concepts which the survey tries to assess, or the questions which these concepts include will be available in the methodology section of the study. After providing information on the way the survey was developed, information on the pilot study will be presented. The data on our modeling applied in survey and the demographic characteristics of the modeling will be available in the methodology part of our study.

One of the elements of methodology that will be discussed is the research questions concerning the study that was carried out and the hypothesis concerning these research questions. In this part, research questions that make the research come in view and related hypothesis will be analyzed with regard to the approach that we take. Another element that we discuss is to define dependent and independent variables. From this point of view, the research analyzes how the dependent variable of fear of crime were measured, and includes information about independent variables that affect the dependent variable. An element that draws attention in the identification of dependent and independent variables is about choosing questions that survey dependent and independent variables, basing them on the literature while making reference to the previous studies that were carried out in this field. In this context method of the study involves not the simple explanation of the methods of data gathering but the reasons of data gathering techniques.

In the fourth section, analysis related to the empirical study takes place and the results of hypothesis related to the study will be analyzed. In the analysis part of the study, first of all, descriptive statistics related to illustration will be ranked. Data regarding the descriptive statistics which are related to scales making up subpart of the survey will be evaluated in terms of our study subject. After the illustration of the descriptive subjects, analysis on the hypothesis will take place and these results of analysis will be discussed in parallel with the literature.

After giving information about the descriptive statistics related to survey, information on the reliability analysis of the sub scales that are used will be also provided. After the rates of Cronbach's Alpha in each scale are indicated, in this part, hypotheses that are established with regard to model will be tested. In this sense, analysis of the hypotheses of demographic variables such as age, gender, type of residence will be dealt with. Apart from the demographic variables, effect of the

concepts such as direct or indirect victimization, environmental features, risk perception of the victimization on the fear of crime will be discussed with the related analysis methods.

In the fourth section where the data regarding survey is analyzed, finally, to indicate how independent variables of the given model have an influence on the fear of crime, regression analysis will take place. Regression analysis is the type of analysis that enables us to see in what proportions independent variables influence the dependent variable. In this sense, it lets us analyze the variables that are used in the model of the study in terms of the fear of crime. Our study includes two different regression analyses on both campus and Kızılay fear of crime and will discuss the results separately.

In the fifth and the last section of our study includes conclusion that evaluate generally results of data. The last section of our study handles the results with regard to literature and degree of validity of the model used in the study in terms of the places where the survey was carried out. After the general evaluation of our study, examples related to the possible future studies and regarding how fear of crime of the university students can be measured, which is a new field for Turkey will be given.

CHAPTER

2. FEAR OF CRIME: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Certain structural and cultural components that enable the co-existence of the individuals in social context ensure the integration of that society. When evaluated from this perspective, establishment of certain social rules that will enable the co-existence of each society and encouragement of observing such social rules are significant in terms of the continuity of that society. In as much as the establishment of the rules matters in terms of social continuity and integration, what kind of applications will be conducted against the violation of these rules is important as well.

The most significant traits differentiating the modern society from the traditional societies are the higher number of social differences and diversities, and that any ethnic and religious beliefs make it possible for the people to live together. The modern society, which we can describe as a junction where different cultures, faiths and cognitive processes intersect, has a more complex body of rules compared to the former societies.

There are particular behavioral patterns and organizations that damage the operation of the certain mechanisms in addition to the fact that there are such mechanisms facilitating the co-existence of people in modern society. For this reason, the crime phenomenon in the modern society where there are cultural, economic and social layers with greatest difference cannot be treated as an individual case. Crime is also perceived as a danger to the system by the governments and their subordinated justice mechanisms and results in the development of policies in line with that fact.

Ensuring the integrity and coherence within the social structure, establishment of rules enabling co-existence of individuals with different culture and belief and ethnic traits are rather a significant problem in the modern society. In the modern society that embodies dissolution and conflicts as much as integration, establishing certain rules in order to avert such dissolutions and conflicts gains utmost importance in terms of ensuring social continuity.

Another issue that is as important as these rules as a way of providing the society with peace is the sanctions to be imposed in the event of violation of these rules. Every society may place various sanctions on the individuals who violate these written and unwritten rules. Crime is a concept becoming significant in terms of social continuity and integration as do the establishment of tools required for determination and implementation of these rules. When evaluated from this perspective, the sanctions to be imposed upon violation of these rules are important in terms of integration of that society as the existence of certain rules in a society. In parallel with this view, the consensus theorists emphasize that the crimes that will endanger the integrity of society include more severe sanctions (Conklin 2006:9).

When considered from the point of our subject, comprehending the approaches regarding the crime phenomenon and covering diverse opinions on the definition of crime will enable a better understanding of the fear state resulting from fear. Reflection of these various approaches oriented at fear from fear of crime perspective will enable us to see that situations that are not considered as a crime in legal terms lead to fear of crime for individuals.

Crime is one of the most significant social problems of modern-day. Governments allocate significant sums of resources for fight against crime in order to ensure the social conciliation and social peace. In today's world, rehabilitation of criminals is as important as fighting with the crime. Reintegrating a criminal into the society bears a meaning in terms of both the criminal individual and the society.

The concept of crime as a social phenomenon also brings along various difficulties in terms of its definition. A phenomenon, which does not constitute an element of crime according to the value judgment or laws of a society, may be described as a crime for another society. This structure of crime may also differ in the course of time within the same society. For example, while homosexuality is not an element of crime for a society, it may be characterized as a crime for another society. The same situation can also be applicable for a certain society. That is to say, while homosexuality may be considered as a crime in a society in the past, later it may be accepted as legal.

When we have a look at the macro social theories explaining the crime, we generally find out three fundamental approaches. The first of these approaches is the approach that handles the crime from the perspective of social integration. The works of Durkheim forms the base of this approach. According to Durkheim, crime is a compulsory and healthy phenomenon for all social structures. Examining the suicide phenomenon, Durkheim states that suicide, considered as an individual case, in fact has a social dimension. According to him, suicide rate increases at the times when social bonds weaken (Barkan 2006:167).

According to Durkheim and other sociologists who develop this idea, crime is a healthy social phenomenon making it possible for us to be together in social life. The

sociologists holding this idea state that crime and the punishment arising from this crime make sense for the individuals not committing a crime. According to this opinion, crime and punishment form an opinion within the remaining part of the society that the criminal is punished and the social peace is reinstated. In addition to this, these sociologists underline that the crimes that can threaten the integrity of society include more severe sanctions.

Consensus theorists see crime as behavior that exceeds a society's limits of tolerance. In this view, crime is behavior damaging to the public interest, rather than behavior damaging to the narrow interests of organized groups that are able to influence law. For consensus theorists; the critical question is why some people violate the law, rather than why the law defines their behavior as criminal (Conklin 2006: 9).

One other macro theory dealing with crime in social terms is the social process theories. According to these theories, the crime phenomenon and adoption of criminal sub-culture is a case being shaped and developed within certain social structures. Crime emerges as a result of existence of particular structures and relations. "Offenders learn motives and techniques for breaking law from many sources, including the community, the peer group, the general culture, the media, sports, pornography, and correctional institutions" (Conklin 2006:213). Considered from this perspective, we see that there are numerous factors diversifying the delinquency of individuals from geographical differences to inequality of opportunity, from influence of media to peer groups.

Another major approach making a macro social explanation for crime issue is the conflict theories. Conflict theorists object to the opinion that crime phenomenon is

determined as to the benefit of society and public interest as argued by Durkheim. The followers of Durkheim indicate that crime phenomenon and its outcome ensure the continuity of society and highlight that actually crime and punishment create a healthy situation for the society. The conflict theoreticians, on the other hand, assert that the fact that what is crime and what is not in the society is not determined by the public benefit.

According to the conflict theorists, crime serves to the interests of a group possessing certain class privileges. This group desiring to reinforce its class interest and position accept certain behavioral patterns in the society as a crime while they push the ones related to their class position out of this category. The conflict theoreticians state that social reconciliation and functionality are not that simple a phenomenon and criticize the consensus theories as follows:

“Conflict theorist asked: if people agree on the value system, as consensus theorist suggests, why are so many people in rebellion, why are there so many crimes, so many punitive threats, and so many people in prison? Clearly conflict is to be found everywhere in the world...” (Adler, Mueller, Laufer 1991: 186)

The crime phenomenon has a complex structure that cannot be reduced to one single dimension. Therefore, the crime theories can make generalizations by taking a more general look at one single dimension of crime. Consensus, social process and conflict theorists make generalizations by only looking at one single dimension of the crime phenomenon. The point the crime theorists generally miss about understanding the social dimension of crime is that they abstract it, deal with it with a reductive approach and makes generalizations.

When we discuss the crime phenomenon according to the types of crime, we can find supportive examples in terms of consensus, social process and conflict theories. For example; crimes such as rape and murder are universally agreed on and can be described as crimes against which sanctions are applied (Clifford 1978 in Conklin 2006:9).

When considered only from the perspective of these crimes, we can fall into error that the consensus theory is the only single theory. On the other hand, the theories asserting that the crime is a learned social phenomenon show us that in some cases offenses such as murder or rape can be perceived that bad by certain sub-societal cultures. In this sense, social process theories help us to understand which groups internalize and approve the crime.

In a similar way, conflict theories can provide some examples showing that the laws can be a little softer when it comes to the interests of different social groups on white collar crimes, crimes on trade monopolization, etc. other than the crimes such as murder and rape as well. When we evaluate from this perspective, it will be clearer that the phenomenon that the existing economic system and resulting exclusion cause the crime, and how the dominant classes manipulate or determine the law in cases of interest (Hayward and Morrison 2005: 75).

The social theories on crime can give us only some part of the social reality. Crime is a social phenomenon having quite different dimensions and being realized in various manners. In this respect, it does not seem possible one single theory can satisfactorily explain and make sense of an entire social reality. Nonetheless, we cannot say that all the crime theories are irrelevant because they just deal with only one part of the social

reality. As in all social theories, efforts spent oriented at explanation the social reality in micro level and then generalization of this phenomenon can enable to a healthier result.

When considered from this point of view, evaluation of the crime phenomenon on theory-basis after dealing with the crime phenomenon in micro level; having a look at what the crime types are and examining its occurrence conditions will prevent us to make judgments independent of micro reality in a reductionist and abstractive manner on this subject. In this regard, our study will conduct examinations oriented at understanding the nature of crime rather than discussing the crime theories one by one, and investigate the problem of fear of crime resulting from certain cases in parallel with these realities.

Prior to considerations on the concept of fear of crime and its dimension in detail, examination of crime definitions and of different approaches on this subject will allow us to better make sense of fear of crime arising from the danger of an occurrence of a certain crime. The concept of fear thought as a significant phenomenon in social terms is a concept open to superficial generalizations and myths to be created upon it.

2.1. Different Approaches on Definition of Concept of Crime

Whether having an interest in social sciences or not, most of us make comments on what crime is and how it can be prevent based on our observations and sensations when it comes to crime. The concept of fear, which concerns the life and property safety of individuals and threatens the peaceful life across society, is a concept

naturally leading to each individual to think about and produce an idea on this issue. Discussing the concept of crime from a scientific perspective and preventing the misperceptions on this subject should form the first stage of a study to be conducted. When we assess from this view, definition of the concepts as a necessary stage for a scientific study will gain more importance as regards to the crime.

Since individuals perceive the concept of crime as a threat to their own security and future, they grow close interest in the criminal events in their immediate environment or the media. Even someone who does not seem much interested in any social incident may want to learn about the extent and potential results of any incident when it comes to crime. The basic instinctive needs such as security and protection lie of course behind this interest.

Nonetheless, this interest in the crime phenomenon does not enable to make a scientific deduction on issues such as what exactly this concept is and how it affects the individuals. Contrary to the general view; it is rather difficult to make a definition of the concept of crime, which is acceptable for everyone, and to reveal its reasons. In this respect, as in the other fields of social sciences, it is of great importance to unfold the fallacies, myths accepted as true regarding the crime from a scientific perspective.

It is not at all easy to make an objective definition of the concept of crime. Above all, the concept of crime described as a social problem may vary depending on the different value judgments, beliefs and lifestyles. An act that a social wants to be punished may not be criminalized as a serious offence by another social class. Likewise, an act that can be labeled as a crime by any society may totally be taken normally by a different society.

Such difference for the crime is not a case differing from society to society. An action seen as an offense within the same society may be pushed out of the scope of crime by entirely perception of it as normal during the course of time. Another example that can be given regarding the fact that the concept of crime may change according to the social structures and values is that anthropologists have not come upon an act, which is universally accepted as crime in all societies (Beirne and Messerschmidt 1995:11). Morrison, (2005) in similar way, states that; the criminologists working on crime have not been able to reach a consensus on the definition of crime and that they have different approaches on this subject.

“Crime we are told, is today a salient fact, an integral part of the risks we face in everyday life. In both scholarly and public opinion crime is associated with harm and violence; harm to individuals, destruction of property and the denial of respect to people and institutions. It is clear that we face pressing problems of a practical and scholarly nature in understanding crime. But we lack agreement on the most basic question, namely what is crime?” (Morrison 2005:3)

Certain scholars, who have the opinion that the crime phenomenon has now a different characterization compared to old times, remark that the most significant indicator determining an act as a crime in modern societies is its determined by laws. Another property of the crime phenomenon is the applicability of the penal sanctions oriented such acts determined by the laws in an equal manner for everybody. According to this, crime in modern societies is an act, the limits of which are specified by the law and in consequence of which certain sanctions are imposed different than past times.

According to this view featuring the legal aspects of crime, crimes are described as the acts, which involve the breaches projected in the criminal law and upon which certain sanctions are imposed by the governing authority. When considering in this regard, the subject of the criminology covers the acts specified as crime by the State. The definition of criminology made by Sutherland (1947) reflects this approach.

“Criminology is the body of knowledge regarding crime as a social phenomenon. It includes within its scope the process of making laws, of breaking laws, and reacting towards the breaking of laws... The objective of criminology is the development of a body of general and verified principles and of other types of knowledge regarding this process of law, crime, and treatment or prevention” (Sutherland 1947 in Adler, Mueller and Laufer 1991:5).

Sutherland phrases that the field of the criminological studies covers the crimes established by the law as well as the process of emergence of the same laws. Although it is known that the crime phenomenon has a relative feature emerging in the social process, dealing with the crime within the framework defined by the law will provide convenience for us since it will create a certain outline regarding which phenomena will be studied.

Michael and Adler believe that “great confusion will arise unless criminologist can agree on a precise definition of crime. Only if crime is defined clearly and precisely will it be possible to distinguish criminal behavior from noncriminal behavior.” (Michael and Adler 1971 in Beirne and Messerschmidt: 1995:11)

Beirne and Messerschmidt state that legal definition of crime phenomenon contains certain cases and summarizes these principles as follows:

- First and foremost a crime must be forbidden by criminal law (no crime without law no punishment without law). According to this, no behavior and attitude outside the scope of acts laid down by the law can be described as crime. Handling of crime in such manner precludes arbitrary conduct and non-standard punishment to occur.
- Crime must contain voluntary illegal act or omission. According to this principle, no one can be prosecuted for bad or evil thoughts. Voluntary illegality of the act may have various dimensions. Thus, nobody can be put on trial based on thoughts unless getting into action. Another reflection of the fact that crime must include a voluntary act is that the offender must be of sound mind, namely, must enjoy good mental health. Another initiative accompanied by the condition of criminal intent is that offenders under certain age established by the law cannot be punished due to their acts (Beirne and Messerschmidt 1995 11-15)

Discussing the acts only within the framework as specified by the law by handling the crime in legal terms may lead to some problems. First of all, it is necessary to mention that the criminal law has a nature that is established and implemented subject to the nation state. When evaluated from this perspective, certain authoritarian and oppressive regimes may decriminalize an act, which in fact may be described as crime, from the scope of the criminal law. It is doubtless that this situation may create problems in a contrary implementation in terms of the objectivity of the definition of crime. Morrison explains the arbitrariness and broad powers of nation states in defining the crime as follows:

“Modern western societies have largely defined crime in the terms laid down by the nation state. A crime is an act or omission that leads to penal sanction in accordance with the constitutionally valid procedures of that nation state. Thus nation-state A will prohibit smoking cannabis, while nation state B may say that within specified areas it is allowed” (Morrison 2005:15).

The establishment of the crime by the nation state authorities only over the legal limits may cause to certain problems. To begin with, the establishment of the crime by the State, acceptance of the same as an objective criterion, and existence of unfair definitions of crime in some fascist regimes may be considered as a problem experienced on this issue. Definition of a smallest political criticism, or an act not complying with the regime as a crime, or restrictions and penal sanctions imposed on the acts of certain ethnic groups mean that the concept of crime is abused.

The drawbacks of the definition of the concept of crime merely over the nation state in legal sense brings along the criticisms towards the necessity that the crime must be defined from an angle with boarder participation and perspective. Especially in the international level after the Second World War, it has become essential to describe certain acts as crime. Coming into prominence of the concepts such as ‘crime against humanity,’ ‘genocide’ in terms of international law may be regarded as the result of the efforts oriented at the prevention of such arbitrariness (Morrison 2005:16)

In a similar way, international conventions and initiatives taken to eliminate the violence against children and women, international arrangements made related to the minority rights may be seen as the outcome of the efforts exerted oriented at the limitation of the arbitrariness of the nation states on the crime. Therefore, the arbitrary

regulations to be made by the countries against the crime may be limited or prevented through the international conventions.

Signature of such agreement by the state parties comes to mean that the subject State will observe the provisions related to the agreement, and will accept the imposition of certain sanction in the event of the violation of these provisions. That is to say, the nation states approve the existence of a supra-national power as an inspection body against the arbitrary implementations by accepting certain restrictions and regulations.

Despite the fact that the concept of international crime coming to the foreground as an element limiting the probability of arbitrariness of nation states and their powers, and the international conventions gaining form in parallel with this allow the positive steps to be taken on certain issues regarding the fundamental human rights, the initiative on this issue is at the hands of the nation states. Primarily the decision to sign the international agreements and to observe the related provisions is vested within the nation states. Today, we witness that some nation states violate the fundamental human rights although the supranational institutions and non-governmental organizations proceed by actions as deterrent force regarding those rights. In today's world, although the State is not the single authority to determine which acts will be considered as crime within its own borders, yet it continues its existence still as the most significant determinant force.

Discussion of the concept of crime only in legal term whether in nation state level or international will mean to push the sociological and cultural aspects of this concept into the background. The crime phenomenon is a notion differing from society to society and changing within the course of time. An act determined as a crime by the

laws within a certain period of time may be decriminalized sometime later. Likewise, an act deemed as crime in the criminal law of a State may not be considered as crime for another State. What is more important is that a deed not characterized as crime by the State may be perceived as a negative behavior of the individuals in the society.

Considering from this perspective; the fact that a social scientist conducting research on crime deals with this phenomenon only in legal level may lead to deficiencies in the study. Stating that the crime is a phenomenon beyond the legal definition as a cultural and social fact, some scholars emphasize that the definition of crime should be handled with in a broad manner. These scholars who come up with the deviance concept instead of crime highlight that the social and changing structure of crime phenomenon can be better understood through the concept of deviance (Barkan 2006:13).

Pointing out that crime should be seen as a relatively cultural phenomenon especially since the 1960s, the scholars made various researches on the sociology of deviance. One of the insights that the deviance sociology has brought over the concept of crime eliminates the limitation of this concept with only the legal definition (Morrison 2005:16). Another advantage of the deviance sociology is that it enables to better to comprehend the perception of crime, which changes in the course of time.

The social scientist working on the crime phenomenon should not disregard the fact that this concept has a cultural dimension as well by a holistic approach. Realizing that the concept of crime has a variable structure according to the time and societies will allow us to analyze the subject with an integrated approach. Comprehension of

the fact that crime has an aspect evaluated and shaped by the society in addition to its legal definition will enable us to make sound analyses on the fear of crime.

Realizing the fact that certain phenomena, which the law does not define as crime or does find unnecessary to dwell on, have significant impacts on fear of crime enables a holistic look at the crime phenomenon. To illustrate, an act to be directed at a woman walking in the street at night may result in serious changes on the fear of crime of that woman. Although this act, which affects the woman's view of that area and the crime, does not sometimes mean anything in legal terms, it may be considered as a factor affecting the fear of crime. When evaluated from this perspective, our study will examine the fear of crime with a parallel understanding to the deviance sociology and will deal with the fear of crime from a broader perspective by not only assessing it over the legal definition.

2.2. Different Approaches on Definition of Fear of Crime

Fear of crime is a concept being examined by various disciplines such as psychology, criminology and sociology. Examination by different disciplines is accompanied by the emergence of quite many opinions and approach styles on this subject as well. Based on this, we can say that the psychologists, criminologists and sociologists handle this phenomenon from different aspects and define the fear of crime over this point of view. Nonetheless, such variations of fear of crime do not arise from various disciplines. The differences resulting from different approaches even within the same discipline makes it hard to make a common definition of the fear of crime.

After briefly mentioning what the difficulties confronted in the definition of the concept of fear of crime, our study will deal with how different scientists approach this subject, and will cover various definitions of fear of crime. Our study will include the appropriate definition of fear of crime and shortly touch on the theoretical structure underlying this definition. In this respect, mentioning the diversities in the concept of fear of crime and why the appropriate definition has been taken up gains quite importance since it constitutes the theoretical structure rather than a simple literature review, and the methodology used accordingly for this structure.

The earlier studies on the fear of crime generally aimed at measuring the worries of individuals against a fictional situation. These studies consider the crime as a general concept. General handling of concept of fear of crime means the measurement of fear of crime of the individual with questions in the style of “How worried are you being a victim of a crime?” The aim in attempting to measure the fear of crime over such type of questions is to determine to what extent the individuals are generally worried about being a victim of any crime.

Jackson and et al (2006: 2) state that the studies on the fear of crime principally aim to measure how worried the individuals are of being a victim of a crime. After analyzing this, it is expected that the researcher should make a social inference over the responses and present the differences between the groups.

This general approach regarding the fear of crime has been criticized by numerous criminologists such as Ferraro and LaGrange. Discussion of fear of crime in a rather general manner makes it indistinct over which crime the individuals talk and according to what they give responses to the survey. In this sense, asking quite general

questions rather than a specific type of crime will cast a shadow on the objectivity of the concept, which is talked. Ferraro and LaGrange (1987) state that there are quite many types of crime and that the fear of crime may vary according to these types of crime.

A study conducted without reducing the fear of crime to specific types of crime may lead to different perceptions of concept of fear of crime by the individuals. Different perceptions will not enable objective measurement of the fear of crime. Ferraro and LaGrange (1987: 74) express that fear of crime should be measured over certain types of crime by criticizing the measurement of fear of crime in a common and general manner though the fear of victimization show varieties.

Assessment of fear of crime over types of crime instead of crime, which is an extremely general concept will allow us to measure the fear of crime in a more detailed and correct way. This approach will prevent a forced assessment based on fictional assumption. For example, address the question of “how worried are you being a victim of theft?” or “how worried are you being exposed to robbery ” to an individual will make it possible for that individual to make a more definite evaluation regarding that type of crime.

Skogan (1993) indicates in his studies that the works on fear of crime generally define this phenomenon in four different ways. The first of these approaches is the definition of fear of crime over the concern regarding the crime. The concern concept is based on the individuals’ assessment of which crime phenomenon creates a serious danger for their environments. That means a general crime assessment of the individuals.

Skogan (1993:132) states that the studies done according to the concern approach aim to measure the fear of crime by asking the individuals questions on whether the crime has increased or not in the regions. Another aim of this approach is to see the rank that the participant has placed the crime among the problems in the country. This approach measure generally the environmental perception of crime.

Because it is of interest for the personal safety of individuals, it is expected that the individuals be sensitive to the crime phenomena in their near environment. This approach underlines the fact that there is a close relation between the worries and concerns of individuals regarding the environment and the fear of crime. Definition of fear of crime in such manner bring along the detailed works and studies between the environmental features and fear of crime. This approach defined as incivility perspectives attempts to make a link between the environmental features and fear of crime (LaGrange and etc 1992).

Another approach regarding the definition of the fear of crime is the definition of this concept over the perceived risk of victimization phenomenon. According to this approach, perception of being exposed to a crime of individuals in their living environment is connected with their fear of crime. In this approach, the individuals are asked the probability of being exposed to crime and fear of crime is assessed over these questions (Skogan 1993:132). According to this, risk of individuals being exposed certain crimes is measured with survey questions and these survey questions conclude that the individuals with high probability of being exposed to crime have higher fear of crime.

Measurement of fear of crime through perceived risk of victimization is insufficient to explain the examples pertaining to the criminal sub-culture that does not have fear of crime though the perceived risk of victimization is higher. Phrased more clearly, a young person growing up in the sub-culture may consider the risk of being exposed to any crime in a quite high way. On the other hand, even though the perceived risk of victimization is higher, this individual may not experience that much fear of crime. The reason of this is that the individual does not feel himself in danger as a result of internalizing the values of criminal culture.

Another drawback of measuring the fear of crime over the perceived risk of victimization is that risk is a situation called fear paradox in literature. According to this, victimization perspectives argue that there is a direct relation between the risk being exposed to crime and the crime itself. Higher risk of being exposed to any crime of individuals mean that their fear of crime will also be higher (Jackson etc 2007: 2). Nonetheless, the studies carried out show that the fear of crime of women and the old is higher though they are segment of society who is least exposed to crime.

“The risk-fear paradox is also evidenced by the fact that some of the social groups most at risk of victimization are relatively fearless (e.g. young males) and some of the social groups least likely to be victimized are relatively fearful (e.g. older females, although in the UK worry decreases as age increases)” (Jackson etc 2007:2).

One other approach in the definition of fear of crime is the measurement of this phenomenon over threat. This approach measures how safe individuals feel themselves against a crime event. Definition of fear of crime over threat and

measurement of it through this definition differentiates it from risk approach. Risk approach assesses the fear of crime only over the probability of being exposed to a crime of individuals. That means higher risk of being exposed to a crime of individuals shows that that individual has higher fear of crime.

The most prominent difference of fear of crime defined over the threat is that it measures the probable fear of individuals in case of being exposed to a crime. If the individuals think that the fear of crime in their daily life is high, they take precautions against the same and decrease the fear of crime by limiting certain actions and behaviors. This means because the individuals show limited behaviors even in an area with higher risk rates, their risk of being exposed to crime may be lower.

Defining the fear of crime over threat measures how safe individuals are against a potential situation. Skogan, explains the difference between these two situations as the following; “people may adopt various tactics to reduce their vulnerability to victimization, and as a result they may not rate their risk as particularly high because they avoid exposure to risk. However, they might rate the threat of crime as high if they were to be exposed to risk” (Skogan 1993:135). When evaluated from this perspective, we can say that the threat approach measures the fear of crime, to what extent individuals feel secure or in danger against a potential case.

Measurement of the fear of crime over threat separates it from risk and worry concepts. In this respect, this approach contain a more fictional approach instead of sense of security resulting from risk avoidance occurring thanks to the precautions they take or constrained behaviors. Having said that, because such measurement of

fear of crime is based on assumption and therefore because it will not ensure a realistic evaluation, this kind of a measurement is criticized. Addressing a question to individuals in the manner such as “how safe would you feel if you were out alone at night” may mean to compel them to assess a circumstance they have never experienced (Ferraro and LaGrange 1987: 77).

Attempting to evaluate the fear of crime of individuals against a fictional situation will come to mean their evaluation of the imagined incidents from the perspective of their personal security. To illustrate, addressing this question to a woman who never goes out after evenings will possibly mean to force that woman to evaluate a situation never experienced.

Another approach other than the definition of fear of crime over worry, perceive risk and threat is its definition over behavior. Definition of fear of crime over behavior is a situation related to measuring what kind of changes the fear of crime creates on individuals. This approach attempts to measure which precautions the individuals take against fear of crime, or which actions the individuals avoid doing. Skogan (1993:137) states that this approach is measured with questions such as whether fear of crime limits the communications of individuals with strangers and whether they go beyond the safe borders.

Definition of fear of crime over behavior is accompanied by the measurement of fear of crime over two basic behavior pattern related to the environment the individuals live in. Considered from this point of view, the fear of crime of individuals is measured over defensive behaviors and avoidance behaviors. Defensive behaviors include the precautions the individuals take against any danger of crime. In this

sense, the fact that a woman takes a sharp object such as knife on herself while going out at night is a defensive behavior developed by that woman due to the fear of crime (Liska and etc: 1988:828).

Another dimension of the measurement of fear of crime over behavior is comprised by the avoidance behaviors. The avoidance behaviors cover behavioral patterns of the individuals such as avoidance of being in a certain area, avoidance in communication with strangers, not shopping in places evaluated as unsafe (Liska and etc: 1988:828). The individuals tend to exhibit avoidance and defensive patterns more often when they feel that their personal security is danger. In this sense, both types of behaviors are acts arising as a result of fear of crime.

Evaluation of fear of crime over behavioral patterns can be considered as a more objective criterion. Levels of worry, risk perceptions or definitions of threat of the individuals contain personal and subjective assessment. Evaluated from this point, measuring the fear of crime over certain restricted and defensive behaviors is more visible and enables making objective assessments. The question “When you go out at night, do you have a sharp object like a knife on you?” is a question assessed outside the personal perception of the individuals.

Even though the evaluation of fear of crime over behavior seems an objective phenomenon, it is a concept more about measuring the reactions occurred as a consequence of fear of crime rather than the fear of crime itself. To be clearer, the behaviors that the individuals exhibit for defensive and avoidance purposes already emerge due to the fear of crime. Therefore, to make a definition over behavior and to consider the restricted behaviors of individuals as fear of crime will mean the

definition of the situation emerging from the conclusion of the act as the fear of crime rather than the act itself.

Our study will deal with the fear of crime according to Ferraro's (1995) approach other than these approaches. This approach highlights that definition of fear of crime over worry, behavior, risk perception and threat will lead to incomplete and incorrect outcomes. According to this, evaluation of the concept of fear of crime over the worry only relating to general crime will come to mean a general crime evaluation rather than the fear of crime. In a similar way, to define the fear of crime over the perception of risk covers the evaluation of exposure risk to a crime not how worried the individuals are from that crime.

Reactions of individuals as a result of their fear of crime include the actions they develop because of their personal security. From this point, these actions contain the precautions taken against the crime rather than the fear of crime. Likewise, asking the individuals to what extent crime is a major problem reveals their neighborhood crime perception. LaGrange and Ferraro (1989) say that such types of questions are insufficient to measure the fear of crime. According to them, the questions asking how safe the individuals feel themselves or possibility of being the victim of a crime do not measure the fear of crime. LaGrange and Ferraro state that judgment of risk and feelings of fear are phenomena different than each other. These two phenomenon are different "because people think they are unlikely to be crime victims does not mean they are unafraid of crime, nor does a heightened sense of perceived risk automatically translate into heightened feelings of fear." (1989:698-699)

Ferraro's (1995) risk perception concept evaluates the fear of crime over the fear of exposure to crime different than the general perception of crime and threat approach. In this sense, this approach handles the anxieties and fear of individuals against exposure to crime as fear of crime. The most significant feature of risk perception approach is it makes a sharp distinction between the concept of fear of crime and risk perception. In this regard, the risk perception approach puts stress on the fact that the risk of exposure to crime of individuals cannot be seen as the fear of crime; though these are the concepts close to each other, in some cases higher perception of risk does not mean that the fear of crime will also be higher.

Based on this distinction Ferraro defined as fear "an emotional response of dread or anxiety to crime or symbols that a person associates with crime" (1995:4). He also defined the concept of perceived risk as "recognition of a situation as possessing at least potential danger, real or imagined." (1995: 4). This way, Ferraro (1995) defines the fear of crime as the fear reaction the individuals demonstrate against a potential situation. This means that a danger signal concerning the personal safety will not be adequate in terms of defining the fear of crime. For the fear of crime, it is necessary that the anxiety and fear reactions should form as an emotional reaction before any stimulus.

One other significant distinction in terms of the definition of fear of crime is the distinction between the anticipated fear and actual fear. Actual fear is a concept used to express the fear the individuals experience in existing situation. Anticipated fear, on the other hand, includes the worry of individuals of exposure to crime. Garafalo (1981) notes the difference between the concepts of actual fear and anticipated fear as follows; "the person walking alone in a high crime area at night is experiencing something quite different than the subordinate who is telling an interviewer that he or

she would be fearful in such an area at night” (Garafalo, 1981:841 in Hwang 2006:57).

2.3. Victimization Perspective

Individuals, living in the society have different reactions to fear of crime. This difference among the individuals is tried to be explained by various criminologists especially starting from 1960. However, initial studies, without based on any theory and model, pointed out the fear of crime just as the attempt to measure situations that individuals experienced. Handling the fear of crime without based on any theoretical structure and model, should be evaluated as an effort to measure the fear of crime instead of realizing it.

Research and evaluation of the fear of crime only according to the statistical data is replaced by more complex and theory-based analysis in the later years. These studies are not only evaluated the fear of crime according to the socio-demographic data, but also tried to create a theoretical structure underlying the causes of fear of crime. This improvement revealed that fear of crime is not a situation resulting simply from any criminal offence, instead there are many social reasons causing fear of crime.

Examining the fear of crime only based on demographic variables means that neglecting its nature, which is affected by complex and different social and economical structures. In terms of fear of crime, examining the different variables’ effects on it will also lead to better interpretation of it, as in every social phenomenon. Interpretation of social phenomenon only based on raw data will means oversimplify and ignoring its complex structure. As Coleman (1994:2) stated, main role of social science is simply not examine the individual and describe his

behaviors , but try to understand the social phenomenon and make explanation to them. When we evaluate in this respect while examining any social phenomenon and individual affected from it, analyzing the covering social context and make extractions suitable to this analyze will lead the social phenomenon to be more meaningful.

To interpret the social phenomenon as statistical data; evaluation and sorting of these data according to the socio-demographic properties, may cause to ignore the different dimensions of the phenomenon. To simplify a social phenomenon to the numbers without a theoretical background makes it difficult to understand its nature and the underlying causes. A good social scientist and a qualified scientific research should harmonize the empirical data with underlying social, economical and political reasons.

When we evaluate in this respect, to examine the fear of crime phenomenon and make determinations related to it, do not cause an exception in terms of scientific maturity and discipline. Examining the underlying social effects of fear of crime by clearing it from statistical data and rough figures and bringing a theoretical infrastructure to this phenomenon will increase the scientific importance of the study to be done. For this reason, examining the different approaches related to fear of crime, not only cause us to better understand the underlying theoretical information but also; cause us to see, how different methodological approaches handle the subject and how social phenomenon expressed by theory become measurable.

Our studies, will examine in detail primarily the basic methods dealing with the fear of crime and the underlying hypotheses of this method. To examine the different

methods dealing with the fear of crime will enable us understand how much complex and multidimensional phenomenon it is. To see, with which dimensions different methods examine the fear of crime will guide us to make our hypothesis of the study.

Our study aims in combination to examine the methodology used in fear of crime studies, theoretical assumptions underlying these methods and methodological differences. The reason for this is to examine theoretical and methodological differences as a whole and in this way to make the justification of the method that we use in our studies more clear. Denzin (2009), as below, stated that the relation between the method and the theory is extremely important, and cannot be evaluated separately.

“... methods are indeed of great theoretical relevance- that in fact every method has a different relevance for theory, and significant advances in substantive sociological theory will occur only sociologists adopt a consistent and viable framework for the dual analysis of theory and method” (Denzin 2009:5).

While knowing the relation between the method and theory, defining this unity as process of making a social phenomenon meaningful will be elements of a more efficient and effective scientific activity. In this respect, our study aims not only to deal with theoretical knowledge, but also to look how this theoretical knowledge affects the empirical studies. In this respect, how theory is set up in the studies and how fear of crime is measured based on this theoretical infrastructure will also be examined in handled approaches.

While examining the main methods handled in fear of crime studies, our studies will also deal with criticized and negative aspects of these methods. Scientific process

and information are predictably fruit of an endeavor resulting from an accumulation. The shortages and the criticized aspects of every scientific study should be perceived as preliminary information source to a new scientific study. When we evaluate in this respect, our examinations on shortages and the criticized aspects of methods used in fear of crime, should be perceived as an effort contributing to the maturity of our study. While giving examples of the studies related to the fear of crime models, our study aims to discuss how much these methods are empirically valid.

One of the first and important studies on fear of crime is the studies, claiming that there is a direct relationship between fear of crime and victimization. According to this theory, fear of crime rate of an individual exposed to the crime is higher than an individual not exposed to crime. Direct victimization is a factor that affects the fear of crime positively. The individual's being victim of a particular crime comes out as a phenomenon changing his point of view to crime

Victimization is seen as a factor affecting the fear of crime directly and positively. After exposure to any crime, individuals' security perception and point of life can show changes. The most serious result of a social phenomenon of crime occurs on individuals exposed to the crime. For this reason, in fear of crime studies victimization is regarded as an important factor in order to measure and understand the fear of crime.

Warr, (1985) believes that "like criminal victimization itself, the consequences of fear are real, measurable, potentially severe, both at and individual and social level" (in Ferraro 1995:3) Skogan (1987) in his comprehensive study on this issue, identified that especially in repetitive victimization the fear of crime has an important

increase. According to this after exposure to a specific crime, repetitive victimizations cause important changes in the perception of security and fear of crime. In humans, being a victim of any crime not only increase the fear of crime, but also causes them to take more security precautions (Skogan 1987:152).

The fear of crime studies based on a specific model and assumption is a condition emerged after the effect of victimization on fear of crime view. Hypothesis of “direct victimization will lead to the fear of crime” caused to design of a specific methodology and hypothesis in the researches on this subject. In this respect, analysis of fear of crime phenomenon on a specific model starts with opinions claiming a relation between fear of crime and direct victimization.

Examining the relation between victimization and fear of crime, Liska et al. (1982) revealed that there is a connection between crime rates and fear of crime. The study examines the relationship between the structural features of the city and fear of crime in 26 American cities. Researchers, examining the fear of crime by using the National crime survey data have demonstrated a significant relationship especially between the fear of crime and rates of committed crimes against property.

“To distinguish the effects of reported property and personal crime, the seven index crimes were sorted into personal crimes (homicide, assault and rape) and property crimes (robbery, burglary, larceny over \$50, and auto theft) and the equations were re-estimated. Only property crimes affect fear” (Liska et al. 1982:766).

Tseloni and Zarafonitou (2008), in their studies, examined the effects of direct and indirect victimization on fear of crime. While direct victimization means exposure to the crime directly, indirect victimization means that someone you know has been exposed to the crime. In study, fear of crime and perceived high risk of victimization of individuals with direct, indirect victimization and individuals without exposure to the crime while at home and walking out, was compared. Study revealed that there is a meaningful relation between fear of crime and direct victimization (Tseloni and Zarafonitou: 2008).

Another important dimension between victimization and fear of crime in direct relationship is the effect of suffered victim's gender and age on fear of crime. Broungart and Hoyer (1980) have pointed out in their examination studies of General Social Survey data conducted by National Opinion Research Center (NORC), sex and age is an important variable in the relation of fear of crime and victimization.

In respect to the gender, study revealed that the women especially exposed to the theft crime carry more fear of crime than the men exposed to the same crime. Again according to the same study, impact of victimization on fear of crime varies according to the age. According to this, the biggest difference between victims' fear of crime and individuals not exposed to any crime emerges in elder population (Broungart and Hoyer 1980:62-63).

Crime is not the only emotion felt by individuals as a result of any fear of victimization. In addition to the fear, individuals exposed to a crime may have different feelings such as, anger, revenge and sadness. Ditton et al. (1999), in their studies, revealed that as a result of exposure to crime, more than fear individuals'

reaction is anger. Ditton and etc (1999), examining the effects of four different crimes on individuals, such as house breaking, vehicle crime, assault and vandalism, stated that except assault crimes, more than fear the anger is the specific reaction.

The relationship between fear of crime and victimization do not always have simple and understandable structure. Many criminologist working on crime (Garafalo 1979, Bursik and Grasmick 1993, Jackson 2009), even though set up a meaningful relationship between specific crimes and victimization, reported that some individuals with a low probability of victimization and social groups, carry greater fear of crime. Studies related to fear of crime revealed that the groups especially women and older people, with the lowest rate of exposure to the crime carry the greatest fear of crime (Stafford and Galle 1984:173). In this respect, fear of crime cannot be understood over victimization, with the victimization determining fear of crime various factors emerge.

Referred in the literature as the risk-fear paradox, this actually shows that fear of crime has a more complicated and complex structure than expected. Many individuals, even though without being victim of any crime can carry fear of crime. Likewise, fear of crime may not be parallel to the crime rates in the society (Taylor and Hale 1986:152). In addition to the victimization, the factors such as the social and economic status of individuals, whether there is a labeling for them and individual's status in society, may be influencing factors to the fear of crime.

While criticizing the existence of a direct relationship between exposure to crime and fear of crime, Hale (1996) indicates that the fear of crime is much higher than the rate of exposure to crime. This means that, many individuals not exposed to crime

directly, can carry fear of crime over indirect victimization. The events heard in the their neighborhood, the attacks carried out to their relatives and the media's broadcasts about the crime are the factors coming to the front as determining individuals' fear of crime

Crime does not show only a limited impact due to exposure to it and this induces the difference between the fear of crime and the exposure to the crime. A crime taking place in our work places, buildings that we live or in our neighborhood indirectly can affect us and increase our fear of exposure to the crime. In a social structure where mass media is used intensively, we do not only be affected by the crimes surrounding us. Fear of crime is in close relation with the media's crime broadcast frequency and also with the style of news broadcast.

Another factor causing the weakness in relation between fear of crime and direct victimization is the phenomenon that the fear of individual who exposed to the crime, may not increase all the time. Every individual who exposed to the crime may show different emotional reaction. An individual accustomed to the guilty sub-culture may not be disturbed because of past experience, when he/she is a particular victim of a crime. Individualization of the guilty culture may cause individuals not to feel themselves in a danger under any crime. This situation is a phenomenon resulting from their cognitive structure and cultural experiences.

One of the important dimensions of the risk fear paradox is that the older people and the women while having low rates of exposure to the crime their fear of crime is higher than the others. Many fear of crime studies revealed that relatively women

while being less victim of the crime their fear of crime is higher than men (Garafalo 1979, Stanko 1995).

To examine the reasons for older people and women who have high fear of crime while having the least exposure to the crime takes an important place in fear of crime literature. Many different views have been proposed in order to explain this phenomenon that makes it difficult to explain the direct relation between victimization and fear of crime. Especially, the imbalance between women having high fear of crime and rate of exposure to the crime, takes the attention of the Criminologists.

There are different approaches explaining imbalance between crime victimization and fear of crime for women. First of these approaches is based on the claim, which is the real percentage of women's victimization is higher than the defined figures. According to this opinion, women exposed the crime not less than men, the crimes women exposed are less reported than the man (Smith and Torstensson 1997:608).

In gender perspective, one of the opinions explaining imbalance between crime victimization and fear of crime is the difference resulting from women's cognitive structures. To put it more clear women can do more generalization of some fear of crime related situations, than men (Smith and Torstensson 1997:608). In this respect, women's fear specific to certain situations do not occur as a result of that situation.

According to this approach, fear of crime for women is a situation developed by the time and as a result of what they heard and saw. To put it more clear, women's fear

of crime is not only limited to the defined situations and assumptions; occurs as a result of cognitive structure shaped after a long processes. As a result of this situation, women can feel themselves under more risk.

In order to explain women's high fear of crime than victimization, another opinion is that men suppress the fear of crime. According to this approach, men under the effect of their social role, reply the questions according to the effect of their ideal role. In fact this opinion supports the opinions of direct relation between the victimization and the crime. Since men's high percentage of exposure to the crime, in this subject, men having more fear of crime are an expected situation according to victimization perspective (Farrall etc. 2007:3)

Men replied the fear of crime surveys according to the social role given to them, and this is important being an example to the methodological constraints that can happen in this subject. Goodey (1997), underlining that the image of fearless man and coward woman is not a true evaluation, stated that teenage and childhood periods are important shaping the social roles over gender. In society where social gender is important, in this respect, objective evaluation of the fear of crime by men is hard; as a result of this situation men prefer to hide their fear and danger.

Even though by complicating direct relation between victimization and fear of crime, crime risk paradox is tried to be explained by the social role given to men, and the reality of victimization percentage of the women is higher than expected; most criminologists think that fear of crime has a complex structure that cannot be simplified to the only victimization relation.

Individual living in modern society is under the influence of many direct and indirect social relationships. The development of mass media, increasing complexity of urban life and a structure full of social interaction, show that the fear of crime can occur under the influence of many factors. Crime news frequently broadcasted on media, and a social structure with different ethnic identities start to live together, reveals the need to handle the fear of crime in a multi-dimensional way.

Fear of crime and victimization studies arise that individuals exposed to crime as women and older people have more fear of crime; this lead the specialists studying this subject to think of other effects defining the fear of crime. Criminologists supporting the vulnerability perspective stated that crime is not defined according to the victimization, the social status of the individuals are also important in respect to the fear of crime. Effects of individuals' physical, economic, and age related situations on fear of crime will be examined in our study in details.

2.4. Vulnerability Perspective

Even though women and the elderly live less victimization in risk-fear paradox, they have more fear of crime and some experts who think the fear of crime can't be explained only by direct victimization, explain this based on vulnerability hypothesis. According to this, the main reason women and the elderly have more fear of crime is that they feel themselves more vulnerable. When we evaluate in this respect, vulnerability perspective underlines that direct victimization is not the reason increasing the fear of crime; reason is the phenomenon of feeling vulnerable to the crime.

Criminologists more focused on vulnerability, as a result of understanding that the fact that vulnerability has as much effect on fear of crime as victimization has, even more than that. War and Stafford (1983), stated that fear of crime emerges as a result of interaction between risk perception and the magnitude of the crime results. War and Stafford suggesting that seriousness of the situation as a result of crime, individuals' perception of crime also creates fear of crime; highlighted the importance of these two factors in interpreting the fear of crime (in McCrea etc 2005: 9).

Vulnerability perspective is a hypothesis helps us to interpret why individuals have different fear of crime while having different socio-economic status. In this point of view, makes the differences explainable emerging as a result of crime perspective of different ethnic groups, different social classes and different sexes. Killias, underlines that vulnerability perspective emerges from the results of 3 factors. According to this:

The Probability of Victimization

The Seriousness of the Anticipated Consequences

The Feeling of Having No Control over the Two Previous Factors (Killias 1990)

In this respect, individuals' personal security perception related to them does not occur as a result of simple assessment; we can say it is shaped as a result of a process that depends on many factors. Individuals evaluate their personal security according to the social dynamics that they live in and act according to this. In fact three factors takes us to the conclusion of personal security is not static, but has dynamic structure. Individuals looking at the nature and characteristics of every social situation and relation; they make different security perception for every situation.

This means that personal security and vulnerability perception can differ by the time according to environment and dynamics of this environment.

Probability of being victim of crime is an important item that shows us this perspective has changed fear of crime perspective. According to this, in previous crime studies direct relation established between victimization and fear of crime replaced by bilateral relations between indirect victimization and fear of crime. The concept of indirect victimization has many dimensions such as media, neighborhood relations, and individual characteristics.

Another dimension methodologically brought by this model besides measuring the likelihood of being victim of crime, is that besides direct victimization, indirect victimization related questions begin to take place in fear of crime related surveys. This model and approaches believe that “people worry when they can imagine themselves falling victim” (Farrall etc 2007:3). This means that the socio-demographic characteristics influence perspective of crime and anyone who feel vulnerable to crime may have fear of crime even if they are not directly exposed to crime.

Another difference of this model is damage as a result of crime and seriousness of the result's impact on fear of crime as a factor. The different expectations among individuals about result of the crime are becoming a factor leading to differentiation of the fear of crime. The basic hypothesis of this model is the formation of the fear of crime for individuals according to their physical and social positions.

“Warr and Stafford (1983) extended this perspective to suggest that the high levels of fear of crime among members of these socio-demographic groups result from the interaction between two factors: the perception of their vulnerability to victimization, and their perception of the seriousness of the consequences of victimization. To illustrate, women and older people may perceive themselves to be more physically vulnerable to victimization in comparison to their male and younger counterparts” (in Baur 2007:5).

In contrast to the victimization perspective, vulnerability approach indicates that no direct relationship can happen between fear of crime and victimization. Victimization perspective indicates that the main factor defining fear of crime is the status of being the direct victim of a crime. On the other hand, victimization perspective proposes that the factor defining the individuals’ fear of crime is the dimensions of the victimization risk and the ability to compensate the damage that may arise as a result of this victimization, rather than direct victimization

To put it more clearly, vulnerability perspective indicates that individuals own personal situation is the main reason for setting up their fear of crime. Therefore, these groups with the lower possibility of exposure to crime than others, such as women and elderly people, reason for carrying a high fear of crime is not only direct victimization but also difficult situation that will be faced in case of a victimization.

Possibility of being the victim of a crime, and having no control over the severity of the damage that will occur as a result of crime, help to explain why the fear of crime is higher in some of the socio-economic groups. Factors face us as an effect to

increase fear of crime, such as being vulnerable to the crime and having no means of eliminating the damage that may occur as a result of crime.

“Incidents of crime often make a good story. Subsequently, the media is quick to report on negative incidents that occur whilst ignoring positive ones (success stories). Thus a perception is often generated that there is a higher risk of encountering crime than what there really is. This is perhaps best highlighted in incidents involving older people, which seem to attract a dramatically disproportionate amount of media coverage to reality of occurrences, thereby significantly increasing the fear of crime of this group.”

(<http://www.police.qld.gov.au/programs/personalSafety/violence/fear.htm>)

Vulnerability perspective proposes that the fear of crime is related to the individuals feeling themselves as vulnerable. However the individuals' feelings about being vulnerable to crime have different dimensions. Skogan and Maxfield emphasize that in fear of crime feeling physically vulnerable to the crime is an important variable. According to them; “physical vulnerability, openness to attack, powerlessness to resist attack and exposure to traumatic physical (and probably emotional) consequences if attacked.” (Skogan and Maxfield 1981:69).

One of the most important results of physically vulnerability in terms of fear of crime is to take various measures against any possibility of crime. When we evaluate in this respect, it will not be wrong to expect women and the elderly feeling physically vulnerable, to take precautions in terms of protecting themselves against specific crimes (Skogan and Maxfield 1981:69).

Fear of crime in these cases, appears as a phenomenon affecting the life of individuals who particularly feel vulnerable. For these reasons we can define fear of crime as a social phenomenon affecting our quality of life. Fear of crime is an important concept in terms of social integration since the individuals see themselves as part of the society to the extent that they feel they are safe.

There are two main variables of fear of crime as a result of being physically vulnerable; women and the elderly. Women and elderly people's physical vulnerability may bring to minds, the possibility that these two groups may have fear of crime against similar crimes. However, gender based differences help us to interpret, especially why the woman have higher fear of crime.

In his study, stating that women have relatively high fear of crime against physical crimes, Warr indicated that one of the most important reasons, why the fear of crime is high, is sexual abuse. Because of sexual abuse and victimization, women have higher fear of crime (Warr 1985). In this respect, we evaluate women's sexual offenses or other crimes, the point of view can be seen as a factor affecting fear of crime (Warr 1985). In this respect, sexual crimes also appear as a factor affecting women's point of view against other crimes.

With this theoretical background Ferraro, developed the shadow of sexual assault hypothesis. "He argued that in face to face confrontations with offenders, women fear that a rape may occur and this fears 'shadows' their fear of other forms of personal victimization that may not involve an actual or attempted rape or sexual assault" (Fisher and Sloan 2003:634) According to this view, other forms of violence

or crimes apart from sexual assaults may be affected by fear of rape and other types of sexual crime.

Ferraro underlined that women are exposed to the sexual crimes more than men; this has misleading impact on the women's general fear of crime. Ferraro indicates that men and women have similar proportions of fear of crime against non-violent crimes but, in case of rape and sexual abuse, women have more fear of crime than men (Ferraro 1996).

One of the most important results of this study is to bring a different perspective to women who have high fear of crime. Ferraro (1996: 686) based on these results highlights that women's fear of rape affects their fear to other types of crime. According to this approach the reason women have more fear of crime than men is because, fear of being raped increases the fear of exposure to other crimes. Fisher and Sloan (2003:651), in their study for university students, examined the effects of women's fear of rape on other crimes. This study supports the claims of Ferraro. According to this, the fear of rape affects the perception of women studying at the university to other crimes.

In particular, in traditional societies certain behaviors that women are exposed and expected social roles from them can make them more sensitive to crime. However, in terms of sexual abuse, it is well known that the women have much greater risk than the men. Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) underlined that in terms of sexual violence compared to women men in their lifetime have 11 times less risk (in Scott, 2003:203). In terms of fear of crime, this situation creates a significant difference between men and women.

Another approach trying to explain why women have more fear of crime than any other is the feminism. According to this approach the reason why women have more fear of crime is social pressures. Considering the woman as a sexual object and behaving them as consumable item, sexual violence against women quite heavily seen in modern society.

Underlining the gender discrimination heavily seen especially in public places and workplaces, Gardner (1995) underlined that such environments are a factor increasing women's fear of crime. Feminist approach indicates that as in house life, gender roles in business life have determining features in criminal cases. According to this, when the issue is crime sexuality shaped social life teaches the men to behave more aggressively, and teaches the women to behave in a passive way (Hilinski 2007, Hollander 2001).

Another view trying to explain women's relatively greater fear of crime is suggests that this difference is due to unreported crimes. According to this view, the complaints of women living under the male-dominated society hampered sometimes officially, sometimes by the neighborhood. Stanko (1985) indicates that unreported crimes described as a dark figure, led to discrimination in fear of crime between men and women. Sexual abuse of women's male colleagues and husbands is also one of the reasons that increase the women's fear of crime (Stanko 1985).

For our country, when we evaluate the feminist views trying to explain why women's high fear of crime comparing to men, we see that these views are quite significant. We can say that women grown in a very passive way during the process

of socialization. The effect of gender-based social roles and the patriarchal structure in Turkey is a factor affecting the women's crime perspective and fear of crime. A cultural structure; disapproving the behavior of women going out in certain hours, describing the specific behavior patterns specific to men, is a factor affecting women's fear of crime. Similarly, the women can keep any experienced harassment incident as a secret, due to concern of being treated in a bad way.

The view, expressing that crimes of violence against women in fact is a lot more than the official statistics and therefore there is a difference between fear of crime and victimization rates of women, can also be valid for our country. The husband and wife fights are not reflected in the crime statistics due to reconciliation at the police office, and the cases such as sexual incest assaults behind closed doors, may be indicators showing victimization of women is more than the actual numbers.

The elderly is one of the other demographic groups in physical vulnerability. Despite there are many studies and views explaining the difference in terms of women's victimization and fear of crime, for the elderly fear of crime is relatively limited. The difficulty of generalization especially in relationship between age and fear of crime stems from the social meaning attributed to the elderly.

Hale (1996:100) stated that in America the elderly people isolate themselves from the life and home close themselves. The reason, why the older people isolate themselves from society, especially in developed countries is because the competitive and materialistic values are more important, this group feel themselves useless. However, in Turkey the respect to the elderly and the sensitivity on this issue is a factor affecting the rate of crime committed against them. In this regard, in fear of crime, to evaluate the effect of age regardless of culture may cause to obtain incorrect results.

The first studies between aging and fear of crime indicate that there is a positive relation between fear of crime and old age (Clemente and Kleiman 1977). This relationship between fear of crime and old age is usually associated with physical disadvantage of the elderly. Similarly, Ziegler and Mitchell (2003) in their literature study found a positive relationship in 60 studies related to old age and fear of crime. However, Ziegler and Mitchell, recorded that in 2 studies could not find a relationship between old age and fear of crime, in 7 studies, the elderly people have less fear of crime than young people (in De Donder etc. 2005:364)

The relationship between old age and fear of crime, have started to be discussed more in recent years. Some experts attribute the existence of a positive relationship between age and crime to the methodological errors in the survey questions. LaGrange and Ferraro by recording that the elderly are more susceptible to the general security-related questions, indicate that in such questions they have more fear of crime (LaGrange and Ferraro 1987).

Positive relationship between old age and fear of crime is criticized by some criminologists by presenting the presence of different factors rather than age. According to this, without minimizing the effects of reasons, such as, different distribution of income, physical environment and class position, to claim that there is a relationship between age and crime is misleading. Pain describes the effects of such factors to the fear of crime as follows:

“The structure of class, gender and race ability is the key determinants of how older people experience old age. It is these which underpin where older people live their

socio-economic status and their risk of victimization, whether from property crime, harassment in the community, or abuse by carers within domestic spheres” (in Powell and Wahidin 2008:95).

This controversial and complex nature of the relationship between aging and fear of crime has led the elimination of the age to the background comparing other variables in terms of estimating the fear of crime (Baur 2007:4). However, especially in developed countries, estimation of increase in elderly population ratio may be indication of concentration to this subject (Baur 2007:4). The relationship between fear of crime and old age will be more meaningful as we take, specific situations between old age and fear of crime, socio-economic and socio-cultural dimensions into account.

Skogan and Maxfield (1981) indicated that besides physical vulnerability, another important factor determining the fear of crime is social vulnerability. They underline that socially vulnerable individuals are at more risk of being victims of crime stated that this condition increases the fear of crime (Skogan and Maxfield 1981). Another reflection of being socially victim’s effect on fear of crime is different social classes can have fear of crime at different rates.

Social vulnerability dimension of fear of crime should not be considered only as an economic and class based case. Cases such as race and immigration are the concepts forming another dimension of social vulnerability. In this respect, every group or individual which labeled and excluded from society and as a result feeling themselves vulnerable can be handled within the scope of social vulnerability.

One of the most important dimensions of the relationship between social vulnerability and fear of crime is the relationship between socio-economic status and fear of crime. Many experts revealed that there is a negative correlation between the socio-economic status and fear of crime (Kennedy and Krahn, 1984, Moeller, 1989, Will and McGrath, 1995, Parker and Ray 1990). A negative correlation between fear of crime and socio-economic status can be tied to as income status of individuals' increases, they live in places where they feel safer. Apartments with private-security, cameras under continuous recording and similar security measures may have an impact on reducing the fear of crime.

We can explain the reasons individuals with low socio-economic status have high fear of crime with similar factors. Particularly neglected and unsafe conditions of settlement, status of having no assurance to compensate in case of any loss can cause people with low socio-economic status to have higher fear of crime. However, having high fear of crime does not mean that people with low socio-economic status are more victim of crime.

Pantazis and Gordon (1998) in their study based on the British Crime Survey draw attention to the imbalance between the fear of crime and the rate of being victim at different economic status. In their study, they underline the economic situation is a factor affecting the fear of crime.

“From this preliminary survey evidence it appears that poverty has an important impact on fear of crime but not victimization. The evidence from the 1992 BCS, show the respondents in the richest households as being twice as likely to experience household crime compared with the poorest... On the other hand, the analysis showed

definite link between poverty and fear of crime. Poor people suffer from a disproportionately high level of fear of crime regardless of whether or not they have been victimized” (Pantazis and Gordon 1998:55).

Another dimension of the relationship between social vulnerability and fear of crime is the relationship between the fear of crime and minorities, especially the race. Many studies, examining the relationship between fear of crime and race in United State show that, especially blacks carry more fear of crime than whites (Larson, 1982 LaGrange and Ferraro 1989). However, we can say that studies on this subject are considerably generic, and does not provide much information about if this fear differs or not in certain specific cases.

The relationship between fear of crime and race is one of the most difficult areas to make generalizations. Race and the perception of identity shaped depending on race can differ from society to society and even among individuals. However, it is a well-known fact that in social terms especially Afro-American originated blacks are less vulnerable in America. This labeling and exclusions against individuals make them feel themselves vulnerable and this vulnerability may lead to an increase in fear of crime.

Another dimension of the relationship between the fear of crime and the race is that the whites have higher fear of crime, especially living in the areas of different ethnic groups. The studies present that the fear of crime of whites living in cosmopolitan areas is high (in Pain 2001:906 Smith, 1986). It has been proposed that the reason why whites living in the areas of different ethnic groups have higher fear of crime is the clichés related to criminals and race (in Pain: 2001 Lea and Young 1984). Stereotyped views about criminals as being people from African and Latin race and

prejudices on this issue may cause the whites to have more fear of crime in areas with heterogeneous ethnic structure.

The relationship between race and fear of crime includes an affair that is very difficult to generalize because of the reasons set forth. When we examine the situations difficult to make generalization first need to understand in which social dynamics the race gains meaning. In this regard, general opinions and prejudices about minorities and the different races can be considered as a phenomenon determining the social vulnerability.

Even though racial minorities taken as an element in determining the fear of crime, to know that this relation is also affected by other factors will enable us to make more objective assessment about this subject. Need to express more clearly, even though race and minority is a concept affecting the fear of crime; factors such as minorities' level of education, income status and their living area are the variables that cause the fear of crime to show difference.

In this respect, if the relationship between fear of crime and race is carried out without considering the effect of other variables, in measuring this fear variety of errors may occur. To put it more clearly, there is a difference between the fear of crime of a black guy with high income level, living in secure complexes and fear of crime of a black guy with a lower income level, living in the squalid areas outside the city. Therefore, without minimizing the aforementioned effects, a study about fear of crime of race and minorities will lead to inaccurate assessments.

Opinions that there are serious relations between vulnerability and fear of crime have brought a new perspective and dimension to the fear of crime research even though they are over-generalizing and lack of discussion of the effects of certain specific situations. Opinions claiming a relationship between fear of crime and direct victimization are insufficient to explain why women and the elderly have more fear of crime, nevertheless they are less vulnerable.

Victimization perspective considers the situation of these groups fear of crime unreasonable. However, the vulnerability perspective indicates that this situation stems from the feelings of women and the elderly as being vulnerable. Many experts believe that vulnerability perspective explains why these groups have relatively higher fear of crime nevertheless they are less victims of crime (Killias 1990).

Fear of crime is a complex phenomenon not to be explained only direct victimization. There is a serious difference between rate of individuals having direct victimization and the fear of crime. When we evaluate in this respect, we can say that vulnerability perspective brought descriptions on the reasons of this difference. Since the fear of crime is a phenomenon especially affected by indirect victimization; victimization perspective brought a new dimension to the fear of crime studies,

Even though, vulnerability perspective establishes significant relationship between indirect victimization and fear of crime, has been analyzing the case of victimization only on certain socio-demographic indicators. Considering this perspective, although vulnerability perspective establishes a significant relationship between crime and victimization, do not bring new perspectives on how the certain specific situations lead to the fear of crime. To look at the fear of crime only from the perspective of

victimization, can lead us to ignore the fear of crime especially stemming from physical environment.

2.5. Influence of Media on Fear of Crime

Another major dimension of the relation between indirect victimization and fear of crime is the influence of the media on fear of crime. Indirect victimization is one the factor as influential as the direct victimization on the fear of crime. In some cases, the indirect victimization might have more influence on the fear of crime compared to the direct victimization. The individuals may be influenced from the crime stories they hear here and there rather than the situations they personally experience. Even sometimes, unreal rumors can create an environment of fear by simply and negatively affecting the lives of the individuals.

In modern societies, the mass media have a considerably important share in lives of the individuals. The people follow the developments and events outside their close environment by means of mass media to a greater extent. Following the social, political and economic developments in a much faster manner thanks to the television, radio and internet compared to the traditional societies, the modern individuals is under the influence of the media. Evaluated from this perspective, we can consider the media as a major factor affecting how the opinions of individuals on any subject get shaped.

To better understand the influence of the media on the fear of crime, we should first comprehend the features of the mass media and effect of them on the individuals.

Different than face to face communication, the mass media/communication can reach the individuals disregarding the concept of space. Nonetheless, the mass media targets the entire population of the society rather than being specific to the person. The content in the mass media has a collective property rather than being personal (Lazar, 2001: 61). In this regard, the message and content given by the mass media on any subject are capable of reaching not only a certain part of the society but millions of people. We can summarize the primary properties of the mass media, which have major impacts on the fear of crime:

- 1) Audience of the mass media is relatively vast.
- 2) Audience is a different type of community coming from various social clusters and comprising people of various qualities and features.
- 3) Audience is a community with no identity; that is to say, the member of the audience and the member of the mass media do not generally know each other personally.
- 4) Mass media is public meaning its content is open to everybody.
- 5) Mass media can establish simultaneous relation with numerous people located at different places and away from the source.
- 6) Mass media requires complex formal institutions.
- 7) The relation between the member of the mass media and audience is established through the people in the role of professional member of the mass media who do not have personal acquaintanceship with the audience.

8) The communication in mass media is strictly unidirectional and actually disregards the probability of instantaneous response of the audience; thus, there is a sharp polarization between the sender and receiver in the communication system.

9) The products of the mass media is within easy access for the majority of the public in monetary sense both in physical sense and due to its rather low cost (Mutlu, 1998: 211-212).

The mass media forms a structure influencing the individuals and shaping their opinions due to such features. Because of the nature of the mass media, the individuals handle the message in a unidirectional manner and are influenced by this message. Notably when it comes to crime, this unidirectional message given by the media can reach large sections of the population very quickly and unsettles them. Especially the rather fast change in the mass media enables quick dissemination of such type of crime news to the audience.

The relation between the media and fear of crime constituting a major dimension of indirect victimization is basically related to how the media processes the issue in crime news and reality shows. For the media, crime is an important newsworthy social incidence attracting attention. The media does not report any incidence or events occurring across the society as news by nature. For an incidence or event to be covered by the media, it should possess one or a few of the following properties:

- 1- Defeat, failure, chaos, tension, negativity. In this respect, bad news is good news.
- 2- Closeness to the country, culture, geography, locality
- 3- Innovation, actuality

4- Achievement – impact on society

5- Abnormality, exceptionality, unusualness, emotionally attractiveness (Usluata, 1995).

The media makes the crime events occurring across the society as news since such events or incidences create tension and have negation aspects; are extraordinary situations and have a probability of creating an emotional effect on the individuals. The more the impact of a crime committed on the society, the more possibility for that crime incidence to be reported as news by the media. “Rating of crime in the media results from the manner of presentation of that piece of news and the fact that the same creates a sensational impact. The individuals of the society are always interested especially in the local type acts of violence in terms of their life safety” (Gökulu 2005:95). The interest attached to the local crime news and manner of reporting such news contribute to the formation of security perceptions of the individuals pertaining to their environment. To state more expressly, the local crime news and ways of reporting the same is a factor influencing the fear of crime of the individuals.

The media makes the crime events in a manner featuring the sensational aspect of the event because of the rating considerations. A piece of news made by featuring the emotional and traumatic dimension of the crime will always draw more interest and attention and be more watched. Evaluated from this angle, the media reports the crime incidences by giving prominence to the emotional side of the incidence in a way placing the visuality to the forefront.

Along with the advancing technology, the speed of the mass media to follow up any event across the world has greatly increased. Today's media has the chance to convey an incidence taking place anywhere on the world to its audience or readers within minutes. Live broadcast of the terrorist attacks to the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001 is a consequence of this development. Sacco (1995) notes that the increasing number of television channels along with the developing mass media technology made it possible to make longer periods of broadcast on more specific issues and subjects. This situation is also being reflected on the crime news, and the media institutions have now started to handle and investigate the crime events in more details compared to reporting such incidences only roughly and in general terms.

“Over the last several years, a number of changes in local and national media environments have altered the nature and extent of crime coverage. The growth of cable stations, for instance, has increased the carrying capacity for news generally and for crime news specifically. More stories can be covered, and those that are judged to be particularly newsworthy can be covered in greater detail” (Sacco 1995:145).

The relation between the media and fear of crime is highly complicated and difficult to comprehend. When we seek to examine the impact of the media on the fear of crime, the first problem we have to resolve is the fact that which media has impact on the fear of crime. The impact of the media lines having various and different formations such as television, radio, newspapers, Internet, etc. on the fear of crime is not in the same degree. Looking from this perspective, it is quite hard to examine the effect of the media on the fear of crime in an analysis of a general fear of crime.

Another element obscuring the measurement of influence of the media on fear of crime pertains to the property of the news appearing on the media. Universality, nationality or locality of the news affects the fear of crime of individuals in different levels and manners. More clearly, watching crime news from Columbia does not have impact on the personal security perception of an individual living in Turkey, yet the same individual is much more sensitive to the crimes news of local nature. Thus, measuring the relation between the media and fear of crime makes it compulsory to conduct a quite specific and comprehensive research.

It is possible that the studies examining the relation between the media and fear of crime can yield rather different and in contradiction with each other. Chiricos and etc. (1997) notes that there is a positive relation between the frequency of watching television news and listening to the news on the radio with the fear of crime, and that there is not meaningful relation between the frequency of reading the newspaper and magazine news with the fear of crime. Yet Williams and Dickinson (1993) found that there is positive relation between the fear of crime and frequency of reading newspaper. Another striking aspect of the studies is the existence of relation between the fear of crime and manner of newspaper for making such news. According to this, the fear of crime of those reading the newspapers, which make the crime news in a sensational manner with dominant emotional aspects, has been found higher compared to those reading the newspapers which present the crime news in a more informative way.

“As tabloids, particularly the low-market ones, were judged to have more sensational reporting styles and low-market tabloid readers showed the highest FOC and highest estimates of the likelihood of crime, there is some support for the hypothesis that sensationalized reports increase FOC and raise estimates of the likelihood of crime” (Williams and Dickinson 1993:50).

Being one of the first scholars expressing the claims that there is a positive relation between the frequency of watching television and fear of crime; Gerbner and Gross (1976) asserted that there are in opinion that the individuals watching television more often might be a victim of crime in a higher rate. Frequent watching of violence scenes especially on television and presentation of the crime news accompanied with such images may result in a change in the perception of fear of crime by individuals. Gerbner and Gross (1976) base their ideas that the media may cause fear of crime on the cultivation hypothesis. According to this, probability of exposure of film heroes and people on television to crime is much higher compared to real life. This situation results in the change in security perception of the individuals and the perception of real life via television.

Nonetheless, Heat and Petraitis (1987) put forth in their studies that frequency of watching television does not affect their fear of crime relating to their residence region although it has an impact on the fear of crime of the individuals concerning the remote region and other cities. In a similar way, Skogan and Maxfield (1981) found that the media do not have an influence on the fear of crime. According to these scholars, the reason that the violence and crimes presented on the media do not have an impact on the fear of crime of the individuals is that the location of crime in many cases is far away from the audience and thus the individuals do not think that they can be a victim of a crime. Yet, it is worth noting that this study dates back to many years and therefore the mass media technology was not very developed compared to what it is today. Today, the increase in especially local channels means that the audience is more informed of the local crimes.

Studies investigating the media and fear of crime find quite different conclusions. While certain studies get to a meaningful relating between the frequencies of watching television or reading newspapers and the fear of crime, some others do not come up with a meaningful relation between the media and fear of crime. In his detailed literature review study, Eschholz (1997) found that “it can be deduced that of 14 studies of the effects of newspaper consumption on fear of crime, and 25 studies of the effects of television consumption on fear of crime, a total of 73 attempts to discover a general relationship have been made. Of these 30 (41 per cent) discovered positive relationship and 43 (59 per cent) did not” (in Ditton and etc 2004:598).

The fact that the relation between the fear of crime and media reveals a good deal of different results primarily arises from the complex structure of the relation of media and fear. Suggesting that the media have always an adverse effect on individuals and that this in turn will lead to fear of crime is an extremely generic judgment. At certain cases, the media play an informative role and reduce the fear of crime for individuals, and sometimes may announce that there is nothing to panic about a crime by means of the official authorities.

Another reason why the relation between the media and fear results in various conclusions is that the members of the social groups are affected from the media at different rates and levels. The rate of being affected from the media for the socially and physically vulnerable individuals and the rate of being affected from the crime news on the media for the individuals who feel safer and who are financially well-off differ from each other. This situation makes it difficult for us to estimate the impact of the media on fear of crime. The media may have impact on the socially and physically vulnerable individuals increasing such fear. Yet, because of the complicated nature of the fear of crime and that the variables interact with each

other, it is hard to assert that the media as a single parameter influence the fear of crime.

Examination of the effects of the media on fear of crime is a process requiring a quite complex and detailed analysis. Instead of an extremely generic simplifying research design, a detailed and deep reaching approach will help in making more sound evaluations on this subject. More clearly, conducting a study unless expressly defining and determining the properties such as the type of media, manner of the media in reporting the crime news, coverage of the media, etc. may cause us to deduct incomplete and missing consideration on fear of crime.

2.6. Incivilities Perspective

Incivilities perspective claims that fear of crime is affected by certain environmental factors and indicators and that this situation in turn results in the fear of crime. The incivilities perspective states that these environmental signs are interpreted by the individuals and such interpretations come to the foreground as a factor influencing the fear of crime. LaGrange et al. (1992:312) define the concept of incivilities as “low-level breaches of community standards that signal an erosion of conventionally accepted norms and values.’ The underlying assumption behind this approach is the view that the erosion of certain social norms and structures and the individuals’ notice of such erosion cause increases in the anxieties of these individuals relating to security.

The incivilities perspective, which is sometimes referred as disorder model in the literature on fear of crime, generally examines the relation between fear of crime and environmental perception. The relation between the fear of crime and the environment has both social and physical aspects. In this respect, the perceived social erosion and perceived physical erosion are two separate factors having an effect on fear of crime.

“The disorder model argues that fear is a response to the perception of residents that the area is becoming characterized by a growing number of signs of disorder and incivility (such as loitering groups of unsupervised teenagers, vandalism, graffiti, abandoned buildings, and public drug and alcohol use) that indicate that social order of the neighborhood is eroding” (Bursik and Grasmick 1993:101).

One of the points to pay attention to in the relation between the incivilities model and fear of crime is how the environmental and physical erosion is perceived by the individuals. In this sense, the significant point in terms of fear of crime is how the individuals perceive the social and physical deterioration rather than the rate of such erosion.

The individuals make evaluations regarding their security based on the extent of the physical and social erosion. “Physical disorder, otherwise known as physical incivility, is characterized by the presence of elements such as litter, abandoned and/or dilapidated buildings or cars, graffiti, and poorly kept lots. Social disorder, or social incivility, refers to the outward display of unwanted behavior in the community, such as groups of unsupervised, open-air drug markets, as well as the homeless or panhandlers” (Melde 2007:29).

One other aspect that should not go unnoticed while investigating the perception of the neighborhood the individuals live in and the impact of this situation on the fear of crime is the requirement to control over other parameters causing the fear of crime. Fear of crime is a phenomenon occurring as the result of a great many individual perceptions such as personal vulnerability, factors relating to the environment, etc. (Wyant 2008:40). In this respect, it would be misleading to examine the influence of the environmental perception on the fear of crime without controlling the influence of the factors such as direct victimization and vulnerability on the fear of crime.

The individuals tend to evaluate their living environment through the information they hear from others as well as they by their own experiences. From this standpoint, the relation of the individuals with the environment they live or work in is factor impacting the security perception and fear of crime. Merry (1981) states that each individual has their own experience or mental topography that is shaped by the information they receive from their friends and relatives. According to this, each individual has a template in their mind concerning which places are safe and which ones are dangerous (in Wilcox etc 2003: 325).

Warr (1990) is one of the first criminologists asserting that the fear of crime is affected by environmental conditions and the environmental changes and disorders lead to fear of crime. Having reviewed the emphasis on the sociology of daily life placed by Goffman and his studies on this subject, War applied these concepts onto the phenomenon of fear of crime. War, according to his study, suggests that the individuals hold more fear against the environments not familiar to them, the darkness and strangers (Warr 1990: 893-895). In his study, War explains the effect of the environment, darkness and strangers on the fear of crime as follows:

“The findings of this study strongly support some of the arguments derived from Goffman’s work both novelty and darkness are potent signs of danger and their combined effects can produce considerable fear. Yet, as we anticipated, the presence of others is not a cue that carries a single meaning. The presence of others can have utterly opposite effects, either frightening or reassuring depending on who those others are, as well as characteristics of the actor” (Warr 1990:905).

The thesis that there is a relation between darkness and fear of crime is significant in terms of the link between especially the street light and fear of crime. Today, many security units state that lighting is an element reducing the fear of crime. Lighting is not only important in terms of elimination of region creating opportunities for crime, but also it is seen as a physical precaution for the fact that individuals notably women feel safer and their fear of crime decreases. Atkins and etc. (1991) noted in their studies that though the street lights do not reduce the fear phenomenon in some areas, it lowers the fear of crime in individuals avoiding especially the public domains and is welcomed.

Adaptation of sociology of daily life to the studies on fear of crime is quite a significant development. Evaluation of fear of crime based on the certain societal circumstances, daily relations and the interactions regarding to these relations will prevent the abstract generalizations regarding the fear of crime. In this regard, determination of what environmental factors lead to fear of crime will facilitate the determination of the applications to be developed to reduce it.

Today, numerous developed countries have been developing preventive practices by producing crime maps oriented at such regions. Likewise, studies and surveys on fear

of crime are applied in order both to understand this phenomenon and to establish policies directed at it. “A popular approach in the attempt to understand the spatial patterns of fear of crime has been to map and highlight areas in which crime appears to be problem as well as of those in which people are most worried” (Pain 1997:232).

A physical or social disorder may come to mean weakening social bonds in the neighborhood where the erosion takes place. As an indicator of the decreasing informal social control, one of the most important components in terms of fight against the crime, the physical and social erosion affect the fear of crime of individuals. In his studies done between 1977 and 1983, Skogan (1990) researched the effect of social and physical erosion on fear of crime. He revealed that the existence of potentially criminal minded individuals, which is a sign of notably social disorder, is a factor affecting the fear of crime (In Mays 2001:27).

The reason fear of crime is sensitive to especially social erosion is that the individuals are less sensitive to the signs of physical erosion such as graffiti, uncollected garbage and abandoned cars. It is for sure that the physical erosion is a factor influential on fear of crime. Nonetheless, the incidences being the indicators of social erosion such as drunken young people wandering in the streets, a group of boys making improper behavior to girls, a drug-dealer gang in front of a school, etc. are elements more seriously affecting the fear of crime. In his study investigating the social erosion in 40 different neighborhoods, Skogan (1990) summarizes the effects of the physical and social erosion as follows:

“Disorder incapacitated a community’s control over local events and conditions. Privatistic, household-oriented measures as well as collective, community-oriented

activities were both weakened by area disorder. Perceived crime problems, fear of crime, and direct victimization were linked to social and physical disorder” (in Mays 2001:28).

There are certain points to bear in mind while conducting research on the impact of social and physical disorder on fear of crime. In measuring the relation of the fear of crime with the environment, it is necessary first and foremost to make the research by taking into account the impact of the other individual variables. To illustrate, a questionnaire addressed to different groups in two neighborhoods where we want to measure the effect of the physical and social disorder will have an impact in reaching a healthy conclusion. To be clearer, if we apply our questionnaire to only women, who is a socially vulnerable group, in one neighborhood, and to the young in the other neighborhood, the effect of different socio-demographic properties will affect to come up with a sound result.

One other point to take into consideration while examining the effect of the social and physical disorder on the fear of crime is that we should carry out our questionnaire by personal observation being aware of the environmental distinctions. Siehr (2004:16) notes that macro studies investigating the effect of the environmental and physical disorders on fear of crime are done through phone interviews, and smaller size studies on the other hand are conducted by field surveys. In our opinion, doing quite large scale studies via telephone interviews will mean missing out the environmental conditions, which will confirm the study by observation.

Another subject to lay stress on in terms of the relation of the social and physical disorder with the fear of crime is the social bonds and informal social control. The

physical and social disorder may create disruptions in the social bonds for the individuals. In their studies, Ross and Jang (2000) concluded that an interaction exists between the perceived neighborhood disorder and the social bonds, and that the neighborhood disorder has an effecting weakening the social bonds.

“In sum, over and above individual characteristics of socioeconomic and family status, gender, race, and age, people who live in a neighborhood where they perceive high levels of disorder are more fearful and mistrusting than those who report they live in clean, safe, orderly neighborhoods. Informal social ties with one’s neighbors buffer the negative effect of perceived disorder on fear and mistrust, but formal participation in neighborhood organization does not” (Ross and Jang 2000:415).

Effect of the perceived neighborhood disorder on fear of crime may not sometimes accord with the real crime rates. This case is referred as meaningless in terms of victimization perspective. That being said, it is a known social reality that the fear of crime does not only occur over victimization. The individuals in a society do not have fear of crime not only because of exposure to crime; news heard in the community and relation with the living environment are other factors determining the fear of crime as well.

The fear of crime of individuals living the society is a situation occurring as a result of the perceived neighborhood disorder to a greater extent than the direct victimization (Hunter 1978: 9). Another indicator of this case is that the rate of the individuals having fear of crime is higher than the rate of those experiencing direct victimization. In this regard, the perception that the individuals have relating the environment they live in is one of the major indicators determining the fear of crime.

The studies examining the relation between the neighborhood disorder and fear of crime attempt generally to measure this issue in two ways. One of these methods is the objective incivility and the other is the perceived incivility. The objective incivility aims to determine the neighborhood disorder according to concrete events and changes while the perceived incivility measures how the individuals perceive such disorder. LaGrange and etc (1992) state that generally the perceived incivility method is a more effective method in the determination of the fear of crime, and sum up the conclusions of the studies establishing a link between the fear of crime and neighborhood disorder as the following:

LaGrange and etc (1992:314) point out that the studies regarding the incivility perspective are theoretically and empirically based on a sound relation. This approach is grounded on the hypothesis that the neighborhood disorder will increase fear of crime. There is a direct relation between incivility and fear of crime; nonetheless the social incivilities are a factor more affecting the fear of crime compared to physical incivilities. One other significant conclusion with regard to this approach is that the concept of perceived incivility has a feature measuring the fear of crime more correctly compared to the objective incivility.

Another dimension of the relation between the neighborhood disorder and fear of crime is the discrimination of fear of crime and perception of risk. Ferraro and LaGrange (1987) note that perceived risk of victimization and fear of victimization are two different phenomena and that it is not noticed that these two phenomena may result in different results because they sometimes create conflicting situations. Stating explicitly, most of the studies on fear of crime contain questions measuring the perceived risk of victimization instead of directly measuring the fear of crime.

Fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization can most of the time be comprehended as a case bearing similar characteristics. Yet, the risk of victimization and fear of crime may yield to rather different conclusions in certain sub-cultural groups. Although the rate of perceived risk of victimization of a member of a gang growing in a criminal sub-culture may be found higher, his/her rate of fear of crime may be low, the reason of which is higher probability of not being afraid of crime even though that young person of the sub-culture becomes a victim of a crime.

The study done by LaGrange and et al. (1992) is one of the first studies separately evaluating the concepts of perceived risk of victimization and fear of crime. LaGrange et al. found out that the incivility is a concept more related with the fear of crime than the perceived risk. (1992: 324). Lewis and Maxfield (1980) investigated the relation between fear of crime and official crime rates in their studies conducted in four different neighborhoods in Chicago. According to their study, the perceived dangerous area and crime statistics show similarities. On the other hand, Lewis and Maxfield detected that the evaluations of the neighborhood residents regarding certain crimes and their personal risk evaluations have differences than the official statistics. As a reason of this, they stated that the fear of crime does not only occur over the crimes committed, and that indicators of incivility are a major component determining the perceived risk (Lewis and Maxfield 1980).

In this respect, we can say that the study by Lewis and Maxfield (1980) is among the earliest studies forming a connection between the fear of crime and incivility. The study is significant in terms of building the relation between neighborhood disorder and fear of crime by basing it on the official statistics. Furthermore, it is important from the point of view it reveals the perception of crime and fear of crime are not only established considering the crimes committed.

The study conducted by Maxfield (1984) is another noteworthy one in terms of incivility and fear of crime. Maxfield investigated the impacts of environmental effects on fear of crime expressing in his study that vulnerability plays a limited role in determining of fear of crime. Covering three different neighborhoods in the city of San Francisco, Maxfield stated as follows that the environmental effect is connected with fear of crime:

“The findings demonstrate that age, as a measure of physical vulnerability previously associated with fear among individuals, is not related to fear in neighborhoods where residents express the greatest general concern about crime. It is concluded that in those urban areas where crime problems are regular features of the neighborhood environment, measures of physical vulnerability are less important in predicting differences in fear among individuals” (Maxfield, 1984:233).

What is important in the study in terms of fear of crime is that it takes up this phenomenon in multi dimensions, which also shows that dealing with fear of crime over one single dimension would be incomplete. Highlighting that the fear of crime is also shaped by geographical characteristics and perceived neighborhood, and that the level of fear of crime in individuals living in different places will vary are another prominent point in the study.

One other aspect of the relation between fear of crime and neighborhood disorder is that this relation is not only unidirectional, but has also a bilateral effect. Markowitz and etc (2001) concluded in their study that neighborhood disorder increases the fear of crime and the neighborhood disorder is on the rise in a region where the fear of

crime levels up as well. The study has importance in indicating that the relation between neighborhood disorder and fear of crime is a mutual one.

Notwithstanding the relation between fear of crime and neighborhood disorder is one in macro scale; individual differences may be observed since numerous studies on this subject measure the perception of victimization risk of the individuals living in a certain area. Differences in fears of crime of individuals living in a neighborhood or area do not stem from only socio-demographic factors. Even though it seems that there is neighborhood disorder in a neighborhood in the same level, the rate of perception of such disorder by the individuals may vary. In this regard, a questionnaire measuring the environmental perceptions of the individuals will be more beneficial in establishment of these differences rather than a questionnaire objectively measuring the neighborhood disorder.

The study by Covington and Taylor (1991) shows in a way supporting this idea that perceived disorder is more effective in estimation of fear of crime; that is to say, perceived neighborhood of individuals is a more significant criterion in determination of fear of crime than the objective properties of that neighborhood. If the signs for objective neighborhood disorder such as uncollected garbage, broken windows and desolated houses are not perceived as a danger by the individuals, then such type of indicators do not matter in terms of fear of crime.

Gibson and etc (2002) revealed in their study that social integration has an impact on fear of crime via social utility. The study also exhibited that perceived neighborhood disorder is a major factor on fear of crime. Moreover according to this scholars, “social ties among neighbors (and to the neighborhood) may lead to attachments that

result in the building of trust among neighbors and expectations that neighbors will be willing to intervene as agents of informal social control in appropriate situations” (Gibson etc 2002:559). Thus, informal social control is not only an element reducing crime rate, but also it is a factor having a decreasing effect on fear of crime.

The informal social control in Turkey is shaped especially over the notion of neighborhood. The neighborhoods having a social nature where there is intense neighborhood relationship and individuals frequently visiting each other are important in reducing fear of crime. A social settlement shaped over the migration to larger cities and based on fellow citizenship means the social control is strong. A social structure immediately responding in case of any crime event, relieving the victim and attaching important to compensation of the loss is an effective mechanism on fear of crime as well.

In addition to this, the urbanization process occurring rather swiftly in Turkey and the anomy experienced along with this process have started as elements decaying the conventional neighborhood structure. Within this process, the elements such as neighborhood relations, fellow citizenship having an importance in terms of informal social control have started to disappear. Notably in large cities, the traditional structure and the modern one is now getting mixed with each other. While examining the city and fear of crime for our subject, it would not be incorrect to state that such neighborhood differences will come to forefront as elements diversifying the fear of crime, which will take its shape according to the neighborhood properties and relations in different neighborhoods.

Analyzing the fear of crime by including the socio-demographic factors and neighborhood structure along with the neighborhood disorder, McCrea and etc (2005) underlies that individual characteristics and neighborhood disorder in terms of fear of crime are more significant indicators compared to the neighborhood structure. Concluding that vulnerability hypothesis, and incivilities thesis are better from the perspective of estimating the fear of crime, the study draws attention to the importance of social disorder in this sense (McCrea and etc 2005:7).

2.7. The Community Concern Perspective

Community Concern perspective is based on the opinion that the fear of crime is shaped not only in individual level, but over the social conditions and social atmosphere they individual lives in. According to this model, the factors such as relations of the individual with the society he/she is in and attitude towards life are important in terms of fear of crime. Hale (1996:120) states that the social facts such as anomie in social structure, alienation, and personal attitudes such as prejudice of individual against change, pessimistic expectations for future have all an impact on the fear of crime.

Community Concern perspective suggests that certain social phenomena and conditions affect the viewpoint of individual and determines the trust of the individual in the society he/she lives in. According to this, negative standpoints of the individual regarding the social construct and circumstances come to the prominence as a factor influencing their social trust, which in turn lead to the fact that the individuals feel less safe. "According to this view a lack of local social ties and an awareness that the neighborhood is deteriorating or declining will result in

elevated fear. Physical and social incivilities may heighten these concerns about community disintegration” (Covington and Taylor, 1991: 232).

For this approach, the environment where the individuals live and their relations with this environment is a major parameter with respect to the fear of crime. According to this, individuals’ cohesion and harmony with their environment and intensity of the community relations each is a sign of the fact that the individual is far away from the anomie phenomenon. The concept anomie was first defined by Durkheim and it concerns with the level of social integration. In the concept of anomie, Durkheim, believes that the problem arise from weakened common morality. “Individuals are said to be confronted with anomie when they are not faced with sufficient moral constraint, that is, when they do not have a clear concept of what is and what is not proper and acceptable behavior” (Ritzer 1998: 120).

Estrangement of individuals from any common social norm and values will mean the weakening of the social contact of that individual with the environment. Feeling lonely and excluded within a social construct, the individual will experience confidence issues against the others. The uncertainty feeling for the future, state of chaos resulting from the uncertainty in the rules emerging with the trust issue will put the individuals in a more worried and distrustful and insecure mood.

Deterioration of common morality, a significant element of social integration, and state of anomie; vagueness in the rules, result in the individuals approaching their living society in a more suspicious manner. Community concern model stipulates that fear of crime will be experienced in a higher degree in a social plane of intense social uncertainty and chaos environment (Skogan, 1986).

This model provides that the social integration generally appears with the environmental disorder and as a result, the neighborhood relations weaken. According to this approach, negativities and problems observed in the physical environmental conditions bring about the individuals' evaluation of their living environment as risky. Nonetheless, though the community concern perspective seems to have been making deductions similar to the disorder perspective, it does not assess the fear of crime over only physical conditions and indicators in contrast to the disorder approach.

The disorder perspective, as we discussed in the previous chapter, depends on the assumption that the neighborhood disorder may be perceived as a sign for the unsafe status of the subject area by the individuals, and this in turn will give rise to fear of crime. In spite of the fact that the disorder perspective investigates the impact of the social and physical disorders on fear of crime, it does not deal with the effects of this circumstance on the human relations and macro social construct. The Community Concern perspective, on the other hand, examines the effect of this situation on the human relations and social mechanisms along with the physical and social disorder. Lane and Meeker (2003) emphasize that the community concern approach differs from the disorder perspective since the former handles not only the physical and social disorder, but also the relations, differences and change across the social structure:

“Even with these suggested ties between the theoretical constructs, the disorder and community concern models remain theoretically distinct because they are not inherently connected. We found no studies of the community concern model that focus exclusively on affluent neighborhoods or communities without much disorder; but other factors such as diversity alone or increasing urbanization, might prompt

residents to think the community is changing for the worse, thereby increasing fear of crime” (Lane and Meeker, 2003:432).

Community concern model discusses the impact of other factors such as urbanization, social disorder and anomie along with the physical, environmental disorder on the phenomena of social consciousness and social integrity; and investigates the effect of such situation on the fear of crime. “This is not the say that the community concern model focuses on ecological factors that influence fear of crime rather it focuses on social- psychological factors” (Katz and etc 2003:103). Considered from this respect, we can say that the community concern model examines the effects of the environmental and social phenomena over the fear of crime from a more macro perspective.

The common value judgments, thought systems and behavioral patterns of the individuals are the facts, with which the imaginary concept that we call society takes its shape, and which ensure that this imagined integrity forms more strongly in the minds. This approach highlights the impact of such value judgments and behavioral patterns on the fear of crime. Asserting that the individuals become isolated and feel unsafe within the network social relations of weakening common value judgments and social integrity, this approach put stress that this situation will lead to fear of crime.

Another phenomenon significant to this model is the informal and formal social control mechanisms. Ross and Jang (2000) lay emphasis on the fact that the fear of crime does not merely hold an individual aspect, and that considering the fear of crime as a psychological reaction originating from victimization would be

incomplete. Fear of crime is not a state observed in or shaped by only individual and psychological dimension, yet this concept is influenced by social relations and social control mechanisms. The social control mechanisms fall under two categories as informal and formal. Research into the effects of these social control mechanisms on the fear of crime will enable to better analyze the community concern approach.

2.7.1. Informal Social Control and Fear of Crime

Informal social control is a concept used to mention any kind of unofficial control mechanism. The social control mechanisms emerging from the individuals own communication and interactions without embarking on any institutional and official construct is covered by the informal social control concept. Since being entire voluntary association and activities, this concept becomes more of an issue in terms of social integrity and personal safety of individuals.

Informal social control mechanisms may include non-state and non-governmental institutionalizations. From this angle, evaluation of the same as randomly realizing, in a way lacking any bureaucratic organization would be an incorrect and missing one. Silver and Miller (2004:553) define the concept of informal social control as “willingness of neighborhood residents to actively engage in behaviors aimed at preventing criminal and deviant behavior in the local area.” The informal social control based on noncompulsory and voluntariness is not only a deterrent concept creating an effect on the criminals, but it has an effect ensuring that individuals feel safe as well.

Community concern perspective underlines that the joint actions initiated by the citizens oriented at preventing the crime will both have benefits in terms of preventing fear of crime and that give rise to social integration since it contains a common activity zone. For this reason, the informal social control is one of the concepts of key importance for reducing the fear of crime and enhancing the quality of life as much as it is significant for prevention of crime. Sampson et al. (1997) explain the role of informal social control mechanisms on fear of crime as;

“... the differential ability of neighborhoods to realize the common values of residents and maintain effective social controls... Although social control is often a response to deviant behavior it should not be equated with formal regulation or forced conformity by institutions such as the police and courts. Rather, social control refers generally the capacity of a group to regulate its members according to desired principles- to realize collective, as opposed the forced, goals... the willingness of local residents to intervene for the common good depends in large part on conditions of mutual trust and solidarity among neighbors. Indeed, one is unlikely to intervene in a neighborhood context in which the rules unclear and people mistrust or fear one another” (Sampson et al.1997, in Farrall etc 2007: 9).

Thinking of the concept of informal social control as activities covering only the fight against crime and evaluation of it as a social impact occurring as a result of these activities will mean the assessment of this concept from a narrow aspect. No matter the informal social control includes the fight against crime and the activities deterrent of crime commitment; we see that any type of activity improving the social integrity and cohesion will indirectly fall under the scope of informal social control when looked from a broader perspective. Thus, any kind of common activity of the individuals outside the governmental organizations within the social interaction is in a sense a factor influencing positive or negative informal social control.

Reviewing the studies on informal social control, we see that the concept is discussed in a broader way similar to this idea, and its effects on fear of crime are examined. The scholars investigating the relation between fear of crime and informal social control have attempted to examine the effects of different social relations over fear of crime. While certain studies examine the impact of informal social ties and social trust on fear of crime (Ross and Jang, 2000); some others are about the relation between the social integration and fear of crime (Gibson et al., 2002).

Certain studies on this subject assess the social control phenomenon over different parameters and examine the effects of these parameters on fear of crime. Riger, LeBailly and Gordon (1981) try to analyze the effects of informal social control on fear of crime through four different criteria. These are, feeling of attachment to the locality, residential ties, social interaction with neighbors and use of local facilities. According to this study; “while local crime rates were positively correlated with fear, neighborhood bonds were inversely and more strongly related to fear levels. Residential ties to the community were also related to less fear. However, social interaction with neighbors and use of local facilities were not associated with fear levels. Neighborhood bonds and residential ties appear to be directly related to fear levels rather than acting as mediators of the impact of crime rates” (Riger, LeBailly and Gordon, 1981: 653).

In their study examining the relation between social integration and fear of crime, Adams and Serpe (2000) revealed that the phenomenon of social integration is factor significantly reducing the fear of crime. Highlighting that fear of crime is an element affecting the life satisfaction, this study shows that the concept of social integration indirectly and positively contributes to life satisfaction by decreasing the fear of crime (Adams and Serpe, 2000: 605). When considered in this regard, the social

integration and social interaction are concepts making it possible for the individuals to mitigate the risks in their lives.

Jackson (2004), in his study conducted by basing fear of crime on multiple model, examines the impacts of the concepts of social cohesion, trust and informal social control on fear of crime along with the other variables. Accordingly this study, “respondents who held more authoritarian views about law and order, and who were concerned about a long term deterioration of a community, were more likely to perceive disorder their environment. They were also more likely to link the physical cues to problems of social cohesion and consensus, of declining quality of social bonds and informal social control” (Jackson, 2004: 960). We can say from this point that the concepts such as informal social control and social cohesion gain their forms as associated with issues such as world view and political tendencies. Likewise, negative judgments of individuals relating to social cohesion and informal social control come stand out as a component affecting their perceptions towards the neighborhood disorder, too. This means, the individuals assess the elements such as neighborhood disorder influencing the fear of crime not only by looking at the objective criteria, but also at the entirety their world views and perceived social integrity.

In spite of the fact the studies on the effect of informal social control over fear of crime generally come up with a negative association between fear of crime and informal social control, certain studies obtain conclusions contrasting with this model. One of such studies has been made by Villarreal and Silva in Brazil. In their studies, Villarreal and Silva (2006) noted that contrary to the general tendency, higher social integration does not have a reducing impact on fear of crime, yet the level of fear of crime in regions of higher social integration is also higher. The study states that the reason for this case is the social integration increases the information sharing, which in turn affects the perceived risk.

Informal social control is a phenomenon shaped by the influence of the culture the individuals live in. In this sense, the impact preventive of crime and reducing the fear of crime of the informal social control in an area of criminal sub-culture will be limited. It is probable that the informal social control, generally having a major effect in terms of ensuring social trust and of fear of crime, loses its functionality in existence of such situations.

2.7.2. Formal Social Control and Fear of Crime

Another dimension of the social control mechanisms comprises the formal social control mechanisms. Formal social control includes activities performed by the government and its subordinated agencies within the framework of fight against crime. In this sense, formal social control covers the law enforcement activities oriented at prevention of crime in a region. Central government and local municipalities take various measures for the sake of individuals' feeling safer. When considered from the point of fear of crime, such types of formal control mechanisms create the following impacts on individuals;

- Presence of officials in any area has a deterrent effect for the criminals to reach their goals. This situation yields to decrease in crime rate in that area. Decrease in crime rates in an area means reduction in fear of crime arising from direct victimization.
- Existence of a formal control mechanism in a region ensures that the residents of that region feel themselves more secure. There will be difference in terms of fear of crime between a neighborhood resident who is aware of the institutions which they can resort to and seek help in any victimization

case are not that much far away and another resident thinking that there are not any close-by officer or agency to take action and intervene right away in case of victimization.

- Existence of a formal social safety mechanism in a region increases the cooperation between the public institution and citizen in that region. Such a situation enables reaching a real and correct piece of information about the crime more quickly. By this means, the exaggeration of any event through word of mouth is prevented and at the same time, the dissemination of unreal crime stories is precluded.

The studies on community concern model generally attach more importance to the effects of informal social control on fear of crime in proportion to the formal social control. One other reflection of this situation is that a standard scale to be used by everybody regarding the subject has not been developed. Bursick and Grasmick (1993) point out that recently the impact of the concept of formal social control on fear of crime began to be examined in addition to the informal social control. They emphasize yet that such studies are not in adequate number and as a result of this; the formal social control is viewed as an undeveloped concept.

Some of the studies dealing with the relation between fear of crime and formal social control searched the link between the community policing and fear of crime. Taking a scientific and influential understanding for the fight with the crime and criminal, with effective participation by cooperating with various organizations, the community policing stands for the better communication with citizens. Community policing defined as "... is a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies, which support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques, to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime."

(<http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/files/RIC/Publications/e030917193-CP-Defined.pdf>)

Scheider and etc (2003) in their study examining the relation between the concept of policing and fear of crime, reveal that that there is meaningful negative correlation between the satisfaction of citizens from the policing services and the fear of crime despite the non-existence of a direct relation between the community concern perception and fear of crime. In this context, the individuals' perception of police services and their satisfaction from these services ensure that they are less afraid of being a victim of a crime. Being aware that they will receive efficient service in case of any victimization, the individuals feel safer in this situation.

When looked at from a theoretical point, the Community Concern Perspective seems to have a content integrity which an association with the fear of crime is easily constituted. On the other hand, according to what the social integration of the individual should be measured and which parameters will be employed for such measuring are rather a problematic issue. The social integration is sometimes measured over the neighborhood relations of the individuals and some other times, establishment of a connection between the efficiency of public organization and the satisfaction level on the citizens from the services of such organizations with the fear of crime is attempted. Nonetheless, the community concern approach is not studied through one single common scale acceptable to everyone. Each individual researcher deals with different aspects of the social integration, informal and formal social control concepts. In this respect, the community concern approach is considered as the least developed model in the research on fear of crime (Melde 2007:30).

There is a weighty relation between the fear of crime and community concern shaped over both informal social control and formal social control. Still, provision of an objective and measurable standard valid for each scientific study and the necessity for the discussions to proceed over this standard are the criticized sides of this approach. As a concept, although the social integration and social control matter to the greatest extent in terms of fear of crime, constitution of a more objective and measurable standard on this subject will conduce to more embrace of this approach and increase in the number of studies on this subject.

2.8. Risk Assessment Perspective

Risk assessment perspective involves an approach going at the fear of crime in a multidimensional manner. Ferraro, the pioneer of this model, consider the fear of crime as a phenomenon emerging from the interaction of various factors. Ferraro's risk assessment model comprises a synthesis of three different theoretical approaches, which are, in order, symbolic interactionism, incivility hypothesis and routine activities theory (Melde 2007:44).

The risk assessment perspective envisages that the fear of crime does not have only one single variable, yet it might happen over numerous social and individuals causes. When regarded from this point, the risk assessment does not evaluate the fear of crime only over demographic variables or environmental properties, but it assesses the fear of crime by referring to how demographic and environmental characteristics are perceived and to the individual behavioral patterns.

Ferraro has the opinion that fear of crime is a state occurring as a result of different reasons instead of reducing it to one single social reason. One of the innovations brought by the risk assessment perspective to the fear of crime is that the individual perceptions and the considerations originating from such perceptions influence the fear of crime. In this aspect, fear of crime is not anymore a state emerging as a result of only objective factors. The fear of crime is a phenomenon getting its form over the perceived risk arising from the subjective assessments of the individuals in addition to objective factors. Brief investigation of the theoretical approaches on which this model is grounded will help to better comprehend the hypotheses of the Risk Assessment perspective.

Symbolic interactionism is a theory dealing with how certain meanings and symbols affect the cognitive level of the people and thus how they determine the people's behaviors within a social construct. Contrary to the previous theories, the symbolic interactionism does not examine the effects of social constructs over the individuals. Underlying that the individuals make contact with each via symbols, Mead, the founder of symbolic interactionist theory, notes that these symbols are the basis of the social life. "In his opinion, individuals can acquire identity only through interacting with others. By doing this, we learn the language of our social lives. Since Mead regarded symbols as the foundation of both personal and social life, the theory he developed is called Symbolic Interactionism"

(<http://oak.cats.ohiou.edu/~ko371597/symbolic.htm>).

Main thoughts of symbolic interactionism are given below:

- Society consists of organized and patterned interactions among individuals.

- Social research methods based on observable face-to-face interactions rather than on macro-level structural relationships involving social institutions.
- Shifts focus away from stable norms and values toward more changeable, continually readjusting social processes.
- Negotiation among members of society creates temporary, socially constructed relation
- This does not occur in a structural flux - we are 'schooled' to act and respond to others within existing social meanings

(<http://people.bath.ac.uk/ssxlw/Symbolic%20Interactionism.ppt#3>).

Symbolic Interactionism puts stress on the facts that the individuals cannot live in a secluded and isolated way from the society, that the individuals are social actors and that they determine their own behaviors according to other individuals they are in contact with. The individual in a social relations network continuously questions how his behaviors will be received and responded by the other individuals. The individual's decision on his behaviors according to the possible reactions of the other individuals he is in a social relation with brings along the fact that the social acts and conduct gains meaning based on the existing conditions and change accordingly.

“For interactionists, humans are pragmatic actors who continually must adjust their behavior to the actions of other actors. We can adjust to these actions only because we are able to interpret them, i.e., to denote them symbolically and treat the actions and those who perform them as symbolic objects. This process of adjustment is aided by our ability to imaginatively rehearse alternative lines of action before we act. The process is further aided by our ability to think about and to react to our own actions and even ourselves as symbolic objects. Thus, the interactionist theorist sees humans

as active, creative participants who construct their social world, not as passive, conforming objects of socialization”

(<http://web.grinnell.edu/courses/soc/s00/soc111-01/introtheories/symbolic.html>).

Symbolic interactionism theory opposes to the understanding of an individual, who lacks any initiative against the social institutions and determiners as frequently mentioned in the structuralist and grand theories. In contrast to the classical sociologists such as Durkheim and Marx; Mead states that the individuals in a society are not the slaves of the structures and institutions existing before them, yet they have the power to change such institutions and structures. The power of the institutions and social structures arises from the individuals’ internalization of these institutions and structures. The socialization of the individual on the other hand lays behind the empathy the individual get use of in calculation of first of all his actions and the reactions to these actions.

According to Mead, the concept of the self emerges throughout the social process. In this regard, the self is a concept realized across the inter-individual interactions. Animals and babies do not possess the self. What bring out the self are the interaction and social relations (Ritzer and Goodman 2004: 396). Expressing that what is social is shaped over the individual relations, Mead states that the individuals are mutually affected from each other. Explicitly speaking, Mead says that opinions of other people on the individual’s self-influence their behaviors.

The ability of the individuals to show empathy and the inclination to internalize the objects outside during this process constitute the ground of the symbolic interactionism theory. The individual differentiating any object is in the opinion that

he himself might be perceived as an object in an environment in the second stage. More clearly, the essence of the symbolic interactionism theory is the individual's perception of any person he is in contact with as the other as well as the opinion that that individual may possibly be considered as the other by other people.

For Mead, the individual has the distinction between the self and social self. Such an understanding reveals the differentiation between the inner self of the individual and his social self. According to the social self-conception of Mead, the individual at all times regulates his behaviors based on the social interactions since the opinions of other people about our self-matter. Because it is not always possible to read the thoughts of others, we make some generalizations, which advise us on which acts are correct and which are not. After all, the individual does not embody all his behaviors according to the social expectations. The individual does have his desires and thoughts and such thoughts can only be changed by the significant others (<http://www.e-sosyoloji.com/mead.htm>).

One of the sociologists establishing principal of the symbolic interactionism, Blumer notes that there are three primary factors ensuring the self and socialization of the individuals. According to Blumer; meaning, language and thought form the fundamental constitutions in terms of making sense of the reasons behind the human behaviors (Griffin, 1997).

Meaning is a fact appearing in the process of creation by the individual of the environment and individuals outside himself according to certain meaning codes. Blumer emphasizes the individuals fictionalize their behaviors over these meaning

codes. According to him, “human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have for them.” (Blumer 1969: 2).

Blumer highlights that the second significant factor in terms of attaching meaning to the reason underlying the human behaviors is the language. At this point, the importance of the language is that it enables that individuals may share the meanings via symbols and can communicate over the same meaning. It is for sure that the language phenomenon is an extremely important tool from the viewpoint of common symbols and creation of a common meaning. Besides, the symbolic interactionists attach great importance to the other symbols providing the common meaning and communication other than the language as well.

Another concept considered as significant for the symbolic interactionists is the concept of thought. The symbolic interactionists assert that the individuals develop different opinions and perspectives by means of this concept. Indeed, development of different ideas and points of view facilitates the act of individuals putting themselves in the shoes of others by developing the ability for empathy. In addition to this, this concept demonstrates how each individual interprets the symbols.

Blumer (1962) claims that; the social communication has a vital importance in terms of formation of the meaning. According to him, individuals’ starting to communicate with other people has given way to the emergence of the meaning and concepts. The communication-based nature of meaning allows better perceiving the dynamic structure of the meaning and beliefs. Blumer (1962) puts emphasis on the fact that meanings and beliefs may change during the course of the time. Such nature is the result of reaction of the individuals against the situations encountered following the

evaluation of new knowledge and past experiences. Briefly saying, for symbolic interaction, meaning, hence the human behaviors are dynamic structures that exist as a result of a process continuously evaluated.

We can summarize the basic principle of the theory of symbolic interactionism as follows:

1. Human beings interpret and define each other's actions. They do not merely react to each other in a simple stimulus-response fashion. Responses are not made to acts but rather to 'interpreted acts', that is, to the meaning social actors ascribe to one another's acts.
2. Human beings can be the objects of their own attention. In other words, they can act toward themselves as they act toward others.
3. Conscious social behavior is intentional behavior. Human beings construct and rehearse different possible lines of action in their imagination before choosing how to act in a given social situation.
4. Interpreting, planning and acting are ongoing processes which begin anew at every stage of social interaction. Further, both parties in a dyadic interaction engage in these processes. Basic to these processes is the fact that each actor takes not only his or her own view on the other into account but the other's view of him- or her- self, when constructing possible lines of action.
5. Mead referred to the general process of taking another into account when imaginatively constructing possible lines of action as 'taking the role' of the other. Along with the observation that social actors have selves, the observation of human intelligence is, in part, reflexive in character is especially important.

6. Finally, Blumer stresses that these processes occur in all social situations although they will be most obvious in newly formed situations as the interactants struggle to align their behaviors with one another (Foddy, 1994: 19).

Symbolic interactionism points out that the relations ongoing in the social construct take shapes at any moment and anew; more precisely are determined according to mutual interactions. According to this theory, the behaviors of individuals and their reactions towards certain situations may vary depending on the environmental conditions and reactions of the people. The individual continuously creating certain roles within the social construct may alter these roles according to different circumstances and this way, can adapt to the social life he is in.

For our subject, while the risk assessment theory deals with fear of crime, symbolic interactionism theory makes use of the idea that different individuals may perceive given symbols in a different manner; and that symbols perceived positively for some may be mean something negative for another individual. Ferraro (1995) in dealing with embodiment of fear of crime over the perceived risk makes a point the individuals may construe the objective environmental properties in a different manner. More clearly, the risk assessment theory notes that the fear of crime may also originate from personal differences in perception, not only by the objective features.

The idea that the fear of crime may show differences due to different risk perception of individuals can be considered as a major phase in terms of the studies on fear of crime. Before this model, the studies researching what the fear of crime is in a given region were arguing that the individual differences only arose from the objective

factors. Nonetheless, the risk assessment theory has shown that the fear of crime may vary even in the same region because of different risk perceptions.

Individual differences in fear of crime do not merely occur as a result of objective environmental conditions. Clearly saying, symbols and signs not posing a serious threat element for an individual may be interpreted in a different way for some other individual. In a similar manner, a member of the criminal sub-culture may not consider the environmental conditions he is in as a threat for his security. This situation has gained a new aspect to the studies on fear of crime. In prior studies, the point was how the objective factors affected the fear of crime in the investigation of effect of the especially the environmental conditions over fear of crime. When it was found out that personal perception is a major factor for the fear of crime, the impact of the environmental conditions on fear of crime is now being examined based on the perceived environment of the individuals.

Symbolic interactionism underlines the symbols and signs play a significant role in giving meaning to the human relations. The individuals communicate via certain meaning codes and signs. Language, mimic and specific bodily movement are tools to make sense of the relations. As an indicator of this situation, indicators of certain meanings for a society will not have any meaning for another society. Besides, the individuals may send a message not only by people, but also via certain institutional and physical indicators. The clothes you wear, music you listen to and public buildings-specific architecture are all tools conveying a message to be communicated to the people.

When we analyze the symbolic interaction in terms of fear of crime, it is stressed that certain indicators and signs of danger have a significant impact for fear of crime. At this point, Ferraro (1995) using the symbolic interactionism theory states that the individuals interpret the meaning in line with their status. Ferraro (1995) attempts at explaining that the individuals assess their status and this way determine on their behaviors, and the fear of crime occurs as a conclusion of this assessment by giving the example of car theft:

“...For instance, two thieves may follow a potential victim and then intentionally bump the victim’s car and wait for the person to exit his or her vehicle, making it easier for one of the thieves to steal the car. Most policies and insurance companies know that carjacking is crime that most often occurs in large cities; they also know that out- of –state travelers are more often victimized. Rental cars are prime targets for carjackers looking for people who appear to be unfamiliar with an area or uncertain of where they are going. ...the critical question is how people define the situation of driving. In routine travel to work, church, or shopping, people are familiar with routes and carjacking may not even enter their minds. On vacation, in a rental car, however, they may be more careful and vigilant- and perhaps fearful” (Ferraro, 1995: 10).

Claiming that there is an association between the perceived risk and fear of crime of individuals, and that this situation determines the fear of crime, this approach suggests the risk perceptions of the people may vary even if they are in the environment. The information individuals obtain due to their security concerns relating to their environment and the communication they establish with the others are factors leading the variations of fear of crime. For Ferraro (1995), higher risk perception is generally accompanied by taking more measures and being more cautious against the neighborhood (Ferraro, 1995: 11).

The dimension brought by this approach and the ideas of the symbolic interactionists is that the individual perceptions are a major indicator in terms of fear of crime as much as objective indicators. Communication of the individuals with one another creates an effect changing the viewpoint towards the fear of crime, which points out that fear of crime has a dynamic dimension, not a static one. The perceived risk and therefore fear of crime of an individual who is in contact with his environment will change based on new information and dimension and nature of the communication.

The second pillar of the risk assessment model of Ferraro is constituted by the incivility hypothesis. Ferraro says that environmental properties are a highly important indicator in the sense of fear of crime. When considered that symbolic interactionism theory lies behind the fear of crime, it is clear that environmental signs and manner of perception of the same will directly influence the fear of crime. Since the risk assessment model argues that the general perception of danger of individual in principle has a direct relation with the fear of crime, how the individual assesses the main properties of his residence region determines his fear of crime.

We had discussed in the previous chapter that the environmental properties are of an important nature of indicator for the fear of crime. The environmental features form one of the most significant sources the individuals perceive as a signs relating to their safety. These features are a major concept to the greatest extent due to the fact that they give an idea to the individuals about the level of crime in a region (Skogan and Maxfield, 1981). The individuals assess their considerations about a region and whether that region is safe or not by looking first of all at the environmental properties.

The environmental properties are examined under two main sections as social and physical in the studies on fear of crime. The social environmental properties generally investigate the structure of human relations in a region while the physical environmental features deals with the structural condition of that region as the name suggests.

Ferraro (1995: 15) divides the incivility concept he handles in the risk assessment understanding into two as physical incivility and social incivility. According to Ferraro, the physical incivility includes the environmental deterioration signals such as uncollected garbage, forlorn buildings and abandoned cars and broken windows. Ferraro (1995) defines the social incivility concept on the other as the behavioral patterns posing a threat for the peace and safety of the public. Drunken people wandering around, youth gangs, drug dealers, and beggars are seen as the signals of the social disorder.

The risk assessment model takes up how the environmental properties are perceived by the individual. The model upholds the opinion that the perception of the individual regarding the environmental properties and neighborhood disorder of his residence area determines the fear of crime of that individual. In this sense, analysis of how the individuals assess their living environmental in social and physical terms is a method necessary for figuring out their fear of crime.

Having a look at the approaches on the environmental disorder and fear of crime, we see that generally there are two types of approach. The first of these approaches is to objectively deal with the environmental properties and environmental deterioration. In this method, the elements such as how many abandoned houses there are in a

neighborhood, condition of [street] lighting, density of graffiti, etc. are objectively established and the effects of such situation on fear of crime are examined. The other approach on the environmental disorder and fear of crime underlines that the personal opinions of the individuals with relation to their living area are important rather than the objective indicators. This approach investigates whether the individuals perceive the environment they live in as safe or not. The questions in the following manner as “To what extent the street gangs in your neighborhood are an important problem?”, “To what extent the uncollected garbage in your neighborhood is a major problem?” are all oriented at measuring the personal perception of the individuals regarding their environment.

The risk assessment model, in parallel with the symbolic interactionism theory it is based on, envisages that the personal security perception on the environment of the individuals will measure the fear of crime more correctly rather than the concrete, objective environmental features. The reality that fear of crime can sometimes be found out lower in some places of higher crime rates supports this idea. The reason behind the lower fear of crime in the individuals in interaction with especially the criminal sub-culture may be originating from the lower perceptions of environmental disorder. In parallel with this opinion, LaGrange and etc. (1992) state that measurement of fear of crime by means of the perceived incivility method instead of the objective environmental criteria yields to better and sounder conclusions.

The advantage of measuring the fear of crime over the perceived environmental properties is that it reveals the diversity of the point of view of individuals living in the same region for fear of crime. Measurement of fear of crime over risk assessment will enable to reach healthier results because the individuals develop strategies relating to their own safety by looking at their environmental perception forms not the objective evaluations.

Another theoretical approach Ferraro made use of while developing his risk assessment theory is the criminal opportunity theory. This theory claims fundamentally that individuals do not always achieve and get their wants, and that some individuals may incline for crime under certain circumstances. The individuals desiring to possess a certain status and goals within the society cannot always have them. This situation motives certain individuals for achieving these goals and status through illegal ways.

“... In those urban, lower-class areas where very few legitimate opportunities are available, one can find opportunities of a different kind. Further, these opportunities are just as well established and access is just as limited as in the legitimitive structure. Thus, position in society dictates the ability to participate in both conventional and criminal avenues of success.” (Williams and McShane, 1999: 118).

Routine activities theory state that the criminals or those potentially apt to commit a crime calculate the risk of being caught and then proceed with a certain act. Saying more clearly, when individuals decide to commit an offense, they compare the risk of the act with the gains from the same. Cohen and Felson (1979: 588), who are among the founding fathers of this theory, talk about 3 main components significant for the realization of the crime. These are a) motivated offenders b) suitable targets of criminal victimization, and c) absence of capable guardians.

Routine activities theory suggests that the individuals should have the intention of crime for the occurrence of crime phenomenon. More clearly, the individual must make up his mind to commit an offense for a social and personal reason and interest. Another major condition for offense is the existence of proper goals. The point here

is the necessity that the object or person the criminal act will be directed at should suit the acquisition to be obtained as a result of such crime. To illustrate, if a decision is given to commit an offense to get a material gain, the suitable target here is for sure a person having money.

Cohen and Felson indicate that another major phenomenon in terms of crime is the non-presence of individuals and precautions oriented at prevention of crime. The reason for this is that the individual having a net intention of an offense does not wish to be subject to a sanction as a result of the crime by making a rational assessment. Higher crime rates in a region with insufficient physical security precautions are a fact arising from this situation.

Cook (1986:1) highlights that the individuals deciding on a crime are also sensitive to social and economic changes just like ordinary people. According to Cook, the changes in the economic and social domain results in effects on criminal behaviors of the individuals as well. In this respect, an economic development in a region will increase the number of crime committed against the property in that region.

When considered from the point of our subject, coverage of specifically the term 'guardians' and dimension of this term gain importance. Felson (1994:319) put stress on the fact that only the police and security personnel should not come to the minds in the term 'guardians,' yet the most prominent guardians are the ordinary citizens (in Paulsen and Robinson 2004:102). An individual deciding on an offense does not evaluate the security characteristics of any region by merely looking at the number of public officers or efficiency of the public security services. We can thus infer the conclusion that perception of informal social control affects more efficiently the

motive of commitment of a crime of the individuals. Evaluating this situation for the fear of crime, we can emphasize the perceived security, thus the fear of crime of the individuals takes its shape to a greater extent through informal social control perception. More clearly, perceived informal security of individuals about an area is a factor influencing their fear of crime.

Routine activities theory is used to account for how the crime rates vary according to the regions. According to this, the regions with dense number of criminals, with the targets are more easily accessible for crime (e.g. open doors, houses with nobody inside) and where there are not any guardians show differences in terms of crime rates from the others (Akers and Sellers, 2009:35). This difference is a situation not only valid for countries or cities, but also different regions of the same town.

Cohen and Felson (1979) argue that the routine activities the individuals do always are related to crime rates. An individual with the intention to commit an offense acts taking into account the environmental features and risk of being caught. In this respect, an individual intending for a crime moves on considering the factors such as reaching to goals, risk of being caught, gains to be obtained from the offense. Routine activities are not an element merely affecting the behaviors and intentions of the criminal. In daily life, established behavioral patterns matter also for victimization. The acts of individuals with leisure time activities in daily life affect the risk of victimization as well. Cohen and Felson define the routine activities performed daily by the individuals as follows:

“We define these as any recurrent and prevalent activities that provide for basic population and individual needs, whatever their biological or cultural origins. Thus

routine activities would include formalized work, as well as the provision of standard food, shelter, sexual outlet, leisure, social interaction, learning and child rearing.” (Cohen and Felson 1979:593).

Cohen and Felson state that the qualities of the business, school and leisure activities in the American society has changed notably after the Second World War, and this new situation has created new crime opportunities. This change in the routine activities resulted in the increase in crime rates (Akers and Sellers, 2009:36). According to theory, the root cause in the crime rates is decline in informal social control as a result of routine activities and in turn creation of a suitable environment for commitment of a crime. For example, increasing women employment for labor force in the post-war period resulted in less safe houses during the day. Likewise, advances in new technology gave rise to valuable electronic tools and devices at homes, which made these houses an appropriate target (Vito and etc 2007:70).

Routine activities theory is also known as Criminal Opportunity in the literature. The theory stresses that criminals or potentially criminal individuals may not always commit a crime, and that such people will take action under certain circumstances and when the conditions are suitable. Suggesting that the crime phenomenon is not realized only over individual and psychological reasons and that the individuals may tend to crime under certain structural conditions, the criminal opportunity theory approaches to the crime phenomenon from a macro perspective. At this point, the concept of suitable target, one of the preconditions for crime occurrence, gains importance. Felson (1998) expresses the important factors that affecting the suitability of target:

- Value: sometimes value is almost universal; other times it depends almost entirely on what is popular in the offender's world (e.g., specific CDs, sneakers, or jackets).
- Inertia: some valuable property (e.g., large appliances) is simply too difficult to move; other property (cars, bicycles) provide their own get away.
- Visibility: This might include valuables left in plain sight or living on a busy street.
- Access: Easy access, such as being within walking distance of a shopping mall (which attracts motivated offenders) or living on a street with exits on both sides as opposed to a cul-de-sac, contribute to suitability (Felson 1998:53-60 in Vito and etc, 2007:69).

Routine activities theory approaches the crime phenomenon with a macro perspective and notes that it is related to the social behavioral patterns and daily activities. Explaining that it is not possible for the individuals to achieve the goals determined by the society always via legitimate ways, this theory highlights that some individuals gain such ends via illegal ways, and further that the macro scale social processes determine the life styles of potential criminals and victims (Paulsen and Robinson 2004:102). In this sense, we can deduct that the offenders learn certain behaviors and incline for crime by embracing such behavioral patterns. Williams and McShane (1999) defines the major hypothesis of the theory below:

- 1) Members of society share a common set of values that emphasize the desirability of certain life goals, especially that of success.
- 2) There are Standard avenues- legitimate and illegitimate- for achieving these goals.
- 3) These two general avenues (opportunity structures) are not equally available to all groups and classes of society.

- 4) Members of the middle and upper classes have primary access to the legitimate opportunity structure (business, politics) while members of the lower class have primary access to the illegitimate opportunity structure (organized crime).
- 5) In any urban, lower-class area, the degree of integration of these two opportunity structures determines the social organization of the community. The less the integration, the more the community is disorganized.
- 6) Communities with well-organized and integrated illegal opportunity structures provide learning environments for organized criminal behavior. In such communities, the male delinquent subculture takes on either of two ideal forms that are dependent on degree of access to the illegitimate structure:
 - a) When an opportunity to participate successfully in the illegitimate structure is available to young males, the sub-cultural gang type most commonly found will be criminal gang. This form of gang serves as a training ground for the form of illegitimate activity found in the community.
 - b) When opportunities for joining the illegitimate structure as limited are those for joining the legitimate structure, the most common form of sub-cultural gang will be a retreatist gang. Here the gang members are basically withdrawn from the community and they solve their problem of access drugs.
- 7) Disorganized communities exert weak social controls and create disorganized gang subcultures. When young males are deprived of both legitimate and criminal opportunities, the common form of gang subculture will be a conflict gang. Such gangs engage in violence and destructive acts against both opportunity structures.

Routine activities theory emphasizes the change trends in crime rates results from the changes in daily activities of individuals in macro scale. The earliest studies on this subject were conducted by the founders of this theory; Cohen and Felson. Cohen and Felson (1979) tried to examine the impacts of only two variables of three they defined in their study. They attempted to measure the effect of the variables; suitable targets and the absence of capable guardians, but they did not deal with the motivated offender variable (in Akers and Sellers, 2009:37). The study investigates the effect of the factors such as change in daily activities, increase in speed of circulation of individuals and commercial goods and commodities on fear of crime. “they presented data on trends in family activities, consumer products, and businesses and found that these correlated with trends in the rates of all major predatory violent and property crimes (in Akers and Sellers, 2009: 37).

In their study based on the routine activities theory, Messner and Blau (1987) examined the relation of domestic activities and non-domestic activities with the crime. The study tests the hypothesis that basically household activities will deter the individuals from crime and non-household activities on the other hand are dangerous in terms of orientation to crime. The study based on these two categories investigated the relation between leisure time activities and the crime. According to this, it was revealed that there is a meaningful relation between the nature, quality and place of the leisure activities and the crime. According to this study, Messner and Blau conclude that:

“We have predicted that the volume of non-household activities will be positively related to rates of crime... We have predicted that the volume of household leisure activities will be negatively associated with the rates of crime. The results of regression analyses for a sample of SMSAs strongly supports these expectations” (Messner and Blau 1987:1047).

Osgood and etc (1996) examined the relation between the leisure time activities of the young individuals aging 18 to 26 and the crime. Their study covered the activities of the young realized outside such as car driving, partying, going to cinema, volunteering activities, sports and shopping, and the activities done at home such as watching television, reading a book and staying home. 5 different deviant behaviors are defined to research whether there is a relation of these behaviors with the crime, which are alcohol consumption, smoking marihuana, use of other drugs and reckless driving. The study concluded that there is a meaningful relation between the unstructured activities, that is, performed without depending on a certain pattern and time (driving, going to a party, etc.) and the crime (Osgood and etc 1996:645). This questionnaire applied on more than 1700 young people at the age range of 18 – 26 revealed the risk of certain activities, notably the risk of tendency for criminal behavior.

Ferraro prescribes that the primary points of the routine activities theory can also be implemented in terms of fear of crime. This theory states whether the criminals will commit an offense based on their evaluations for any region. Thinking that this opinion might also be valid for the potential victims, Ferraro explains that the individuals make inferences about whether a region a safe or not. According to this approach “If one believes they are in the company of motivated offenders in the absence of capable guardians, and they feel they are personally unable to deter a possible attack, their assessment of risk will increase, and so will the chances of a fearful reaction” (Melde 2007: 50).

Thinking that individuals’ formation of any idea about their environment and their actions in accordance with this idea will not be valid for only the criminals, Ferraro applied the routine activities theory to the potential victims and ordinary individuals. Ferraro’s approach is to work on crime as a multidimensional phenomenon and to examine what kind of conclusions these dimensions have for the individuals.

Considered in this aspect, the risk assessment model interprets the phenomena occurring at both macro and micro level in terms of fear of crime.

Ferraro used the ideas of the symbolic interactionists to explain how the fear of crime varies in individual terms. In a similar manner, this approach deals with how the environmental features affect the fear of crime on individuals. Ferraro (1995) investigated the outcomes of the daily behavioral patterns and lifestyles on fear of crime lastly with the criminal opportunity theory. The model aims to take up the impacts of interaction levels of the individuals at micro level on fear of crime. The risk assessment model aims to examine the effects of the macro level environmental conditions and structures on fear of crime in addition to the micro level personal relations (Ferraro 1995:15).

Risk assessment model notes the requirement of dealing with the fear of crime as a multi-dimensional phenomenon and of evaluation of each of these dimensions for fear of crime. Clearly speaking, the risk assessment model states that other than the main demographic indicators of the crime; the environmental factors, previous exposure to crime, daily life styles and perceived risk of individuals regarding their residence areas are elements diversifying the fear of crime.

Another advantage of the risk assessment model is the evaluation of the impact created by the environmental properties on individuals from the point of fear of crime. In this regard, individuals' adjusting their behaviors according to the environmental features they live in and the personal differences formed within this context are significant indicators in terms of fear of crime (Ferraro, 1995). The personal differences in the perception of environmental features and of the risk will

mean the diversification of fear of crime, and thus of constrained behaviors. As in the case of different interpretations of certain environmental properties and events by each individual, the opposite of this situation may be experienced in some cases. To illustrate, certain crime incidences and environmental disorders may draw the attention of people, and these stimuli may cause worries in individuals about their safety (Innes, 2004: 336).

Risk assessment model makes a differentiation in terms of fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization. The fear of crime and risk of victimization are separate from each other in certain points though these two seem similar concepts at the first glance. While fear of crime examines the fear phenomenon to occur as a result of victimization, the risk of victimization is interested in finding out to what extent the individuals feel themselves in risk in terms of being exposed to crime rather than the fear as a result of the crime.

The fear of crime, and risk perception are two phenomena having numerous intersecting common points with each other. To be clearer, risk perception appears as an element directly affecting the fear of crime phenomenon. Within this context, increase or decrease in risk perception is a determinant for fear of crime. Thus, there is a positive correlation between the risk perception and fear of crime (Villarreal and Silva, 2006).

The fact that risk perception and fear of crime have quite many common points and that generally the individuals with higher risk perception hold higher fear of crime gives the impression that these two concepts have similar properties or measure the same phenomena. Nonetheless, risk perception and fear of crime may sometimes

lead to different conclusions. Emphasizing that fear of crime and risk perception are different concepts, Larange and Ferraro (1989) stress that an approach attempting to measure the fear of crime only over the risk perception might miss some points. Addressing the fear of crime and risk perception as the same phenomena may result in erroneous conclusions while operationalizing the fear of crime.

“Questions that ask respondents how safe they think they are from crime or what the likelihood is of their being victimized by crime are asking people to estimate their risk of being victimized, not how afraid they are of being victimized. Judgments of risk and feelings of fear are two distinct perceptions. Simply because people think they are unlikely to be crime victims does not mean they are unafraid of crime, nor does a heightened sense of perceived risk automatically translate into heightened feelings of fear. And equal levels of perceived risk do not generate equal levels of fear among all people” (LaGrange and Ferraro 1989: 698-699).

Despite the fact that the risk perception and fear of crime are generally seen as concepts similar to each other and in positive correlation with one another, these two concepts are totally different from each other in some cases. To illustrate, the risk perception of a young person who is a member of a youth gangs in a region with rather higher rate of crime may be found higher and on the other hand, the fear of crime of a young individual who is personally inside many risk acts will most probably be lower. This is so because the individuals make a personal security assessment based on the subculture they possess and the status of his interaction with the criminal individuals.

The perceived risk may vary by the conditions of the environment the individual lives in, living conditions, ethnicity status in the subject area, frequency of following the media, and any previous victimization. Yet, individuals having high perceived risk may not always hold fear of crime in the same level. Even if the individual thinks of the possibility of being a victim of a crime, he may not be afraid of exposure to a crime. Ferraro (1995) underlines that; the fear of crime is a perception occurring as a result of the evaluations of the findings by the individuals regarding their personal security. The individuals make an inference about their personal safety by interacting with the people around, by assessing to what extent their daily activities pose a risk and by taking into account the environmental conditions.

2.9. Campus and Fear of Crime

Fear of crime behaviors of university students is a significant field of study for the developed countries. The universities of the countries such as the United States, England, where the language of instruction is English, are the destination for a good deal of students from different religion, language and race. Coexistence of such different identities and cultures is a factor influencing the risk perception of students. Fisher et al. (1998) point out that campus crimes across the United States of America are now perceived as a major problem and that the government is putting new implementations in order to find out the campus crimes and to take measures related to such crimes.

“In 1990, Congress passed the Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act (20 USC 1092), which requires colleges and universities that participate in federal financial aid programs to publish statistics for specific on-campus FBI Index

offenses, liquor and drug violations, and weapon possession. The law also mandates that institutions make available their respective crime prevention and security policies and procedures. Interest in claims of increased on-campus crime continues to hold the attention of Congress.” (Fisher et al. 1998: 672).

Ever increasing importance of the campus crimes have given rise to the studies developed oriented at measurement of the student victimization at the campus. Baum and Klaus, (2005) signify the properties related to the crime of violence that the university students experienced in the years between 1995 and 2002 in their study, as below, prepared based on the National Crime Victimization Survey conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics:

- 58% were committed by strangers.
- 41% of offenders were perceived to be using alcohol or drugs.
- 93% of crimes occurred off campus, of which 72% occurred at night (Baum and Klaus 2005:3).

In a similar research analyzing the crime victimization of students, Fisher et al. (1998) note that more than one third of 3472 students determined by means of random selection method at 12 universities across the United States were exposed to a crime in the academic year of 1993 – 1994 (Fisher et al. 1998: 671).

These striking data in the crime victimization of the university students are accompanied by the studies examining the fear of crime of the university students in parallel with this approach (Fisher and Sloan 2003, Hilinski 2007, Kelly and DeKeseredy 1994 Hickman and Muehlendard 1997, McConnell 1997). When we evaluated in this respect, fear of crime constitutes a major field of research and study

as a phenomenon affecting the quality of life of the university students who comprise the young and educated segment of the population.

Fear of crime phenomenon is rather a new field in Turkey although it is gradually gaining importance particularly in developed countries with quite many studies conducted in this field. Dolu and et al. (2010) note that there are only two studies on fear of crime made in the cities of Malatya and Erzincan up to now in Turkey, and underline that there is not a national level study yet. In this sense, lack of a national level research on fear of crime “means that the critical data needed in terms of policy makers shaping the public policies in the domain of criminal justice are missing” (Dolu et al., 2010:73).

When we review the conclusions of the study done in the province of Malatya, one of the first conducted on fear of crime in Turkey, we see that women hold higher fear of crime compared to men. Still, the results of the study show that people with lower degree of education have higher rates of fear of crime than the ones with high education levels. Likewise, people in the lower income levels have more fear of crime when compared with the people of high income. Another major conclusion of the research is that those finding the street lighting insufficient hold higher fear of crime than the people thinking that the street lighting is adequate (Uludağ et al., 2009 in Dolu et al., 2010:72).

Examination of the conclusions of the study on fear of crime conducted on 1745 people in the province of Elazığ reveals that individuals with high level of education have more security concerns than the people with lower level of education in contrast with the Malatya sample. This research highlights that crime victimization and

residing in a detached house are the elements heightening the safety concerns of the individuals (Polat and Gül 2009 in Dolu et al., 2010:73).

One other study we have found in the literate review to have been made on the subject except for the studies conducted in the provinces of Malatya and Erzincan is the research on fear of crime Özaşçılar and Ziyalar (2009) made oriented at 554 university students in the range of age 18 to 25 living in Istanbul. The significance of this study for our dissertation is the fact the sampling group consists of the university students as in the case of our study. Another common thread of the study is that it has employed the risk perception approach as we have done in our dissertation.

In their study, Özaşçılar and Ziyalar (2009) took the Fear of Crime Interpretation Victimization Risk scale of Ferraro (1995) as basis. Though Ferraro's scale comprises appropriate question types for the general population structure, it includes questions which are not that meaningful for the students of a developing country like Turkey. As an example, the fear of car theft given in the scale is extremely low in the results of the study for this age group. Özaşçılar and Ziyalar (2009:16) explained the reason for this data referring to the majority of students' not possessing a car.

Özaşçılar and Ziyalar (2009) found in their studies that fear of crime phenomenon is higher in women compared to men in parallel with the literature. The study determined that the highest fear of crime victimization is burglary while at home with the average 7.63. This fear is followed by fear of rape and sexual assault with an average of 7.34; being robbed and snatched in the street with the average of 7.34 (Özaşçılar and Ziyalar, 2009:10).

Our study aims to measure the fear of crime over the crimes, which university students might more likely experience, instead of exact copying the scale of Ferraro (1995). Therefore, our study covers the measurement of fear of crime to result from theft, robbery, simple attack, severe assault and sexual abuse. The reason for measuring the fear of crime over these certain crimes is there are potential crimes the university students may experience. Another reason to include these types of crime in our study is that they are included among the crime types in the studies made oriented at measurement of fear of crime of the university students (Hilinski 2007:70).

2.10. METU Campus Structure

To date, no study has been conducted on campus and fear of crime in Turkey. In this respect, there is not any local reference source to make use of as a guide for our study. Different campus structures and university buildings located at city centers across Turkey make it rather difficult to make a national scale research oriented at measuring the fear of crime at campus. The reason for this case is that most universities especially the ones in the metropolitan cities have their departments in various parts of the city and they do not have a campus structure in this sense.

Differences in the structures of universities and lack of campus complex architecture of most universities may result in non-function of questions about fear of crime in the campus. In this sense, fear of crime at the university is a component varying based on the city and area of the university. To illustrate such diversity, there are total universities in Ankara, 4 of which are state universities (Ankara, Gazi, METU and Hacettepe) and, 7 of which are foundation [private] universities (Atılım,

Başkent, Bilkent, Çankaya, TOBB ETU, Turgut Ozal and Ufuk). However, the departments of the Universities of Hacettepe, Gazi and Ankara are in different regions of the city. Moreover, the university campuses at the city center do not have units such as accommodation, food, etc.

Hacettepe and Bilkent Universities and the Middle East Technical University [METU] are the only universities having a complex campus structures in Ankara. METU is a university where life goes on day and night with any kind of facilities addressing to the needs of the students such accommodation, sports halls, cafés and restaurants open at night, cultural and convention centers, bank. Considering this status of METU, its campus is a suitable research environment for measuring the on-campus fear of crime of the students. Determining the level of fear of crime of students affecting their quality of life in such a campus environment where the students can fulfill their needs will contribute to giving shape to the policies regarding the student safety.

The Middle East Technical University has been established on November 15, 1956 under the name of the Middle East Higher Technology Institute. The establishment purpose of the university is to provide contribution to Turkey and the Middle East countries and to this end, to educate and train people in the fields and science and social sciences. “Its earliest years, part of METU was located in a small building that belonged Social Security Office of Retirees at Kizilay's Müdafaa Street and the other section was located in the barracks behind the TBMM (Turkey's National Grand Assembly). In 1963, the University moved to its current campus location which is the first university campus of Turkey.” (<http://odtu.edu.tr/about/misguide.php>).

The Middle East Technical University is located within the borders of the province of Ankara towards the west of the city center. The university campus has undergone great transformation up to date since its establishment in 1963. Since then, the forestation has commenced, and buildings important for the student social life such as sports hall, convention centers, and shopping centers have been built. The area of the METU campus is 45,000 decares and the forest land covers an area of 30,430 decares (<http://odtu.edu.tr/about/misguide.php>). Such vast expansion of the campus area brings about its desolated status for some parts of the campus especially after evening hours. This situation of the campus area for our subject means that is the probability that it may influence the fear of crime of the students.

There are 40 different undergraduate programs, 3 of which are international, at the Middle East Technical University. Other than the undergraduate programs, 97 masters and 62 doctoral programs are carried out by the relevant institutes. The number of students enrolled at the METU is over 23,000 for the academic year 2007 – 2008 including 4,500 master students and 2,700 doctorate students (<http://odtu.edu.tr/about/misguide.php>).

The METU is the most prestigious university across Turkey in terms of the education standards. High standards of the education, economic and cultural facilities are the reasons why the candidate students choose to study at METU. “Each year, more than one third of the top 1000 high school graduates with the highest scores in the University Entrance Exams administered nation-wide prefer METU. Since there is a great demand for studying at METU, most of the departments of METU admit only those students ranking in the top three percent segment among approximately one and a half million students sitting on the University Entrance Exam” (<http://odtu.edu.tr/about/misguide.php>). In this sense, it would not incorrect to say

that METU is one of the universities that the prospective university students desire most.

METU has a quite developed campus structures enabling numerous social and cultural facilities and opportunities. The university has a cultural and convention center where plays and concerts are organized in addition to the scientific seminars and meetings. Other than these, there is a large shopping center where the students can eat, shop and do banking and postal transactions. METU has many different types of facilities in terms of the sports activities as well. Two gymnasiums and one open stadium as well as swimming pool, tennis and basketball courts allow students to do various sports. For accommodation, there are dormitories for male and female students, guesthouses and lodgments for lecturers. The total capacity of the private and public dormitories is around 6,000 (<http://odtu.edu.tr/about/misguide.php>), which means that the number of students staying at the campus is quite high, thus it points out to a lively campus life.

The security at the Middle East Technical University was being ensured by the gendarmerie and the officers subordinated to the directorate of the internal services of the university until August 1, 2009. There was also a gendarmerie station in charge of the campus security. The gendarmerie officers and privates would swiftly intervene with any disorder and incident. It has been resolved by a regulation issued by the Government in 2009 that the responsibility in terms of security of all the areas within the borders of district and province municipalities is vested in the police and the areas outside these borders be vested in the gendarmerie. As a result of this resolution pertaining to the jurisdiction, the gendarmerie station at the METU was vacated and the campus has been given to the jurisdiction of the police. But, no police station has been established to replace the gendarmerie station at the campus; instead, it has been notified that the police will arrive at the campus to take action for any event as necessary.

The campus security at METU is provided by the directorate of the internal services in addition to the police since 2009. For the security of the campus, people other than the university students or those associated with the university can only enter into the campus upon check by leaving their identity cards at the campus entrance. The rules applied for the entrance into the campus means that the students do not come across with different social sections. Clearly saying, the students may feel more secure and safe at the campus since it is low probability to encounter with people of different sections than the students.

Another application in terms of the campus security is the video surveillance cameras installed at central locations of the university. The information we have received from the directorate of internal services states that the security surveillance cameras are installed at the campus entrances and office of the president. The officer from the internal services we met said that in addition to these cameras, some departments have installed security cameras in line with their desire and these cameras are controlled by both the relevant department and the internal services in necessary cases. In addition to monitoring the images from these cameras, the duties and tasks of the internal services concerning the campus security are as stated below:

- Ensuring the security and safety within the campus area and taking the related precautions.
- Daily continuously inspection and check of the university entrance gates and buildings.
- Monitor and inspection of temporary workers employed for in-campus construction works.
- Provision of the necessary security during student upheavals.

2.11. Kızılay City Center

Ankara is a city made the capital of newly founded Turkey after the proclamation of the Republic and the development of which quickly gained pace with this process. While the city was a small residential area prior to the Republic, it has gained importance following the proclamation of the Republic and settlement has begun over a planned urbanization along with this process. As the capital of a newly founded state, Ankara is under fast settlement and through a process of high rates of urbanization in parallel with the migration.

During the earliest years of the Republic, Ankara resumed its development over the Ulus quarter and its surrounding area as a result of the settlements over the foot of the castle as brought from the past. In this period, the Ulus square and its surrounding became one the most significant regions of the city. In the first years of the Republic, the Ulus square and its vicinity were leading locations most frequently used by the public. Existing of the First Grand National Assembly of Turkey in Ulus is an indicator of prominence of this area for not only the public but also the government institutions (Cıkıt ve Taçyıldız, 2010).

The initial settlement plan of Ankara was prepared in 1932 by Herman Jansen. This plan forecasted a population of 300,000 and the arrangements were being made according to this population density. One striking feature of the plan is that it allows a kind of settlement more environmentally friendly and allocating large spaces rather than an urbanization understanding of quite close and high development. Trees planted along the roads and buildings not exceeding four storeys are among the characteristics of this period (Kacar, 2010:50).

Notably after 1950s, Ankara underwent a rather accelerated urbanization process as a result of the policies of mechanization and industrialization. During this period, a new plan was put into practice and the Kızılay square came to the foreground in the meanwhile. 3 – 4 storey structures characterizing the previous period were gradually replaced by higher buildings. “In the new plan, Ulus area has been announced as the ‘traditional center’; Kızılay area has been determined as the new center; thus, demolition of the settlement regions extending to the south of the city in the post-Republican period started and during the course of the time, the pattern belonging to the old culture became unprotected” (Akdemir, 2009: 81),

The Kızılay square started to emerge as the business center of the city due to the rapid urbanization process. This speedy transformation after the 1980s made the Kızılay area as the primary center of the city. Cıkıt and Taçyıldız (2010) put stress on the properties of this transformation as follows: “... shift of the population, previously settled in city centers, towards the newly developed suburban settlement areas brought along the vacation of the dwellings in the city centers. While the city expanded towards its peripheries, the global capital produced its specific places with office blocks and shopping centers across various regions of the city and the urban geography has gained a multi-centered structure.”

Today, Kızılay has turned into a region having a good deal of formations in both cultural and social sense such as business and shopping centers, entertainment places, language and driving courses, ticket sales offices, etc. The cultural, social and commercial formations have made Kızılay a busy area at day and night. When considered in this regard, Kızılay area has become one of the most important areas where any university student studying in Ankara frequently visits. Therefore, Kızılay area may be accepted as a major point in terms of student safety and fear of crime.

CHAPTER

3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter of our study will contain information on which approach has been utilized in dealing with fear of crime, what the hypotheses with relation to this approach are and with which kind of questions the variables that we wanted to measure in our research have been measured. The methodology chapter of our research will include the justifications of the method employed in the hypotheses regarding the study. The methodological approaches used will not be described only in technical level, but also the link between the technique used and theory will be explained in detail. When we evaluate from this perspective, the study will scrutinize the reasons for the connection between the methodology and the theory, and will reveal the methodological phrases used in a detailed way in parallel with the approached dealt with.

The methodology chapter of the study will also contain information on the properties of the sampling, how the data have been collected, pilot study regarding the research and considerations on the limitations of the research in addition to the chapters such as research questions, definition of dependent and independent variables and hypotheses. From this point, in this chapter where we handle the methodological part of the research, it is planned that the technical information on the method will be included as much as the relation between the research method and theory.

3.1. Type of the Study

This study aims first of all to measure the fear of crime of the students from the Middle East Technical University in the campus and in Kızılay area. Unavailability of a study measuring the fear of crime of university students in the campus or at any other region is a component making it difficult for the descriptive dimension of this study. In this sense, the fear of crime of student relating to the campus and Kızılay will be studied in detail with the relevant questions.

Yet, the study does not have only have the descriptive dimension as expected from a doctorate thesis. Our study intends to test the hypotheses regarding how the fear of crime of university students varies in parallel with the risk assessment approach, which has a prominent place in the literature, following the examination of different approaches in the fear of crime literature.

From this aspect, our study will apply the risk assessment model of Ferraro (1995), which has a prominent place in the literature on fear of crime, and will investigate how the variables used in the model affect the fear of crime. Our study is in this sense a case study, and will show how the model works in terms of METU campus and Kızılay area. Thus, this is important to put forward which points share a similarity with, or differ from the other studies done by risk assessment perspective in the literature on crime sociology to be able to see the reflections of fear of crime in developing countries such as Turkey.

3.2. Design of the Questionnaire and Pilot Study

Our study has reviewed the foreign and domestic literature on fear of crime and the questionnaire on the fear of crime oriented at the university students has been designed in line with the risk interpretation model of Ferraro (1995). In addition to this, the questions and application field of the research have been changed according to the interviews that were carried out by the researcher with the scholars of the subject and warnings. So, fear of crime investigation of undergraduate students related to the METU campus has been expanded and questions aiming at measuring the fear of crime in Kızılay area have been included in the study.

Based on the literature review and scholars recommendations, it has been decided not to use the original scale that Ferraro (1995) uses in his risk assessment approach. The reason for this is that the scale used by Ferraro (1995) may reduce the functionality of these questions due to both the cultural differences and the respondents being university students. To illustrate, fear of car theft included in the fear of crime study for the age group of 18-24 in Istanbul by Özaşçılar and Ziyalar (2009) who based their study on the Fear of Crime Interpretation Victimization Risk Scale by Ferraro (1995) has been found rather low, which can be associated with the inter-countries cultural differences and socio-economic traits of the age group examined. In this sense, our study has considered more appropriate to employ a questionnaire for fear of crime containing the probable victimization kinds that university students may experience. The questionnaire has been formed in line with the studies of Fisher and Sloan (2003) and Hilinski (2007).

Another determinant for the questionnaire questions is the criticisms received from the scholars interviewed in crime sociology that the campus structure in Turkey is different from the campuses in the United States of America, where many studies on fear of crimes are conducted oriented at the university students. The scholars we have interviewed stated that strangers can easily enter at most of the campuses across the United States of America, which in turn increase the fear of crime of students there. On the other hand, in Turkey, the campus boundaries are restricted to a certain area for many universities, and the campuses are closed to strangers by assigning security personnel at the gates and around the campus. METU is a university under a strict protection at the gates of the campus. In this context, the scholar we have talked said that the fear of crime will be found very low at a place under strict surveillance and control, and highlighted that it would be more meaningful to compare the campus area with another region.

From these criticisms, our study has included the questions measuring the fear of crime in the campus and the Kızılay area. The choice of Kızılay area is based on the fact that this area is the downtown of the capital, and thus it is one of the place where the students mostly go and that a good many people of different social and economic identities happen to be in Kızılay. This situation is seen as a factor affecting the fear of crime in the relevant literature. Therefore, it would be more meaningful to compare the fear of crime of students pertaining to the campus, which we can consider as a protected area with the fear of crime of students in Kızılay, which is an intersection point of many different sub-cultures. The fear of crime questionnaire relating to Kızılay has been prepared by incorporating questions parallel to the campus fear of crime questions since we wanted to make a more sound comparison between the campus and Kızılay area in terms of the same crime types.

After determining the questions of fear of crime related to the Kızılay and Campus, a pilot study oriented at 30 university students at the campus has been conducted to measure the validity of these questions. Points such as fear of crime questions being

obtained from a foreign source, modification of certain questions and adaptation to the METU campus structure, made it necessary to test whether these questions are valid. In this context, seeing whether the questions work by means of the pilot study conducted is a prerequisite for a healthier analysis. The researcher personally conducted the pilot study to better see the functionality of the questions, and personally checked if there is comprehension problem with regard to the questions asked. Carrying out both the pilot study and generally the questionnaire by the researcher has been preferred because it has eliminated the misunderstanding and misdirection to arise from the poll takers. The data entry from 30 questionnaires has been done after the pilot study, and components such as marking, distributions, etc. of the data entered has been checked. As a result of these processes, it has been found out that there is no problem with the questions and questionnaire is comprehensible.

3.3. Sampling

Our study aims to measure the fear of crime of undergraduate students studying at the Middle East Technical University by means of the questionnaire questions. The target population of the study is the undergraduate students of the Middle East Technical University. To have a healthier reflection of the target population sampling in our study, we have requested the METU Office of Registrar to provide us with the total number of students at undergraduate classes and distribution of these students according to the classes.

The Registrar of the Middle East Technical University stated that the number of undergraduate students at the academic year of 2009-2010, in which our questionnaire was conducted, is 15794. Yet, no information about the distribution of students according to the classes was available. Therefore, our study has aimed to

taken the numbers of students studying at Basic English Department, Grade 1, Grade 2, Grade 3 and Grade 4 into account as being equal.

Our sampling has been formed by utilizing the random sample method. Our sampling initially has aimed to get in touch with total 600 students. 120 students from each grade have been included in the questionnaire to make intergrades comparison and to ensure proper age distribution. However, 497 of 600 questionnaires have been found valid and included in our analysis. Considering from this point, our research has been administered on 497 students from all undergraduate classes including the Basic English Department at the Middle East Technical University at the academic term 2009/2010. 223 of the responding students were male (44.9%) and 274 of the students were female (55.1%). The distribution of the sampling according to the gender and classes are as the following:

Table 1 Distribution of Sampling According to Classes

Class Studied	Sex		Total Frequency	Percent
	Male	Female		
Basic English Department	46	56	102	% 20.5
Grade One	57	58	115	% 23.1
Grade Two	39	55	94	% 18.9
Grade Three	41	54	95	% 19.1
Grade Four	40	51	91	% 18.3
Total	223	274	497	% 100

3.4. Importance of Study and Benefits of Model Employed

Fear of crime is a phenomenon affecting the quality of living of individuals and being influential on their daily behaviors. In this sense, higher fear of crime adversely affects the quality of living of the individuals. The fear of crime does not always have a structure exhibiting similarity with the crime rates in the society; so residents of a region with higher crime rates may not hold high fear of crime at all times. This situation puts forward the requirement to comprehensively examine the fear of crime, which is a major variable in terms of quality of life for the individuals.

Studies on fear of crime are conducted frequently in many developed countries like the United States, England and Germany. The reason for the studies in those countries is that the governments, local municipalities and security organizations seek to better perceive the various aspects of fear of crime being a crucial phenomenon in terms of the living standards of the individuals. In a similar manner, the studies developed especially oriented at the university students in the United States investigate the association between the campus and fear of crime. Our study aims to examine the dimensions of fear of crime of the undergraduate students of the Middle East Technical University, and more specifically to measure the level of fear of crime of the students at the campus and in Kızılay area.

Our study aims to deal with the concept of students' fear of crime in a multi-dimensional way. In this sense, the study will measure to what degree the students are uneasy and afraid of victimization rather than the probability of only victimization to a crime. Prior to the risk assessment approach, the fear of crime studies were measuring the fear of crime over the perceived risk of victimization.

Asking the individuals the probability of their victimization, this approach is criticized by most criminologists arguing that it does not in real meaning measure the fear of crime (Garafalo and Laub 1978, Dubow and etc 1979 in Hwang 2006). From this respect, the risk assessment approach makes the discrimination between the fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization. In this regard, it differentiates the fear of crime from the possibility of victimization of the individuals to any crime, and enables in this sense a more comprehensive analysis.

Ferraro's (1995) risk interpretation model we have employed in our study handles the fear of crime in a multi-dimensional aspect. In this sense, it does not probe only into the relation between the demographic variables and fear of crime as do most of the studies on fear of crime. This approach altogether evaluates the phenomena influencing the fear of crime such as environmental properties, perceived risk of victimization, previous experiences of victimization along with the demographic variables.

One other major strength of the risk interpretation model is it takes the impacts of fear of crime not only micro level but also macro level impacts into consideration. From this view, macro level phenomenon like environmental disorder perception is included in the analysis of the fear of crime as well as the demographic variables such as age and gender and individuals characteristics like victimization. Examination of the effects of the perception of residence environment on fear of crime beside the demographic features of the university students means to see the effect of the macro-level changes on fear of crime.

One other advantage of the risk assessment approach we have utilized in measurement of the fear of crime of the university students is that this approach measures the fear of crime over certain types of crime not in a quite general way. In this sense, investigation of fear of crime over certain crimes to which the students may experience allows to make healthier analyses. Thus, our study will examine the effect of certain crimes such as theft, robbery, assault and sexual abuse. By this means, an approach making evaluations over more apparent and specific crimes instead of more general and fictional approach will enable to provide more realistic answers to the fear of crime questions of the students.

3.5. Research Questions

With reference to the risk interpretation model of Ferraro (1995), our study inquires into the fear of crime over individual characteristics, victimization, environmental properties, perceived risk of victimization and constrained behaviors. In this way, what each variable means for the fear of crime and research questions concerning these variables will be included in the study. After specifying the research questions, what these variables mean for the model will briefly be explained and the hypotheses of our study will be put forward in parallel to the research questions.

The goal of this study is to unfold various aspects of fear of crime. More clearly, the field of investigation of our study will comprise what factors affect the fear of crime, and which variables are influential on fear of crime. Reflections of different, not merely one single variable, demographic and environmental effects on fear of crime of students will be examined. The study intends to assess the fear of crime over more specific and potential situations rather than a general and hypothetical approach. The

advantage of examination of students' fear of crime over certain crimes and situations is it gives the opportunity to more correctly analyze their worries regarding the crime in their daily lives.

Demographic variables like age, gender, and race are the primary issues elaborated by the fear of crime studies since it first made its appearance. Different gender, age or race of the individuals is a factor creating serious effects on their fear of crime, which originates from the effect of mentioned individuals characteristics on risk perception of the individuals. Still, social determinations and prejudices on demographic properties such as gender, age, race, etc. are significant in terms of the said differentiation as well as in terms of fear of crime just life in other sociological problems. Our study will look for the answers to the following questions in order to probe into what the demographic variables mean for fear of crime.

Is there a relation between the age of students and fear of crime?

To what extent does the fear of crime of undergraduate students at the Middle East Technical University vary based on gender?

Is there is a relation between the residence areas of students and their fear of crime?

Does the fear of crime of the students residing in the campus differ from the fear of crime of those students living outside the campus?

Another fact mattering in terms of fear of crime is victimization. Whether the individuals were victimized to any crime in their previous life experiences is a phenomenon influencing their fear of crime. Nature, time and place of occurrences of these crimes are an element affecting the fear of crime of that individual for a region. Victimization may happen indirectly as well, not only directly. In this sense, indirect

victimization can be illustrated by victimization of a relative, friend and being notified of the same.

It is not the purpose of this study to examine the impacts of victimization in terms of fear of crime together with the other demographic variables. Victimization underlines that in micro level previous life experiences of individuals about a crime are significant for fear of crime. The victimization phenomenon is dealt with in detail both directly and indirectly. In this respect, our study will seek answers to the questions below for the purpose of better investigation the dimensions of the association between victimization and fear of crime.

What effects does the victimization of students have in terms of fear of crime?

What kind of a relation is there between the nature of crime exposed to and fear of crime?

Except for direct victimization, what are the impacts of indirect victimization on fear of crime?

Which of the concepts; direct or indirect victimization, is more determinant in terms of fear of crime?

Environmental properties comprise another variable of our study. In the risk interpretation approach, the importance of macro variables is emphasized as much as individual characteristics. In this sense, the living environment and perceptions regarding this environment is a significant variables in terms of fear of crime. The security perceptions of the individuals towards the environment they are in are

formed as a result of the interaction they establish with different people. It is possible that such an interaction may demonstrate itself not only individual level but also in institutional level. To state more clearly, campus is a public domain belonging to the university. In this sense, institutional structure plays an efficient role in the security perception pertaining to this area. The individuals determine the risks for the environment they are in over both institutional and personal interactions, and do take precautions based on these interactions. The research questions regarding the environmental properties and fear of crime are as given below:

How does environmental perception towards any region affect fear of crime?

Does the perception of environmental disorder of the individuals for an area influence the fear of crime for a different region?

Which of the perceptions, social or physical disorder perception, is a determining variable in terms of fear of crime?

Perceived risk of victimization constitutes one of the most significant variables for Ferraro's (1995) risk assessment model. According to this model suggesting the possibility of exposure to any crime event of the individuals is a major determiner in terms of fear of crime, this risk perception heightens the fear of crime on the one hand and causes the individuals to constrain their behaviors and to take measures to diminish the risk of exposure to crime on the other. From this standpoint, the probability of the individuals who consider the risk of exposure to a crime as high to exhibit constrained behaviors and their fear of crime are both higher. The research questions on perceived risk of victimization are given below:

Is the perceived risk of victimization of the students a factor influencing their fear of crime?

To what degree does the perceived risk of victimization at the campus and in Kızılay differ?

What are the types of crimes resulting in higher perceived risk of victimization of the students?

Is there any difference students' perceived risk of victimization in terms of gender?

One other variable employed in the risk interpretation approach is constituted by the constrained behaviors. Stressing that the risk of being exposed to crime of the individuals forces them to take up certain precautions, Ferraro (1995) highlights these behaviors are an effective variable on fear of crime. The individuals assess their own perceived risks and make changes in some of their behaviors taking into account the features of the environment they live in. These security-related behaviors are categorized mainly as defensive and avoidance. The avoidance behaviors are seen in the form of individuals' abstaining from going to certain regions or accompanied by someone else. On the other hand, the situations such as individual's carrying a tool on themselves for security purposes against any danger can be given as examples of defensive behaviors. The research questions on the constrained behaviors are given below:

Are the constrained behaviors an element influencing the fear of crime?

Is there a difference between Kızılay and the campus in terms of constrained behaviors?

3.6. Definitions of Variables and Hypotheses

Definition of the independent variables used in the risk interpretation model and noting down the hypotheses relating to these independent variables are important in terms of testing the functionality of the model. This chapter will provide information on the questions about the variables after briefly explaining these variables employed in the risk interpretation model. Following the definitions of the independent variables, the information on the content of the questions concerning these variables will be given. The relation of the questions utilized in the model to the independent variable and according to which criteria they are determined will be expressed in short. The hypotheses of the study will be presented after the independent variables are defined and brief information on the questions is provided. Our hypotheses will separately be included in the relevant chapters on each independent variable.

Description of the independent variables used in the model is a significant process to understand the effects of these variables in terms of fear of crime. In this aspect, what the independent variables defined mean in the literature on fear of crime will be in few highlighted and the association of the independent variables with the theory will be touched on in a few words. In this sense, the link between the theoretical information significant in terms of a scientific study and the empirical facts will be established in a sounder style. Our study will present a short piece of information on the dependent variables to be used following the definition of the independent variables and reveal of the hypotheses. Our study will proceed with the analysis chapter after justifying the reasons for defining these variables as dependent variables.

3.6.1 Individual Characteristics

One of fundamental reasons that the fear of crime varies among the individuals results from individual characteristics. Individual characteristics such as sex, age, ethnic identity, income come to the prominence as components influencing the fear of crime. The earliest studies done on this subject attempted to establish a link between the personal characteristics of the individuals and fear of crime, and more comprehensive studies on fear of crime continue to investigate the effects of individual characteristics on fear of crime.

In this sense, our study examines the impact of certain individual characteristics, as one of the most significant independent variables affecting fear of crime, on fear of crime. In addition to this, certain demographic properties of each region, school or neighborhood considered to be examined draw the attention as an element affecting the independent variables to be selected for the study. In respect of the social structure we examine, independent variable of race has not been included in our questionnaire on account of the fact that it will not be meaningful for our study.

Since the purpose of our study is to investigate the fear of crime of university students, it has sought to evaluate the individual characteristics according to the research in this field and the original model. Ferraro (1996) included the variables such as age, sex and race in his study in evaluation of the fear of crime over the individual characteristics. In a similar way, examining the variables such as age and sex in his study oriented at university students, Hilinski (2007) did not include the race variable in his study considering that race does not pose a problem in terms of representation.

Our study did not cover the race factor and foreign student criterion under the analysis due to similar motives. Although there are quite many foreign students at the Middle East Technical University, such students were excluded from the study because the variables such as socio-economic levels of those students, cultural traits of the home countries will make the analysis of the hypotheses, which we seek to test, difficult and exclusion of those students will not create a problem in terms of representation. Briefly saying, since the analysis of fear of crime of the foreign students at the Middle East Technical University falls under the scope of a separate research, the fear of crime questionnaire was not applied onto these students.

Being a significant variable in terms of fear of crime, age factor is the subject in numerous similar studies (La Grange and Ferraro 1987, Pain 1997, Baur 2007). Our study examines the fear of crime of undergraduate university students. In this sense, the questionnaire was applied on the students in the age range of 18–24. The reason for this age range is that the ages of undergraduate students are close to each other. Inclusion of the ages below and above this age range will not bear any significance in terms of the representation of the study, so the questionnaire was applied merely to these students.

The reason why the questionnaire was only applied to the undergraduate students is that first of all our study aims to investigate the fear of crime of young university students. In Turkey, where the students desire to continue their education considering the higher rates of unemployment among especially university graduates, this situation heightens the average age of the postgraduate students. Therefore, it is possible that graduate students and doctoral students are outside the scope of the targeted age group. Considering this fact, the graduate and doctoral students are excluded from our study in terms of age criterion.

Another reason to exclude the graduate and doctoral students from the study is that the time spent by these students at the campus is limited. Some of the graduate and doctoral students both work and study; so these students come to the campus for merely attending the courses and then they leave the campus after the lessons are over. Limited time spent at the campus may mean the neighborhood perceptions of these students regarding the campus are superficial. In this respect, measuring the fear of crime undergraduate students will be more meaningful in terms both the targeted age range and criterion of time spent at the campus for the content of the study.

Jackson and et al. (2007) state that the individuals have fear of crime when they think of themselves as a victim of a crime. The individuals' having fear of crime when they feel defenseless ensures attaching more meaning to the connection between age and fear of crime. In this sense, age in fear of crime studies gains meaning only when the individuals feel themselves in a vulnerable and powerless position. Thus, the studies on fear of crime stipulate that the fear of crime generally increases as age goes up.

Since the study has been oriented at the university students, it anticipates that the age criterion will not realize in inversely proportional over the fear of crime in parallel to the concept of vulnerability. Melde (2007) reached a similar conclusion in his study he made on the adolescent students. In this sense, as the age increases in the young population, the fear of crime decreases. From this point of view, our study projects that the age will have a negative effect on the fear of crime for the university students.

H1 Fear of crime decreases as the age goes up.

Our study evaluates that the gender factor as another independent variable will be meaningful in terms of fear of crime. In this sense, that the women may feel relatively vulnerable and that this in turn may be an element increasing the fear of crime constitutes a basic foundation for the examination of this criterion. In this point, what type of differences there are in terms of fear of crime of women living at the campus and at city center compared to men is examined in our study. Our study expects that the fear of crime of women will be higher in parallel to the vulnerability approach.

H2 Women have more fear of crime compared to men.

Another independent variable we use is the residences of students. Our study will investigate whether the students live inside the campus or off-campus will show any differences in terms of fear of crime. In more detail, residential places of the students have been established as public dormitory at the campus, private dormitory at the campus, public dormitory outside the campus, private dormitory outside the campus, a flat with friends, a flat with family, a flat with relatives, a flat alone. In this regard, it is significant for our study to examine whether there are any differences between the students residing especially at the campus and those living outside the campus.

H3 Residing in different regions is a factor influencing the fear of crime.

3.6.2. Victimization

One other independent variable selected in accordance with the risk assessment model of Ferraro (1996) has been defined over whether the individuals have been a crime victim. Victimization of individuals of any crime is an element directly affecting their fear of crime. The studies investigating the victimization and fear of crime generally mention the existence of a positive relation between these two phenomena (Garafalo 1979, Bursik and Grasmick 1993 Tseloni and Zarafonitou 2008). In this respect, victimization comes to the front as an element affecting the fear of crime.

Victims of any crime are under the influence of what they go through, and such influence show itself up in the factors such as crime scene, time frame, etc. Notably, repeated victimization cases lead to more fear of crime in individuals (Tseloni and Zarafonitou 2008). When considered from this perspective, victimization can be described as a major variable in terms of fear of crime. When it comes to crime, past experience of individuals and their assessment of incidences over those experiences become more of an important process.

A direct relation may not always be observed between victimization and crime. In the studies conducted on fear of crime, it has been generally observed that the women and the elder have higher rates of fear of crime (Stafford and Galle 1984:173). Looking through the official crime statistics, the victimization rate of women and the elder is lower compared to the young and men. This is called risk-fear paradox in the literature of fear of crime. When considered from this view, the fear of crime across society may not always realize with the same crime rates (Hale 1996). It will be an incomplete approach to attach meaning to fear of crime merely over direct victimization.

The missing points in the relation of direct victimization and fear of crime, and imbalances between the crime rates and fear of crime bring about the understanding that indirect victimization should also be taken into account. The consideration that the individuals may shape their safety perceptions not only over their experiences but also by getting into interaction with their close environment enables the establishment of a connection between fear of crime and indirect victimization. In this way, a case of victimization told by a close relative, friend or neighbor has significant influence on individuals.

Our study discusses the victimization phenomenon, being dealt with as an independent variable, with its two dimensions. Our survey contains questions regarding the direct and indirect victimization of students. The questions attempting to measure the direct victimization aim to measure the victimizations from theft, grab/snatch, assault with penetrating objects and sexual abuse. The questions oriented at measurement of direct victimization of students overall contain the types of crime the students may experience in parallel with the study of Hilinski (2007).

Another issue bearing importance in terms of questions on direct victimization is that our study works on direct victimization phenomenon in two different manners. Our study includes questions of direct victimization inside the campus and direct victimization outside the campus. The reason for handling the direct victimization in two different manners is to be able to make a healthier analysis between the fear of crime and direct victimization. Thanks to this differentiation, the effects of a victimization case inside the campus over fear of crime and effect of victimization outside the campus over the fear of crime in Kızılay are separately discussed. In this context, the aspects of the relation between a victimization case occurring in any region and the fear of crime pertinent to that region are analyzed in more detail.

In this regard, our study underlines that it would be more meaningful to discuss the relation between the victimization and crime over a specific location rather than a quite broader context. Besides, the reason for separation of questions on victimization as in-campus and off-campus is not to limit the victimization as only in-campus and Kızılay and to be able to examine the impacts of a general victimization outside the campus on Kızılay in detail. Discussing the victimization in a comprehensive manner allows more extensive analyses between the victimization and fear of crime.

Another section of the questions on victimization consists of questions on indirect victimization. In this section, the students – in a similar way to direct victimization questions – are asked questions about theft, robbery, assault, attack with sharp tools and sexual abuse. The section of the questions on indirect victimization covering in-campus asks the students whether they know any student, civil servant and lecturer who became victims of such assaults. On the other hand, the off-campus indirect victimization questions ask whether they know any friend, close relative, neighbor who experienced such assaults. The reason for this difference is the want to measure the off-campus indirect victimization phenomenon through not the school but the close environment.

Our study has also made research on the impacts of victimizations occurred in different regions on the subject region in order to more comprehensively examine the effects of direct and indirect victimization on the fear of crime. In this sense, the impact of direct and indirect victimization happened outside the campus on the fear of crime inside the campus is also handled from the perspective our subject. Likewise, whether direct and indirect victimization occurred at the campus is an element impacting upon the fear of crime pertaining to Kızılay.

H4 Direct victimization increases fear of crime.

H5 Indirect victimization increases fear of crime.

3.6.3. Environmental Features (Neighborhood Disorder)

Neighborhood disorder is a phenomenon frequently investigated in the studies on fear of crime. Abandoned buildings, uncollected garbage, existence of youth gangs, beggars and drunken people are significant elements in the assessment of a region as safe or dangerous. Bursik and Grasmick (1993) emphasize that certain features pertaining to a given region are important in terms of security perception for that region. In this sense, it will not be wrong to say that the individuals assess the environment they are in by referring to certain indicators.

The indicators relating to the neighborhood disorder fall in two categories, one as physical and the other social; in this respect, the security perception of individuals with regard to a region is shaped according to the physical and social features of that region. From this aspect, the degree of physical and social disorder in a region can be considered as a factor influencing the security perception regarding that region. The physical disorder within the concept of neighborhood disorder comprises exterior indicators such as uncollected garbage, derelict buildings and vehicles, graffiti and banners. The concept of social disorder, on the other hand, includes the behavioral patterns not approved by the majority of the society such as drug sale in street, existence of youth gangs, frequency of existence of beggars and street sellers, quarrelsome and noisy neighbors, and so on (Melde 2007:29).

Ferraro (1995) has defined the perception of neighborhood disorder as an independent variable in his risk assessment model and analyzes the impacts of physical and social disorder on the fear of crime. In this respect, rendering that the environmental perception of the individuals is a component influencing their fear of crime; this study will examine the impacts of the physical and social neighborhood disorder on the fear of crime of university students in line the model explored.

Another significant point in the relation between the environmental disorder and fear of crime is the discussion about how the environmental disorder will be measured. While some studies measure the neighborhood disorder over objective criteria, others highlight that neighborhood disorder is a matter of perception above all. The objective criteria investigate the effect of this circumstance over the fear of crime by basing the neighborhood disorder on observable and concrete events. In this sense, the measurable criteria relating to the condition of infrastructure in the neighborhood, determination of various physical defects and social disorder constitute the subject of examination of this method.

The perception of environmental disorder forms another dimension of the relation between the environmental disorder and fear of crime. According to this method, the neighborhood disorder is assessed over the individuals' perception regarding that environment. The advantage of this method is that fears of crime of individuals living in the same environment may vary due to different environmental perceptions of them. In this respect, measurement of neighborhood disorder over perception gain importance in terms of both it reveals the individual differences and shows that fear of crime may be lower in the region where the crime rate and objective neighborhood disorder is high.

The study aims to measure the neighborhood disorder over the individual perception in accordance with the risk assessment approach of Ferraro (1995) instead of objective criteria. This way, it is possible to measure the impacts of different environmental perceptions of students regarding the campus and Kızılay on the fear of crime in a sounder manner. The students may assess the campus or Kızılay in different way in terms of environmental features due to various individual and social reasons. More clearly, the environmental risk perception of a student living in a region with intense neighborhood disorder with regard to the campus will not be same with the perceived risk of a student living in an environment with good environmental features.

Various researches conducted oriented at the university students measure the impact of neighborhood disorder on fear of crime in accordance with the risk assessment model of Ferraro (1995) (Fisher and Sloan 2003, Hilinski 2007). The survey prepared in parallel with these studies contains questions measuring the neighborhood perceptions of the university students with regard to the campus and Kızılay. These questions are intended to go through the impacts of both physical and social disorders on the fear of crime. The questions with relation to the physical and social features of the campus and Kızılay aim at measuring the environmental perception of students for these regions.

With the purpose to measure the environmental perceptions of students, the students are separately asked to what extent the theft and violence incidences at the University and in Kızılay constitute a problem. In addition to these questions, our survey contains questions on physical and social disorder in line with the literature. The questions regarding the environmental disorder aim at measuring the environmental perceptions of students in accordance with the risk assessment approach, not the objective environmental evaluation. At this point, the reason that we want to measure

the perceptions of students rather than the objective criteria is the emphasis placed by the risk assessment approach we use that individuals may assess the same environment through different eyes. In this sense, while an area may be described as safe for a student, the same area might be perceived as dangerous for another. The survey questions have been designed in a way enabling the measurement of this difference.

To make the relation between neighborhood perceptions of students and the fear of crime more meaningful, the survey questions on this subject have been prepared by taking into account the properties of the campus and the Kızılay area. The study aims at measuring the physical environmental perceptions of students over the questions assessing to what degree the issues such as uncollected garbage, graffiti and banners, insufficient illumination at the campus constitute a problem for the students. On the other hand, the campus questions relating to the social environmental disorder aims at measuring to what extent the people making noise, drinking alcoholic beverages and drunken people and strangers coming to the campus from outside are perceived as problem. Likewise, the environmental perception questions for Kızılay include the assessment of physical and social properties pertaining to Kızılay. The Kızılay questions contain one question regarding snatching incidences. The purpose for adding this question is to find out whether this crime, which is not observed at the campus, but prevalent at downtown, constitutes a problem for students.

H6 Students with higher perception of neighborhood disorder have high fear of crime.

H7 As the perception of neighborhood disorder increases, so do the constrained behaviors.

H8 The social disorder perception more affects the fear of crime than the perception of physical neighborhood disorder.

3.6.4. Perceived Risk of Victimization

Fear of crime is a situation, which is generally mistaken with the risk of victimization. The first studies on this subject have not differentiated between the fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization. Though these two concepts seem similar to each another, in certain cases the fear of crime and risk of victimization are different notions. Perception of victimization is a concept having major impacts on the fear of crime and increase or decrease in the fear of crime. Measuring the probability of being exposed to any crime of the individuals, this concept leads to increase or decrease in the fear of crime as a result of this risk of victimization.

Ferraro (1995) states that; numerous studies on fear of crime actually measure the risk of victimization, not the fear of crime. Emphasizing that fear of crime and risk of victimization are different concepts. Ferraro underlines that any analysis conducted without first examining the relation between these two concepts would be incomplete and erroneous. Asking questions regarding only the perception of risk of victimization instead of the fear of crime will in this sense mean the measurement of perception of exposure of individuals to any crime. In this sense, although the individual estimates a high probability of being exposed to any crime, he or she may not be afraid of exposure to that crime. Thus, any analysis made without uncovering the relation between the fear of crime and perception of risk victimization may be misleading.

Having knowledge on the differing points between the perception of risk of victimization and the fear of crime gives us the opportunity to do more sound and analyses on this subject. La Grange and Ferraro (1989) state that the studies not differentiating between the fear of crime and risk of victimization will not result in healthy evaluation in terms of fear of crime. According to this, an individual's perception of lower probability of exposure to any risk does mean that that individual will have lower level of fear regarding that incident. Therefore, to infer that fear of crime is high by looking at the high level of risk of victimization will not be a sound conclusion (La Grange and Ferraro 1989: 699).

Separate measurement of perceived risk of victimization and examination its relation with the fear of crime make it possible to evaluate the fear of crime in a more detailed and sound way, and measuring the perception of risk of victimization of individuals gives us the chance to see how sensitive the individuals are on issues regarding the crime. Ferraro (1995) stresses that; the individuals make an assessment about their personal safety by interacting with their environment. So, awareness of different risk perceptions in the same environment allows us to investigate the impacts of these risk perceptions on fear of crime.

Another advantage to yield from the scale of perception of risk of victimization for the studies on fear of crime is that this approach facilitates the explanation why the fear of crime of individuals from the criminal sub-culture is lower. When considered from this angle, level of fear of crime of individuals from the criminal sub-culture or of individuals who have high risk of victimization may not be higher. Parallel to this, fear of crime of individuals having lower risk of exposure to crime becomes sometimes high. The risk assessment approach differentiates between the fear of crime and risk of victimization, and precludes the consideration of risk of victimization as fear of crime.

Risk assessment perspective describes the perceived risk phenomenon as both dependent and independent variable. The aim to do this is that it wants to separately measure the perceived risk formed by the individuals over their acquaintance and strangers. Our study aims to measure the perceived risk phenomenon without making any differentiation between the acquaintance and stranger because when this analysis is involved, the research questions and its scope will be more comprehensive. Further, the studies carried out show that individuals have lower level of perceived risk against the familiar environment and higher against the strangers (Koss 1985 Fisher et al 2000 in Hilinski 2007:65). Yet, since it is thought that perception of risk of victimization between night and day has a significant difference our study include the questions that enable to measure students' day and night perceived risk of victimization.

The survey questions have been prepared in parallel with other studies targeting at measuring the fear of crime of university students (Fisher and Sloan 2003, Hilinski 2007) and in conformity with the model of Ferraro (1996). In this sense, perceived risk of victimization covers the questions containing the probabilities of exposure to theft, robbery, assault, serious assault and sexual abuse. The questions regarding the perception of risk of victimization aim to measure the probability of victimization to the above-mentioned crimes both in the Kızılay area and at the campus during night and day time. The questions have been prepared over scale of 10 and 1 means the lower value and 10 means the highest value for the perceived risk of victimization. The hypotheses we have specified regarding the perceived risk of victimization according to the model are as the following:

H9 As the perceived environmental degradation increases, so does the perceived risk of victimization.

H10 As the perceived risk of victimization increases, so does the fear of crime.

H11 As the perceived risk of victimization increases so do the constrained behaviors.

3.6.5. Constrained Behaviors

Risk assessment perspective means that the fear of crime is not a static phenomenon and that it develops as a result of the interaction of individuals with their environment. The individuals interpret the developments and changes in their living environment, and adjust their behaviors in parallel to these developments and changes. The individuals are in continuous interaction with their living environment and they sometimes reflect and apply the knowledge they acquire through such interaction on their behaviors. In this sense, the individuals construe the environmental and social context they are in according to their point of views.

An individual, who is under the influence of the social relations they are in, may embrace and internalize various behavior patterns based on this degree of relations. To express more clearly, internalization of the social values and patterns depends on the density of the social relations that individuals has established. As exactly in the other issues and fields, the individual forms his perception regarding his security over the relation networks he has established. In this sense, self-defense or taking precaution of the individual are related to the social relations he is in and the perception of security resulting from these relations.

Ferraro (1995) has applied his criminal opportunity theory onto the fear of crime in the risk assessment approach. This theory investigating the criminal behavior and reasons for crime density in a region examines why individuals turn into crime. Cohen and Felson (1979) say that daily behavioral patterns of the individuals are the elements determining whether they will turn into crime. According to this approach, the individual act by comparing the gains and risk of being punished after a crime. In this sense, individuals' orientation towards crime occurs as a result of interpretation of the signals of being caught and of crime the individuals are in.

Ferraro (1995) adapting this approach onto the fear of crime emphasizes that the individuals set up the sense of security and the risk by taking into account the environmental signals and social interactions, and as a result of this, take various precautions. Individuals' having different fear of crime is a situation shaped as a conclusion of these signals and the precautions they take. The security precautions each individual decides to take following the environmental risk perception and interaction vary. These restrictive behaviors pertaining to crime change according to how the signals relating to the demographic properties and individuals' self-security are interpreted. In this respect, there is a close relation between the constrained behaviors and fear of crime of individuals.

Our study measures the impact of constrained behaviors on fear of crime by asking the students how often they perform the subject behaviors by grading between 1 and 10. 1 means the lower value while 10 measures the highest value. The survey questions have investigated the constrained behaviors in two main parts. According to this, the survey contains questions regarding to avoidance behaviors and defensive behavior of the students. In this sense, the questions relating to the behaviors the students avoid include the questions about any region kept clear of. Similarly, the questions measuring the defensive behavior of the students are related to whether the

students carry any tool for defense purposes on them, and requesting someone to accompany one until a destination is included under the defensive purpose questions.

The impact of constrained behaviors of the students on the fear of crime has been measured through the questions related to both the campus and the Kızılay area. This way, it has become possible to compare the defensive and avoidance behaviors of students at the campus with their defensive and avoidance behaviors in Kızılay. Another significant point related to the constrained behaviors is the differentiation between the night and day time. The survey includes the questions on constrained behaviors both at day and night. The reason for differentiation of night and day is that fear of crime is a major variable of the time frame. Assessment of the impact of differences in this time frame on the fear of crime enables a more specific evaluation of the fear of crime phenomenon.

H12 As the constrained behaviors increases, so does the fear of crime.

CHAPTER

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Our study, as we have already pointed out, was carried out on the undergraduate students studying at the Middle East Technical University. We constrained the number to these students because university students often spend their leisure time in the university campus and subject of our study is about how the fear of crime of young people can be measured. In this sense, basic demographic element of our study is the METU's students.

Age is one of the important elements in the studies of fear of crime. In this sense, the matter of age group that will be the subject of study is also important in terms of fear of crime. Hilinski (2007), in his similar study in which he measured the fear of crime of the university students, highlights that age is an important variable that determines the fear of crime. The study was carried out on students of 18-25 ages with regard to mentioned influence of the age (Hilisinki 2007:61).

In this matter, age criteria, one of the important demographic variable in our study, was determined between 18-24 ages as it was suitable for our study. Since we performed our study on the undergraduate students, we detect that there is no student under 18 that answered our questions. The students studying in METU but over this age scale are not being involved in the study.

After indicating the descriptive statistics related to basic demographic variables, our study intends to mention the essential different statistics of campus and Kızılay including direct or indirect victimization, environmental features, risk perception of the victimization, fear of crime and constrained behaviors. The aim of the detailed basic statistics is to analyze in detail the differences between the campus and Kızılay.

After the evaluation of descriptive statistics about the basic variables, our study involves the analysis of related hypotheses and comments. The effect of defined independent variables will be measured with the instrument of our hypothesis and the variable which is influential on the fear of crime will be determined. Following the part including the analysis of the hypotheses, our study will deal with, in detail, the effects of variables that determine fear of crime. Detailed analyses aim at indicating which elements affect the fear of crime.

4.1. Demographic Characteristics

4.1.1. Studied Class

Our study was performed on 497 undergraduate students studying at Middle East Technical University. Ages of these students can change among 18-24. While we have no hypothesis about the fear of crime and studied class of the students, our survey was carried out on preparatory class, first-grade, second-grade, third-grade and fourth-grade. With regard to the literature, there are studies that correlate the fear of crime with the classes of the students (Fisher and Sloan 2003). Evaluating from this aspect, study handled the age factor as well as the class studied by students.

Looking at the classes of the students on which survey was carried out; we pay attention to the fact that dispersion of the students of METU was to be equal.

Whereas the biggest group is first-grade with 115 students, the smallest one is fourth-grade with 91 students.

Table 2 Which grade are you studying

	Frequency (n)	Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent (%)
Preparatory class	102	20.5	20.5
First grade	115	23.1	43.7
Second grade	94	18.9	62.6
Third grade	95	19.1	81.7
Fourth grade	91	18.3	100.0
Total	497	100.0	

4.1.2. Gender

The number of students participating in our study is 497 including 223 male and 274 female students. As you can see on the table male students that participated in survey constitute part of %49, and the rate of female students is %51. In contrast with the actual number of female and male students in the university (%42 female, %58 male), the reason why the number of female participators seems high is that the survey was carried out with regard to voluntariness and that women were more interested in our personal security study. Gender, which is an important variable in terms of fear of crime, in this sense, seems very important in the very phase of application of our survey. Especially female students that we surveyed were content with the questions about security of the campus and asked how they can learn results of the study.

Table 3 Gender distribution

	Frequency (n)	Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent (%)
Male	223	44,9	44,9
Female	274	55,1	100,0
Total	497	100,0	

4.1.3. Age

Relationship between the age and fear of crime has been analyzed since 1970 when the studies of fear of crime started. High level of fear of crime among elders and related discussions occupy an important place in the literature of fear of crime. According to defenselessness approach, it is emphasized that since elders feel themselves defenseless, they afraid more of being the victim of any crime.

Besides, correlation between the youth and fear of crime is shaped under the cultural effects. Expressing more clearly, relationship between the fear of crime and age of the young people is a fact that can vary with regard to characteristics of the sub-cultural groups. However, it can be expected that negative correlation between the years that students spend at campus and the fear of crime may exist in a study concerning especially university students. Individuals feel secure as much as they reinforce the relationships with the society in which they live. Our study will analyze the age and fear of crime of the students at length.

To analyze the fear of crime of the students at campus and in Kızılay, the prepared survey was carried out on the age group among 18-24. The ones under and over this age group were not involved. Average age of 497 students is 20,79 and standard

deviation was calculated as 1,663. This number is appropriate for the general subject of our study which is youth and fear of crime.

Table 4 Age distribution

	Frequency (n)	Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent (%)
18	37	7,4	7,4
19	88	17,7	25,2
20	108	21,7	46,9
21	92	18,5	65,4
22	86	17,3	82,7
23	52	10,5	93,2
24	34	6,8	100,0
Total	497	100,0	

4.1.4. Sheltering

Sheltering and the fear of crime are interrelated terms. Environment in which individuals live and the features of this environment are the elements that affect directly the fear of crime. Good and bad environmental features influence directly the perception of security and the fear of crime of the individuals. Our study emphasizes that there is a relationship between the place where students live and the fear of crime but does not put forward a hypothesis about this relationship having positive or negative extent. The reason of that is to measure not fear of crime in the places that individuals live but the fear of crime at campus and in Kızılay. Since fear of crime, related to the campus, of the students living in or outside the campus matters to us, this demographic question is included in our study.

Considering the statistics about the residence types, the biggest part, with %34, 4 rates, is the choice that I am living in a flat with my family. The most important second option of the residence is the state dormitory at the campus with the rate of 29, 4. This rate consists of the option of a flat with my friends with %17, 9 rates and the option of private dormitory at the campus with %13, 3 rates. The number of students that inhabit in state or private dormitories outside the campus and that live together with their relatives or alone totally consists of small part with the rate of %5.

Table 5 Residence type

	Frequency (n)	Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent(%)
State dormitory at the campus	146	29,4	29,4
Private dormitory at the campus	66	13,3	42,7
State dormitory outside the campus	3	,6	43,3
Private dormitory outside the campus	5	1,0	44,3
Living in a flat with my friends	89	17,9	62,2
Living in a flat with my parents	171	34,4	96,6
Living in a flat with my relatives	7	1,4	98,0
Living in a flat alone	10	2,0	100,0
Total	497	100,0	

4.2. Direct Victimization

Direct victimization is an important variable in terms of the fear of crime studies. Since the 1960s when the studies of fear of crime began to appear, relationship between the fear of crime studies and the direct victimization studies has been attempted to establish. In our study there are 10 direct victimization questions. While

5 of them are for measuring victimization of the students at campus, other 5 questions intend to analyze the victimization outside the campus. Direct victimization questions analyze whether students are exposed to crimes such as robbery, seizure, attack or sexual abuse.

Table 6 Direct victimization at the campus

		Frequency (n)	Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent (%)
In the recent year, something that belongs to you has been stolen at the campus? (you were not exposed to any violence)	Yes:	51	10,3	10,3
	No:	446	89,7	100
	Total	497	100	
In the recent year have you been exposed to crime of robbery at the campus?	Yes:	2	,4	,4
	No:	495	99,6	100
	Total	497	100	
In the recent year has anyone without gun or sharp object attacked, injured or beaten you at the campus?	Yes:	6	1,2	1,2
	No:	491	98,8	100
	Total	497	100	
In the recent year has anyone with gun or sharp object attacked, injured or beaten you at the campus?	Yes:	0	0	0
	No:	497	100	100
	Total	497	100	
In the recent year have you been exposed to any sexual abuse at the campus?	Yes:	20	4,0	4
	No:	477	96,0	100
	Total	497	100	

Analyzing the direct victimization table, we notice that the students are exposed most to theft at the campus. In the course of survey that we carried out face to face, we received complaints about the frequency of theft especially in dormitories. As a reflection of this case, %10,3 of the students that participated in survey said that they were victims of the crime of theft at the campus.

After the theft cases, the second victimization type that the students are exposed to most is the sexual abuse. %4 of the participators of the survey stated that they were subjected to any sexual abuse at the campus. The women at the campus with whom we talked about sexual abuse expressed that especially in nighttime they were harassed with sayings and were followed teasingly.

Regarding the rates of victimization of the other crimes, after robbery and sexual abuse, we can observe that other rates of crimes show quite lower cases. None of the students participating in the survey specified that they were exposed to crimes of sharp object injuries at the campus. Apart from that, the rate of attack at the campus is observed as %1,2 and the rate of exposure to any seizure is %0,4.

Table 7 Direct victimization outside the campus

		Frequency (n)	Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent (%)
In the recent year, something that belongs to you has been stolen off the campus? (you were not exposed to any violence)	Yes:	44	8.9	8.9
	No:	453	91.1	100
	Total	497	100	
In the recent year have you been exposed to crime of robbery off the campus?	Yes:	8	1.6	1.6
	No:	489	98.4	100
	Total	497	100	
In the recent year has anyone without gun or sharp object attacked, injured or beaten you off the campus?	Yes:	14	2.8	2.8
	No:	483	97.2	100
	Total	497	100	
In the recent year has anyone with gun or sharp object attacked, injured or beaten you off the campus?	Yes:	3	.6	.6
	No:	494	99.4	100
	Total	497	100	
In the recent year have you been exposed to any sexual abuse off the campus?	Yes:	53	10.7	
	No:	444	89.3	100
	Total	497	100	

Looking at the rate of victimization outside the campus, we see that sexual abuse, with the rate of 10,7, takes place on the top. After the crime of sexual abuse, type of crime that is exposed to most is theft. %8,9 of the students specified that they were not exposed to any robbery crime. Another issue that draws attention with regard to direct victimization outside the campus, the rate of exposure to the all crimes except theft is higher in comparison to the campus.

4.3. Indirect Victimization

Apart from the direct victimization, another victimization type that is important for the fear of crime is indirect victimization. When indirect victimization is handled in a wide context, it generates the concepts such as events of crime heard in neighborhood, crime news followed from the media.

Indirect victimization, in a narrow context, is formed through the victimization of acquaintants in the environment of the person. Our study handles the narrow sense of the indirect victimization and measures the exposure that immediate surroundings of the students experienced.

Table 8 Indirect victimization at the campus

		Frequency (n)	Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent (%)
In the recent year has anyone that you know been exposed to theft without use of violence at the campus?	Yes:	128	25,8	25,8
	No:	369	74,2	100
	Total	497	100	
In the recent year has anyone that you know been exposed to robbery at the campus?	Yes:	8	1,6	1,6
	No:	489	98,4	100
	Total	497	100	
In the recent year has anyone that you know been attacked, beaten or injured without gun or any sharp object at the campus?	Yes:	29	5,8	5,8
	No:	468	94,2	100
	Total	497	100	
In the recent year has anyone that you know been attacked, beaten or injured with gun or any sharp object at the campus?	Yes:	9	1,8	1,8
	No:	488	98,2	100
	Total	497	100	
In the recent year has anyone that you know been exposed to sexual abuse at the campus?	Yes:	67	13,5	13,5
	No:	430	86,5	100
	Total	497	100	

Considering the number of the indirect victimization at the campus, we see that in all crimes, indirect victimization is rather higher than the direct victimization. Another issue that draws attention in terms of the indirect victimization at the campus is that percentage of the indirect victimization related to theft is high. One in the four participators in the survey expressed that anyone whom he/she knows was subjected to the theft. After the theft, the highest rate is the sexual abuse as it is in the direct victimization. Crimes of robbery, simple and serious attack are lower than the rates of theft and sexual abuse.

When we look at the rates of indirect victimization outside the campus, we can see that theft is the highest one, with the rate of %39, 4, in the types of the indirect victimization. After the theft, the highest rate is the crime of sexual abuse, with the rate of %20, 3. Another point that draws attention in terms of indirect victimization outside the campus is that indirect victimization related to crime of seizure is higher than within of the campus. At the campus, while theft is intense, robbery is seen hardly and this situation is related to certain physical borders of the campus and the security measures that are taken in the borders of campus.

Table 9 Indirect victimization outside the campus

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Do you know anyone who has been exposed to theft in the recent year outside the campus?	Yes:	196	39.4	39.4
	No:	301	60.6	100
	Total	497	100	
Do you know anyone who has been exposed to robbery in the recent year outside the campus?	Yes:	63	12.7	12.7
	No:	434	87.3	100
	Total	497	100	
Do you know anyone who was attacked, injured or beaten without using weapon, sharp object etc. in the recent year outside the campus?	Yes:	74	14.9	14.9
	No:	423	85.1	100
	Total	497	100	
Do you know anyone who was attacked, injured or beaten using weapon, sharp object etc. in the recent year outside the campus?	Yes:	38	7.6	7.6
	No:	459	92.4	100
	Total	497	100	
Do you know anyone who was the victim of sexual abuse in the recent year outside the campus?	Yes:	101	20.3	20.3
	No:	396	79.7	100
	Total	497	100	

The reason of the lower rate of crime of robbery at the campus can be explained by the routine activities theory that Ferraro (1995) benefited from while developing risk assessment model.

According to this theory, presences of the persons that have the intention of committing crimes occur when the security guards do not exist. Evaluating in terms of the campus, the defined borders and presence of security guards that can interfere in the course of seizure make the seizure rates low.

4.4. Environmental Features

Individual's perception of security is a fact that is shaped by with interaction process. Individuals interpret the environmental features as significations related to their security. If individuals see in their environments abandoned buildings, gangs, and similar disorders, they can think that the area is vulnerable to crime and may feel fear of crime. Our study evaluates the regional features in terms of campus and Kızılay. Environmental feature questions related to campus and Kızılay measure the physical, environmental and social incivility. Questions related to environmental features are asked according to 10 points likert scale. According to the scale, whereas 10 points mean the highest perception of environmental incivility, 0 point means that there is no environmental incivility.

Table 10 Enviromental characteristics of the campus

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
In your opinion, to what extent theft is an important problem at campus?	497	3.94	3.081
In your opinion, to what extent robbery is an important problem at campus?	497	2.25	2.978
In your opinion, to what extent assault is an important problem at campus?	497	2.67	2.997
In your opinion, to what extent sexual abuse is an important problem at campus?	497	3.67	3.33
In your opinion, to what extent noisemakers are important problems at campus?	497	4.80	2.98
In your opinion, to what extent graffiti and bill-posting are important problems at campus?	497	4.01	3.624
In your opinion, to what extent poor lighting is an important problem at campus?	497	4.85	3.043
In your opinion, to what extent drunken people are important problems at campus?	497	3.86	3.315
In your opinion, to what extent the garbage which is not collected are important problems at campus?	497	4.00	3.333
In your opinion, to what extent street vending are important problems in Kızılay?	497	6.40	3.535

Analyzing students' evaluation of the environmental features about the campus, we have seen that the most significant environmental issue, with the average number 6,40, is stray dogs. When considering that questions related to environmental features are prepared according to 10 points scale and that 10 points mean the highest rate, as an average number 6,40 indicates that students are worried about the stray dogs at the campus.

Another important finding about the environmental evaluation of the campus is that problem of insufficient lightening, with the average of 4,85, is considered as the second biggest environmental problems. Since female students on whom we carried out the survey spread out the campus extensively, they emphasized that going from one place to another in the nighttime caused concern. After the insufficient lightening another important element is that persons who make noise at the campus are considered as the third most important problem.

Table 11 Enviromental characteristics of the Kızılay

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
In your opinion, to what extent theft is an important problem in Kızılay?	497	7.08	2.180
In your opinion, to what extent robbery is an important problem in Kızılay?	497	6.50	2.477
In your opinion, to what extent assault is an important problem in Kızılay?	497	6.58	2.484
In your opinion, to what extent sexual abuse is an important problem in Kızılay?	497	7.76	2.439
In your opinion, to what extent noisemakers are important problems in Kızılay?	497	6.80	2.820
In your opinion, to what extent graffiti and bill-posting are important problems in Kızılay?	497	4.61	3.304
In your opinion, to what extent poor lighting is an important problem in Kızılay?	497	6.10	2.946
In your opinion, to what extent drunken people are important problems in Kızılay?	497	7.15	2.589
In your opinion, to what extent the garbage which is not collected are important problems in Kızılay?	497	6.97	2.656
In your opinion, to what street vending is an important problem in Kızılay?	497	5.37	3.191

Analyzing the perception of environmental features about Kızılay, we can see that the most important problem is considered as sexual abuse with the average of 7,76. The second most important problem about the environmental features is drunken persons in Kızılay. Another problem that is considered high is theft. When we make a general evaluation about the perception of environmental incivility, it can be observed that perception of environmental deterioration about Kızılay is much higher than the one about the campus. While, none of the environmental deterioration rates outgrew the 5 points except the stray dogs at the campus in questions related to the campus, all the questions except the graffiti outgrew the 5 points in questions related to Kızılay.

4.5. Perceived Risk of Victimization

Perceived risk of victimization aims at measuring possibility of which crimes individuals are exposed. Possibility of individuals' exposure to crime and fear of crime are different concepts. While an individual considers risk of exposure to crime as high, he/she may not feel fear of crime. Similarly; an individual who considers risk of the victimization as low may feel fear of crime. Notwithstanding; risk of the individuals' exposure to any crime may directly affect fear of crime. To put forth risks provides us to understand why fear of crime is high. Questions of the victimization are evaluated on the basis of 10 point likert scale. While "0" is used to point out situations in which there is no risk, "10" points out highest risk of victimization.

Table 12 Perceived risk of victimization at campus

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Please estimate the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc) without being exposed to violence at campus in daytime?	497	2,64	2,311
Please estimate the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc) without being exposed to violence at campus in nighttime?	497	3,29	2,684
Please estimate the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc) by using violence at campus in daytime?	497	1,22	1,923
Please estimate the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc) by using violence at campus in nighttime?	497	1,90	2,191
Please estimate the probability of being attacked by using sharp object at campus in daytime?	497	1,01	1,494
Please estimate the probability of being attacked by using sharp object at campus in nighttime?	497	1,77	1,986
Please estimate the probability of being attacked simply at campus in daytime? (without using sharp object)	497	1,57	1,774
Please estimate the probability of being attacked simply at campus in nighttime? (without using sharp object)	497	2,11	2,053
Please estimate the probability of exposure to sexual abuse at campus in daytime?	497	1,61	2,203
Please estimate the probability of exposure to sexual abuse in at campus in nighttime?	497	2,39	2,669

When the questions of perceived risk of victimization at campus are examined, we observe that the highest average belongs to the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings in nighttime with the rate of 3, 29. The fear of theft in daytime follows this figure with the rate of 2,64. After theft, the most significant victimization risk is exposure to sexual abuse in nighttime. The risk of exposure to any crime at campus can be stated that generally progresses lowly. Students especially observe that risk of exposure to crimes such as seizure, being injured by using sharp object as low at campus. However; probability of exposure to crimes signified appears high in nighttime in comparison to daytime.

Table 13 Perceived risk of victimization in Kızılay

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Please estimate the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc) without being exposed to violence in Kızılay in daytime?	497	6,60	2,536
Please estimate the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc) without being exposed to violence in Kızılay in nighttime?	497	7,62	2,467
Please estimate the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc) by using violence in Kızılay in daytime?	497	5,56	2,658
Please estimate the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc) by using violence in Kızılay in nighttime?	497	7,01	2,468
Please estimate the probability of being attacked by using sharp object in Kızılay in daytime?	497	4,96	2,583
Please estimate the probability of being attacked by using sharp object in Kızılay in nighttime?	497	6,85	2,342
Please estimate the probability of being attacked simply in Kızılay in daytime? (without using sharp object)	497	5,68	2,657
Please estimate the probability of being attacked simply in Kızılay in nighttime? (without using sharp object)	497	7,00	2,427
Please estimate the probability of exposure to sexual abuse in Kızılay in daytime?	497	5,44	3,513
Please estimate the probability of exposure to sexual abuse in Kızılay in nighttime?	497	6,67	3,532

When the questions of perceived risk of victimization in Kızılay are examined, we can state that the risk perceptions of students are considerably high in comparison to campus. The highest figure belongs to the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings in nighttime with the average of 7,62 in terms of the risk perception of victimization. By comparison with campus, another significant outcome is that crime of seizure oriented risk perception is too high in Kızılay. The probability of being stolen of any belonging by using violence in Kızılay in nighttime is second crime risk with the average of 7,01. Similarly, attacked simply in nighttime is one of the highest crimes that are suffered with the average of 7, 00. When viewed in the general sense, students observe that probability of exposure to crimes signified as low in Kızılay in comparison to campus. Another point of the risk perception of victimization, similarly at campus, is that risk perception of victimization appears high in all crimes in nighttime in comparison to daytime.

4.6. Fear of Crime

Our study measures students' fear of crime on the basis of theft, robbery, simple attack, serious attack and crime of sexual abuse in parallel with questions of risk perception of victimization. Students are required to evaluate fear about these crimes in the sense of day and night because there is a difference in fear of crime between day and night in terms of these crimes .Our study evaluates fear of crime on the basis of 10 point likert scale. While value for “0” points out that there is no anxiety, “10” reflects the highest anxiety level.

The reason why fear of crime is carried out without abiding questions in original scale of Ferraro (1995) is the risk of students' considering these questions senseless or not related to their own life. If necessary to express again in a more clear way, a

question like” how much do you concerned about being broken into your house by thief?” does not make sense for a student who stays in a dormitory. Posing a question about being stolen of car to the student who doesn’t have a car prevents to carry out qualitative analysis. Our study aims at measuring fear of crime on the basis of crimes that university student can sustain in parallel with studies (Hilinski: 2007) that is directed to measure university students’ fear of crime.

Table 14 Campus fear of crime

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Please indicate your fear about your belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen without being exposed to violence at campus in daytime.	497	2,24	2,210
Please indicate your fear about your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen without being exposed to violence at campus and in nighttime.	497	2,67	2,583
Please indicate your fear about your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen by using violence at campus in daytime.	497	1,31	1,879
Please indicate your fear about your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen by using violence at campus in nighttime.	497	1,77	2,082
Please indicate your fear about being attacked by using sharp objects at campus in daytime.	497	1,06	1,748
Please indicate your fear about being attacked by using sharp objects at campus in nighttime.	497	1,58	2,051
Please indicate your fear about being attacked simply at campus in daytime. (without using sharp object)	497	1,30	1,843
Please indicate your fear about being attacked simply at campus in nighttime. (without using sharp object)	497	1,77	2,049
Please indicate your fear about being exposed to sexual abuse at campus in daytime.	497	1,48	2,358
Please indicate your fear about being exposed to sexual abuse at campus in nighttime.	497	1,97	2,594

When the fear of crime statistics related to campus are examined, we can state that fear of crime is generally at low level in parallel with risk perception at campus. The most significant fear of crime of the students is fear of any personal belongings to be stolen in nighttime with the average of 2, 67. Similarly, following significant fear of crime of the students is fear of any personal belongings to be stolen in daytime. Most significant figure belongs to fear of exposure to sexual abuse in nighttime with the average of 1, 97 after fear of theft. We can state that there is a difference between day and night in the matter of fear of sexual abuse at campus. As to the lowest fear of crime, it appears as fear of being attacked by using sharp object at campus in daytime. Similarly, crimes such as simple attack and crime of robbery are also among the crimes students are worried about at the lowest level.

Table 15 Kızılay fear of crime

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Please indicate your fear about your belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen without being exposed to violence in Kızılay in daytime	497	5,89	2,932
Please indicate your fear about your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen without being exposed to violence in Kızılay in nighttime	497	7,01	2,773
Please indicate your fear about your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen by using violence in Kızılay in daytime.	497	5,36	2,976
Please indicate your fear about your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen by using violence in Kızılay in nighttime.	497	6,72	2,810
Please indicate your fear about being attacked by using sharp objects in Kızılay in daytime.	497	4,69	2,961
Please indicate your fear about being attacked by using sharp objects in Kızılay in nighttime.	497	6,18	2,987
Please indicate your fear about being attacked simply in Kızılay in daytime. (without using sharp object)	497	5,08	2,921
Please indicate your fear about being attacked simply in Kızılay and in nighttime. (without using sharp object)	497	6,40	2,876
Please indicate your fear about being exposed to sexual abuse in Kızılay in daytime.	497	4,79	3,666
Please indicate your fear about being exposed to sexual abuse in Kızılay in nighttime.	497	5,93	3,817

When the fear of crime data related to Kızılay is examined, we observe that figures of Kızılay fear of crime generally are higher than campus fear of crime. Similar to campus fear of crime, the highest Kızılay fear of crime belongs to fear of any personal belongings to be stolen in nighttime with the average of 7,01. Following highest figure belongs to crime of robbery in nighttime with the average of 6, 72 in the light of data of Kızılay fear of crime. When evaluated from this point of view, there is significant difference between campus and Kızılay in the matter of the fear of robbery in nighttime.

Fear of robbery that is one of the fears of crimes at low level at campus is at high level which is of vital importance in Kızılay. Similarly, serious and simple attacks that are relatively lower fear of crime in terms of campus appear higher in Kızılay especially in nighttime. When the fear of crime is examined in terms of sexual abuse in Kızılay, we observe that it follows crimes such as theft, robbery and attack. Despite the facts that fear of sexual abuse follows other types of fear of crime, we can state that it is considerably high both in daytime and in nighttime in comparison to campus when it is evaluated in terms of average.

4.7. Constrained Behaviors

Constrained behaviors, significant variable in terms of fear of crime, involves precautions individuals take against fear of crime as a result of interaction of individuals with their environment. Constrained behaviors basically include two different types of questions in our survey. While first type of questions related to constrained behaviors involves behaviors that individuals abstain from, another one involves behaviors that individuals show to defend themselves. This study aims at

evaluating constrained behaviors on the basis of 10 point likert scale While “0 “is used to point out that you don’t develop any constrained behavior , “10” points out the highest frequency of constrained behaviors from this point.

Table 16 Campus constrained behavior

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
In the recent year, how often do you carry pepper spray; knife etc. so as to defend yourself at campus?	497	0,74	2,026
In the recent year, how often ask anyone that you know to escort you somewhere you go so as to feel more secure at campus?	497	1,28	2,275
In the recent year, how often ask anyone that you know to take care of your belongings when needed to leave where you are for a short time at campus?	497	3,70	3,236
In the recent year, how often do you give up hitchhiking for security reasons when you go out of campus?	497	2,53	3,471
In the recent year, how often do you give up going certain areas of campus for fear of exposure to any crime in daytime?	497	1,35	2,339
In the recent year, how often do you give up going certain areas of campus for fear of exposure to any crime campus in nighttime?	497	2,61	3,082
In the recent year, how often do you talk to someone in charge for security reasons at campus?	497	0,74	1,746

When the data concerning campus constrained behaviors are examined, we can principally state that behaviors of defense and avoidance are low in terms of average. The highest figure of constrained behavior belongs to students’ demand anyone they know to take care of their belongings in parallel with campus fear of crime. After this constrained behavior for theft precaution, avoidance from going certain areas of campus in nighttime follows first one. Another point that draw attention concerning campus constrained behavior is that frequency of carrying tool so as to defend yourself and talking someone in charge for security reasons are considerably low.

Table 17 Kızılay constrained behaviors

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
In the recent year, how often do you carry pepper spray, knife etc. so as to defend yourself at in Kızılay?	497	1,55	2,898
In the recent year, how often ask anyone that you know to escort you somewhere you go so as to feel more secure in Kızılay?	497	3,69	3,605
In the recent year, how often ask anyone that you know to take care of your belongings when needed to leave where you are for a short time in Kızılay?	497	6,21	3,581
In the recent year, how often do you give up going to the Kızılay for fear of exposure to any crime in daytime?	497	1,68	2,454
In the recent year, how often do you give up going to the Kızılay for fear of exposure to any crime in nighttime?	497	3,99	3,255
In the recent year, how often do you leave Kızılay early for fear of exposure to any crime in daytime?	497	2,45	2,884
In the recent year, how often do you leave Kızılay early for fear of exposure to any crime in a nighttime?	497	4,64	3,463

When the data concerning constrained behaviors-Kızılay are examined, it can be generally observed that average is higher in comparison to campus constrained behaviors. The highest figure of constrained behavior concerning Kızılay belongs to students' demand anyone they know to take care of their belongings as it is at campus. When it is evaluated from this point of view, the most significant security precautions in terms of campus and Kızılay are taken against any possible victimization of theft. Another constrained behavior that can be considered as significant in terms of Kızılay is to leave Kızılay early for fear of exposure to any crime in a nighttime. Similarly, avoidance of going to the Kızılay for fear of exposure to any crime in nighttime is evaluated as third highest constrained behavior.

4.8. Data Analysis

In previous part, basic characteristics of data which are acquired including descriptive statistics are presented. In this part, study aims at testing hypotheses that are related to model by discussing variables in accordance with structure of model we examine in this part. In this respect, effect of basic demographic characteristics such as gender, age, sheltering on the fear of crime is going to be presented firstly.

Our study is going to examine the effect of direct and indirect victimization on fear of crime in accordance with risk assessment model after it gives place to analyses between demographic variables and fear of crime. Similarly, the effect of risk perception of victimization and constrained behaviors on fear of crime is going to be discussed by means of hypotheses testing. Our study lastly is going to discuss fear of crime as dependent variable and give place to regression analysis with a view to observe effects of variables on fear of crime.

Our study includes scale questions designed in accordance with risk assessment perspective. However, analysis of students' fear of crime which is our study subject differs from original fear of crime scale Ferraro (1995) has developed. As indicated before, our survey and subscales are developed on the basis of studies (Fisher and Sloan 2003, Hilinski 2007) which try to evaluate university students' fear of crime because questions of fear about your car to be stolen that exist in original scale don't include all university students.

Measurement reliability of scale questions is carried out with Cronbach Alpha method. If scale value, in other words, Cronbach value equals to 0, 7 and above, that means this scale is reliable. Scale questions which we use in our study are measured separately both for campus and for Kızılay. Cronbach Alpha values presenting to what extent measures conceptions that is wanted to be measured in line with scale questions take place on the table. If the statistical analysis values are examined, it is observed that all scales measuring variables are above this number. All scales being above than 0, 8 Cronbach Alpha value except for campus constrained behaviors shows that scales related to variables are highly reliable.

Table 18 Reliability analysis of scales

Variables(Scale)	Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha)
Incivilities(Campus)	0,836
Incivilities(Kızılay)	0,847
Risk of Victimization(Campus)	0,919
Risk of Victimization(Kızılay)	0,932
Fear of Crime(Campus)	0,946
Fear of Crime(Kızılay)	0,957
Constrained Behaviors(Campus)	0,755
Constrained Behaviors(Kızılay)	0,838

4.8.1. Demographic Variables and Fear of Crime

Association of demographic variables with fear of crime dates back to 1960s when these studies come up. These studies presenting in which basic demographic characteristics differ fear of crime in those years are not based on any theory and only include observations for fear of crime. In this sense, these studies carried out directed to fear of crime aim at observing which demographic variables differ in fear of crime.

First approach trying to correlate between demographic characteristics and fear of crime is vulnerability perspective. This approach puts forth that possible damage which occurs as a result of any attack and to what extent individuals can get rid of this damage determines fear of crime. (Killias, 1990). According to this approach, females and elders relatively feel fear of crime at higher rate because they feel themselves vulnerable. Risk perception model which we examine in our study indicates the effect of personal characteristics on fear of crime and it (Ferraro1995) deals with the effect of fear of crime on the factors such as gender, age, and race. Our study is also going to involve the effects of demographic factors such as gender, age, sheltering on fear of crime in parallel with this approach.

4.8.1.1. Age and Fear of Crime

As we have stated before, our study aims at examining the correlation of age and fear of crime. Vulnerability approach, which studies the relation between fear of crime and personal characteristics states that there is a positive correlation between fear of crime and age. According to this approach, the reason of this situation is that as the age increases, individuals feel more vulnerable and it causes fear of crime.

Since our study aims at university students, our survey is applied to the youth between the age of 18 and 24. For this reason, in contrast to correlation between fear of crime and age, our study aims at testing "as the age increases, fear of crime decreases" hypothesis. The reason is that when we make comparison among the youth, younger feels more vulnerable and inexperienced. In the study that aims at

primary school students, Melde (2007) finds out that as the age of youth increases, fear of crime decreases.

Our study analyzed the correlation between age and fear of crime with the help of correlation analysis. Correlation is a method of analysis used to measure the linear relationship between two variables. According to this method of analysis, if an increase or decrease in a variable causes an increase or decrease in another, it means that there is a positive or negative correlation between each other.

Our study discusses the correlation between age and fear of crime in terms of campus and Kızılay separately. The correlation between age and fear of crime is analyzed on the basis of our "as the age increases, fear of crime decreases" hypothesis. Our hypothesis is tested by using Pearson Correlation analysis. As a result of analysis, it is found out that there is no significant correlation between age and campus fear of crime ($r: -0,057$ $p>0,05$).

Table 19 Age and campus fear of crime correlation

		Age	Campus Fear of Crime
Age	Pearson Correlation	1	-,057
	Sig. (1-tailed)		,103
	N	497	497
Campus	Pearson Correlation	-,057	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	,103	
	N	497	497
Fear of Crime	Pearson Correlation	-,057	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	,103	
	N	497	497

Similarly in our study, to measure the relationship between fear of crime and age in Kızılay, Pearson product moment correlation coefficient is used. In the direction of our "as the age increases, fear of crime decreases" hypothesis, 1 tailed test is chosen because the existence of correlation in a specific direction is estimated. As a result of

the analysis, it is found out that there is a significant correlation between fear of crime and age at $p < 0,01$ level in Kızılay. Table shows the correlation between fear of crime and age in Kızılay.

Table 20 Age and Kızılay fear of crime correlation

		Age	Fear of Crime in Kızılay
Age	Pearson Correlation	1	-,115**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		,005
	N	497	497
Fear of Crime in Kızılay	Pearson Correlation	- ,115**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	,005	
	N	497	497

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

As a result of analysis, it is seen that r value is significant at the 0,01 level. Pearson value gives us information about degree and direction of correlation between two variables. Pearson value places a value between +1 and -1. In this sense in the analysis of r value, 0,1 expresses a small effect, 0,3 expresses middle effect and 0,5 and upper reflects a big effect (Gaziarifoğlu 2009:50). When we evaluate in this respect, 0,115 “ r ” value refers to existence of small, negative correlation between fear of crime and age. In accordance with our hypothesis, the meaning of negative value indicates that as the age increases, fear of crime decreases.

When we examine the correlation between fear of crime and age in general, we can say that age factor doesn't have an important effect upon sample. When we look at the studies between fear of crime and age, it is found out that there is a positive correlation between fear of crime and age. Moreover, there are also studies that show the existence of negative correlation between fear of crime and age. Melde (2007) states that as the age of the youth increase, fear of crime decreases.

As we stated before, our study states that there will negative effect upon fear of crime as the age of university students increases because the time they spend in Kızılay and in campus and also the relationship between friends will increase. Furthermore, there is no significant result between fear of crime and age especially in terms of campus. It means that it will be more significant for us to try to explain campus fear of crime with sociologic facts instead of age.

On the other hand, when we examine in terms of Kızılay, there is little effect of age upon fear of crime. In general, that average fear of crime in Kızılay is higher than in campus implies that age factor is less significant. If we express it clearly, fear of crime is a fact which is higher in regions that have different cultural, ethnic and socio-economic structure. For this reason, age, as a dimension of vulnerability, is more significant in regions where fear of crime is high.

4.8.1.2. Gender and Fear of Crime

Gender is one of the variables that is used in fear of crime studies and upon which there are different views and discussions. The first studies about this subject try to clarify the reason why female feel higher fear of crime although being exposed to a crime is lower in female compared to male. One of the approaches about this subject thinks that as in age variable, vulnerability is explanatory in terms of fear of crime. According to this approach, the fact that females are more vulnerable than male affects their fear of crime (Fisher and Sloan 2003).

Apart from physical vulnerability, another reason why female feel more fear of crime is that they are exposed to much more sexual abuse and as a result, they also feel higher fear against other types of crime. Ferraro (1995) tries to explain the effect of gender on fear of crime by indicating the risk and fear of female's being exposed to sexual abuse and rape affects the fear of other types of crime. From this point of view, our study sets forth that campus and Kızılay fear of crime will be higher in female.

To determine whether there is a difference in the level of female and male students' fear of crime in campus, independent sample t test analysis is performed. With the help of this method, male and female students' fear of crime averages in campus are compared. As a result of this analysis, it is observed that the difference of fear of crime between male and female students is statistically significant.

Table 21 Campus fear of crime and gender

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	t
Male	223	1.2430	1.44622	-.85878	-5,639
Female	274	2.1018	1.94532		

Another interesting aspect of relationship between fear of crime and gender in campus is that the most important difference in the questions of fear of crime results in fear of being exposed to sexual abuse in daytime and nighttime. In other types of crime (theft, robbery, serious attack, simple attack), average fear of crime between male and female varies between -0, 47 and -0, 78. While average anxiety of being exposed to sexual abuse in daytime in male is 0.59, this is 2.21 in female. In a similar way, while average anxiety of being exposed to sexual abuse in nighttime in male is

0.89, this is 2.85 in female. Table shows the average campus fear of crime according to gender in detail.

Table 22 Gender differences in campus fear of crime

	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
Male	1.87	2.24	.97	1.36	.80	1.26	1.03	1.43	.59	.89
Female	2.55	3.02	1.59	2.11	1.27	1.85	1.51	2.05	2.21	2.85
Mean D.	-0.68	-0.78	-0.62	-0.75	-0.47	-0.59	-0.48	-0.62	-1.62	-1.96

S1. Please indicate your fear about your belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen without being exposed to violence at campus in daytime.

S2. Please indicate your fear about your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen without being exposed to violence at campus and in nighttime.

S3. Please indicate your fear about your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen by using violence at campus in daytime.

S4. Please indicate your fear about your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen by using violence at campus in nighttime.

S5. Please indicate your fear about being attacked by using sharp objects at campus in daytime.

S6. Please indicate your fear about being attacked by using sharp objects at campus in nighttime.

S7. Please indicate your fear about being attacked simply at campus in daytime.
(Without using sharp object)

S8. Please indicate your fear about being attacked simply at campus in nighttime.
(Without using sharp object)

S9. Please indicate your fear about being exposed to sexual abuse at campus in daytime.

S10. Please indicate your fear about being exposed to sexual abuse at campus in nighttime.

When we examine campus fear of crime from the point of gender, female suffer from much more anxiety of being exposed to all types of crime in general than male. Moreover, in terms of fear of being exposed to crime, the most significant difference between female and male student is about fear of being exposed to sexual abuse in daytime and nighttime. Warr (1985) states that one of the most important reason why female experience higher fear of crime is sexual abuse. According to this view, treating female like a sexual object and acts including sexual violence, cause female to be more uneasy in society. In a study about sexual abuse and attacks against it, female's being at 11 times more risk than male is the indicator of what a serious danger the female in from the point of sexual abuse (Tjaden and Thoennes 1998 in Scott 2003:203).

When we examine from this point of view, according to vulnerability approach, that female feel much more campus fear of crime stems from the fact that female are less likely to be able to recover the results of victimization. More clearly, the point of view of male or female student to a possible attack or seizure is evaluated according to his or her defense potential against possible crime. Female feeling physically vulnerable feel higher fear of crime compared to male.

To determine whether there is a difference in student's fear of crime in Kızılay in terms of gender, the analysis of independent sample t test is performed. With the guidelines of this method, male and female students' averages of Kızılay fear of crime are compared. As a result of this analysis, it is observed that the difference of fear of crime between male and female students is statistically significant.

Table 23 Fear of crime and gender in Kızılay

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	t
Male	223	4,513	2.39503	-2.36654	-11,191
Female	274	6.8679	2.30308		

When we evaluate the correlation between fear of crime and gender in Kızılay, it is pointed out that difference in fear of crime average between genders is higher than that of at campus. When we evaluate in terms of the level of general fear of crime, it can be stated that campus is safer than Kızılay according to students. The reason why difference in average fear of crime between genders in Kızılay is higher is because female students feel themselves more uneasy in Kızılay compared to campus.

Similar to fear of crime in Campus, the most important difference in the questions of fear of crime results in Kızılay is the fear of being exposed to sexual abuse in daytime and nighttime. In other types of crime (theft, robbery, serious attack, simple attack), average fear of crime between male and female varies between -1, 28 and -2, 00. Although average of anxiety of male about being exposed to sexual abuse in daytime is 2, 27, it is 6, 84 in female. Similarly, average of anxiety of being exposed to sexual abuse in nighttime is 3, 06 in male while it is 8.26 in female. As it is seen in numbers, fear of being exposed to sexual assault in daytime and nighttime is really high in female students. When it is compared to campus fear of crime, fear of being exposed to other types of crime is also high .The table shows averages of fear of crime in Kızılay in terms of gender in detail.

When we analyze fear of crime in Kızılay on the basis of gender, another interesting point is that anxiety of both genders about being exposed to robbery in nighttime is really high in contrast to anxiety of being exposed to robbery at campus. In addition to crime of robbery, the fear of being exposed to theft in daytime and nighttime is also high in both genders. Another interesting point is that fear of being exposed to sexual abuse in daytime is really high in female.

Table 24 Gender differences in Kızılay fear of crime

Gender	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
Male	4.79	5.96	4.27	5.70	3.99	5.32	4.20	5.44	2.27	3.06
Female	6.79	7.86	6.24	7.55	5.27	6.87	5.80	7.19	6.84	8.26
Mean	-	-1.90	-1.97	-1.85	-1.28	-1.55	-1.60	-1.75	-4.57	-5.20
D.	2.00									

S1. Please indicate your fear about your belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen without being exposed to violence in Kızılay in daytime.

S2. Please indicate your fear about your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen without being exposed to violence in Kızılay in nighttime.

S3. Please indicate your fear about your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen by using violence in Kızılay in daytime.

S4. Please indicate your fear about your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen by using violence in Kızılay in nighttime.

S5. Please indicate your fear about being attacked by using sharp objects in Kızılay in daytime.

S6. Please indicate your fear about being attacked by using sharp objects in Kızılay in nighttime.

S7. Please indicate your fear about being attacked simply in Kızılay in daytime. (without using sharp object)

S8. Please indicate your fear about being attacked simply in Kızılay in nighttime. (without using sharp object)

S9. Please indicate your fear about being exposed to sexual abuse in Kızılay in daytime.

S10. Please indicate your fear about being exposed to sexual abuse in Kızılay in nighttime.

When we generally evaluate campus and Kızılay fear of crime in terms of gender, we can state that females feel much more fear of crime than male. It is suggested that among the reasons of this situation, feel of female physically vulnerable in case of exposing to a possible crime and recovery of it harder than male take part. Approach of physical vulnerability claims that occurrence of fear of crime is higher in female and in old age to previously mentioned reasons.

Apart from physical vulnerability, another factor that enhances fear of crime is social vulnerability (Skogan and Maxfield 1981). Although physical vulnerability involves precautionary action of them during possible crime, social vulnerability refers to individuals' feel of vulnerable as a result of social exclusion or marginalization. Social vulnerability manifests itself in concepts such as race, social class, socioeconomic status etc. Gender concept is another dimension of social vulnerability. Apart from difference of sex, society's assignation a meaning to gender and as a result of this meaning, taking shape of social and economic division of labor and inter-family distribution of tasks cause marginalization of female especially in patriarchal societies.

When we handle the subject from the point of fear of crime, girls brought up under the influence of patriarchal culture feel socially more vulnerable and as a consequence, they may have higher fear of crime. When we look at the upbringings of boys and girls, we can see the reflection of patriarchal culture belonging to Turkish society. Stereotyped sentences like "Men don't cry" and "what does a girl do

outside at this hour?" can be given as an example to marginalization in terms of gender. Marginalization which is a dimension of social vulnerability can manifest itself in gender and can try to make female stay in the background. Altınay and Arat mention about the extensity of violence and sexual abuse which are the dimension of marginalization against female in Turkey .They also state that this situation prevents female from entering social and economic life effectively (Altınay and Arat 2008:12).

Apart from physical and social vulnerability, another approach trying to explain the level of female's fear of crime is that female expose to much more sexual abuse compared to male. Treating female like a sexual object brings about sexual abuse against them. In parallel with this view, our study proves that fear of being exposed to sexual abuse in daytime or nighttime is really high among female. All in all, in our study, gender can be evaluated as a significant variable in terms of fear of crime.

4.8.1.3. Studying Class and Fear of Crime

There is no specific hypothesis that shows relationship between class in which student studies and fear of crime in a study including hypotheses related to variables such as age, gender and the place residence. Notwithstanding; certain studies examining the relationship between university students and fear of crime include class to analysis of fear of crime. In our study, it is separately examined whether there is any relationship between class and fear of crime pursuant to study of Fisher, Sloan (2003) and Hilinski (2007) which is aimed at university students.

Our study is going to examine the correlation between class and fear of crime with correlation analysis method. According to this analysis method, if increase or

decrease in a variable causes change in examined variable, it can be mentioned there is positive or negative correlation between these two variables.

Our study discusses separately correlation between class and fear of crime in terms of campus and Kızılay. Two tailed analysis method is preferred because of not having any hypothesis between studying class and fear of crime. As a result of Pearson correlation analysis, it is found out that there is a negative correlation between studying class and average fear of crime at campus.

Table 25 Studied class and campus fear of crime correlation

		Class	Campus fear of crime
Class	Pearson Correlation	1	-,096*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,032
	N	497	497
Campus fear of crime	Pearson Correlation	-,096*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,032	
	N	497	497

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

When the relationship between studying class and fear of crime at campus is evaluated, coincidence of value for r with -, 096 primarily signifies that there is poor relationship between these two variables. While fear of crime at campus does not emerge in age variable, it emerges in variable of class. That can be explicated like that: As the time students spend at campus increases, the fear of crime they feel decreases at the least.

Relationship between class and fear of crime in Kızılay is similarly examined with correlation analysis method. 2-tailed Pearson analysis method is applied because of not having any hypothesis between class and fear of crime. As a result of analysis, it is found out that there is a negative correlation between class and average fear of crime in Kızılay at the level of $p < 0,01$.

Table 26 Studied class and Kızılay fear of crime correlation

		Class	Fear of crime in Kızılay
Class	Pearson Correlation	1	-,159**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000
	N	497	497
Fear of crime in Kızılay	Pearson Correlation	- ,159**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	N	497	497

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

When the relationship between studying class and fear of crime in Kızılay is evaluated, coincidence of value for r with $-,159$ primarily signifies that there is poor relationship between these two variables. Furthermore; when students move to next classes, it can be deduced that fear of crime progressively subside. Factors such as adaptation to city, extension of a circle of friends can be effective in emergence of that outcome.

4.8.1.4. The Place of Residence and Fear of Crime

The studies that measure the correlation between residence and fear of crime usually examine the effects of regions which have different socio-economic levels on fear of crime. According to this approach, it is stated that regions with poor public service and inadequate environmental feature will have higher fear of crime. Pantazis and

Gordon (1998:55) indicated in their study that individuals living in rich region are exposed to crimes against property two times more than people living in regions with low socioeconomic status. Moreover, it is indicated that when it comes to fear of crime, individuals with low socioeconomic status experience higher level of fear of crime because they feel themselves vulnerable.

Our study will examine the correlation between region and fear of crime in terms of the place of residence inside and outside campus in accordance with the model that we examine. The reason why regions with different socioeconomic status are excluded in our study is to stick to the model. This model aims to measure the socioeconomic differences about the place of residence on the basis of environmental feature perception of individuals. The measurement of fear of crime in terms of the place of residence inside and outside campus will help us to understand whether the time spent in campus is relevant to fear of crime in campus or not. Furthermore, it will be examined in our study whether there is a relationship between the place of residence in campus and Kızılay fear of crime.

In our study, the questions about where individuals live are determined as state or private student dormitory at campus, state or private student dormitory outside campus, apartment with friends, family, and relatives or alone. In accordance with our analysis, the place of residence variables is re-determined as the place of residence at campus and the place of residence outside campus.

To analyze whether there is a difference between people living in campus and people living outside campus in terms of fear of crime, independent sample t test analysis is performed. As a result of analysis, it is found out that there is no significant

difference between the place of residence at campus and the place of residence outside campus in terms of fear of crime.

Table 27 Campus fear of crime and residence

Residence	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	t
In campus	212	1.8151	1.84667	.17194	1,060
Outside Campus	285	1.6232	1.74517		

In our study, to analyze whether there is a difference between students living in campus and students living outside campus in terms of the average fear of crime in Kızılay, the analysis of independent sample t test is performed. As a result of this analysis, it is found out that there is no significant difference between the place of residence in campus and the place of residence outside campus in terms of average fear of crime in Kızılay.

Table 28 Fear of crime in Kızılay and residence

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	t
In Campus	212	6.0368	2.58203	.40241	1,695
Outside Campus	285	5.6344	2.64282		

4.8.1.5. Frequency of Going to the Kızılay and Fear of Crime

Our study aims at examining whether there is a correlation between frequency of students' going to the Kızılay and fear of crime although it doesn't takes place

among hypotheses that are related with demographic variables. A question of how often students go to the Kızılay consists of answer options such as one day a week, two-three days a week, every day, every fifteen days, monthly in survey of fear of crime. When it is examined that how far students go to the Kızılay, every fifteen days, one of the answer options, is marked mostly with the 26 percent. As to closest option to this, this option is two-three days a week with 25, 6 percent. Below is the table that shows frequency of students' going to the Kızılay.

Table 29 Frequency of students' going to the Kızılay

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
One day a week	97	19,5	19,5
Two-three days a week	127	25,6	25,6
Everyday	68	13,7	13,7
Every fifteen days	129	26,0	26,0
Monthly	76	15,3	15,3
Total	497	100,0	100,0

One way anova test is applied in order to test whether there is a relationship between frequency of students' going to the Kızılay and average fear of crime in Kızılay and understand whether there is any difference among groups. As a result of test, there is no significant relationship that can be detected between frequency of going to the Kızılay and average fear of crime in Kızılay. ($f= 1,419$ $p>0, 05$)

4.8.1.6. Fear of Crime and Period of Time Spent in Kızılay

Our study includes not only the frequency of going to Kızılay but also the question regarding the period of time, most frequently spent in Kızılay. In order to examine if there is a correlation between fear of crime and period of time spent in Kızılay or not, the question "Which hours do you prefer going to Kızılay?" is asked to the students.

The answer with the highest rate is the evening hours between 17:00-20:00 with % 37, 4. The second answer with the highest rate is the afternoon hours between 14:00-17:00. In order to examine if there is a correlation between period of time which students spend in Kızılay and average Kızılay fear of crime or not, one way anova test is conducted. In the consequence of the analysis performed, it is found out that there is a significant correlation between the most frequent period of time which students spend in Kızılay and average fear of crime in Kızılay. ($f=2,813$ $p< 0,05$) The following table shows the correlation between fear of crime and period of time spent in Kızılay.

Table 30 Fear of crime and period of time spend in Kızılay

Period of Time Spent in Kızılay	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Difference**
Between 8:00- 11:00 in the morning	25	5.8160	2.88064	2,813*	
Between 11:00-14:00 at noon	31	7.0387	2.41822		17:00-20:00 in the evening
14:00-17:00 in the afternoon	175	6.0131	2.56535		
17:00-20:00 in the evening	186	5.4930	2.67032		11:00-14:00 at noon
20:00-24:00 at night	80	5.6000	2.50296		
Total	497	5.8060	2.62202		

* Mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level. ** LSD post-hoc test

In the consequence of the analysis performed, it is found out that there is a statistically significant correlation between period of time which students spent in Kızılay and fear of crime. Post hoc comparison using the Tukey HSD test indicates that mean score for group is significantly different from each other. On the other hand, the effect size is calculated by using eta squared and the result is .02. This figure shows that in spite of statistically significant correlation between group 2 and group 4, the actual difference in mean scores between these groups are quite small.

4.8.2. Direct Victimization and Fear of Crime

Direct victimization is a concept used to explain that individuals are exposed to crime. As a result of this victimization, individuals may develop various reactions and take different precautions in order not to be aggrieved in their future. One of the reactions developed as a result of victimization is fear of crime. Individuals may experience a change on the perception of risk and personal security. As a consequence of this situation, fear of crime differs from individual to individual who are not exposed to the same crimes.

Before direct victimization approach, fear of crime studies used to analyze the differences of personal traits on fear of crime. The researches on the correlation between victimization and fear of crime gave a new dimension to fear of crime studies. For the first time fear of crime studies are started to be analyzed on the basis of a model, along with direct and indirect victimization approach.

When we look at the studies analyzing the correlation between direct victimization and fear of crime, we can say that various results are observed in this respect. Along with numerous studies putting forward that direct victimization increases fear of crime (Skogan 1987, Liska etc 1982, Tseloni and Zarafonitou 2008), the studies which criticize the correlation between fear of crime and direct victimization, also exist (Taylor and Hale 1986). The views which criticize the correlation between direct victimization and fear of crime state that fear of crime and crime rate in the society are not always proportionated.

The correlation between direct victimization and fear of crime is generally analyzed on the basis of the distinction between personal crime victimization and property crime victimization. While personal crime victimization covers types of crime such as battery sexual abuse, menace and fraud, property crime victimization covers property-based types of crime such as car theft, stolen goods, robbery. Similarly, risk assesment perceptivity model which we examined, analyzes the victimization as personal crime victimization and property crime victimization.

Instead of copying Ferraro's (1995) scale on victimization, our study will include questions about victimization which university students may face. In this respect, asking questions about victimization related to being stolen of personal belongings such as wallet or laptop instead of the victimization related to car theft in Ferraro's scale, is more reasonable in our judgement. In accordance with the model, our study includes questions about personal crime victimization and and property crime victimization. In this sense, the questions in our study concern victimization related to theft, robbery, simple attack, serious attack, and sexual abuse. While simple attack, serious attack, and sexual abuse constitute personal crime victimization, theft and robbery constitute personal crime victimization.

After primarily analyzing the correlation between fear of crime and victimization in terms of Kızılay and campus separately, our study also aims to discuss the effect of personal crime victimization and property crime victimization concepts on fear of crime. When we evaluate in this way, we will find out that which type of victimization has more effect on students' fear of crime after general victimization.

In order to specify if there is any difference regarding average fear of crime in campus between students exposed to victimization in campus and students not exposed to any types of crime in the campus, we apply independent sample t test

analysis. In the consequence of the analysis, it is found out that there is a statistically significant distinction between the ones who are victims of a crime in campus and those who are not, in terms of fear of crime at the campus. ($t=3.308$ $P<0.05$)

Table 31 Fear of crime and direct victimization experience in campus

Direct victimization experience in Campus	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean Difference	t
Yes	70	2.3657	1.67210	.75564	3,308
No	427	1.6101	1.78731		

The correlation between direct victimization and fear of crime in Campus has two diverse dimension as follows: personal crime victimization and property crime victimization. As we stated before, while personal crime victimization covers crimes such as attack and sexual abuse, property crime victimization covers crimes regarding personal properties. The kind of crime, which students are exposed to, is an element affecting their fear of crime.

Our study analyzes personal crime victimization on the basis of simple attack, serious attack, and sexual abuse. Students' being exposed to simple attack, serious attack and sexual abuse at campus forms personal crime victimization in total. So as to examine if there is any difference in terms of average campus fear of crime between students who are exposed to personal crime victimization and students who aren't, we apply independent sample t test analysis. In the consequence of the analysis, it is found out that there is no statistically significant distinction between students who are exposed to personal crime victimization and students who aren't in terms of fear of crime in Campus. ($t=1.653$ $P>0.05$)

Table 32 Fear of crime in campus and personal crime victimization experience

Personal Crime Victimization experience	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean Difference	t
Yes	25	2.292 0	1.61785	.60598	1,653
No	47 2	1.686 0	1.78731		

Our study will also analyze property crime victimization concept in terms of average campus fear of crime. Property crime victimization covers the crimes related to the properties of students. Our survey aims to measure property crime victimization at campus on the basis of the theft and robbery questions. So as to examine if there is any difference in terms of average campus fear of crime between students who are exposed to property crime victimization and students who aren't, we apply independent sample t test analysis. In the consequence of the analysis, it is found out that there is a statistically significant distinction between students who are exposed to property crime victimization and students who aren't in terms of fear of crime in Campus. (t=3.720 P<0.05)

Table 33 Fear of crime in campus and property crime victimization

Property Crime Victimization Experience	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean Difference	t
Yes	53	2.5698	1.77976	.95517	3,720
No	444	1.6146	1.76510		

When we examine the correlation between type of victimization and fear of crime, compared to personal crime phenomenon, property crime victimization phenomenon emerges as a factor identifying average campus fear of crime. This consequence

bears resemblance to the results of the studies analyzing victimization and fear of crime (Liska and etc 1982, Smith and Hill 1991). The fact that theft victimization at campus is particularly the most frequent type of victimization with the percentage of %10,3, has an effect on this situation. When we evaluate the case from this point, theft emerges as a factor which affects students' average campus fear of crime.

Another significant characteristic pointed out regarding direct victimization is that gender of the victim is a variable affecting fear of crime. In the studies about victimization and fear of crime, it is mostly found out that females who are exposed to direct victimization feel more fear of crime compared to males (Broungart and Hoyer 1980). The fact that females who are exposed to direct victimization feel more fear of crime compared to males, is tried to be explained on the basis that females generalize their crime experiences more (Smith and Torstensson 1997:608).

In order to analyze if victimization creates a difference in terms of gender, our study compares the male and female students who are exposed to direct victimization in campus. To explain more clearly, the average fear of crime of females and males who are exposed to direct victimization in campus will be compared.

With the aim of determining if gender creates a difference in average campus fear of crime, independent sample t test analysis, which examines if there is a meaningful difference between females and males who are exposed to victimization in terms of fear of crime, is applied. In the consequence of the analysis, no statistically significant correlation between females and males who are exposed to victimization in terms of average fear of crime in campus, can be found. ($t=-.995$ $P>0.05$)

Table 34 Average fear of crime in campus, direct victimization and gender

Average Campus Fear of Crime in Campus	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean Difference	t
Male	27	2.1148	1.79266	-.40844	-.995
Female	43	2.5233	1.59312		

Our study will discuss the effects of victimization outside campus in terms of Kızılay, besides victimization in campus. Like the questions about victimization in campus, our survey aims to measure victimization outside campus by means of the questions about theft, robbery, simple attack, serious attack, and sexual abuse. While the questions about simple attack, serious attack, and sexual abuse constitute personal crime victimization, the questions on robbery and seizure constitute property crime victimization within our study.

In order to specify if there is any difference regarding average fear of crime in Kızılay between students exposed to victimization outside campus and students not exposed to any types of crime outside campus, we apply independent sample t test analysis in our study. In the consequence of the analysis, it is found out that there is a statistically significant distinction between the ones who are victims of a crime outside campus and those who are not, in terms of average fear of crime in Kızılay. (t=3.218 P<0.05)

Table 35 Fear of crime in Kızılay and direct victimization experience outside campus

Direct victimization Experience outside Campus	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean Difference	t
Yes	101	6.5485	2.44776	.93185	3,218
No	396	5.6167	2.63423		

As in the correlation between direct victimization in campus and crime fear in Campus, victimization is divided into two sub-types as; personal crime victimization and property crime. Personal crime victimization is analyzed on the basis of simple attack, serious attack and sexual abuse. The number of simple attack, serious attack and sexual abuse in campus forms personal crime victimization in total. In a similar way, the personal crime victimization outside campus is defined with simple attack, serious attack and sexual abuse. In order to understand the effect of exposition to personal crime outside campus to average fear to crime in Kızılay, by comparing the fear of crime in the victims of personal crime and non-victims of personal crime, an independent simple t-test is applied. In the consequence of the analysis, it is found out that there is a statistically significant distinction between students who are exposed to personal crime victimization outside campus and students who aren't in terms of fear of crime in Kızılay. ($t=3.720$ $P<0.05$)

Table 36 Fear of crime in Kızılay and personal crime victimization outside campus

Personal Crime Victimization Experience outside Campus	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean Difference	t
Yes	64	6.9297	2.26902	1.28973	3,720
No	433	5.6400	2.63211		

The fact that victimization inside and outside campus are different from each other in terms of personal crime victimization experience means that students, exposed to these types of crime, are afraid of being attacked. In other words, students who experienced personal crime victimization in campus do not generalize and convert this into fear of crime; however, the students who are exposed to victimization outside campus perceives this as a danger and develop fear of crime.

Our study will analyze property crime victimization besides personal crime victimization concept in terms of average fear of crime in Kızılay. Property crime victimization covers the crimes related to the properties of students. Our survey aims to measure property crime victimization outside campus on the basis of the theft and robbery questions. So as to examine if there is any difference in terms of average campus fear of crime between students who are exposed to property crime victimization outside campus and students who aren't, we apply independent sample t test analysis. In the consequence of the analysis, it is found out that there is no statistically significant distinction between students who are exposed to property crime victimization and students who aren't in terms of fear of crime in Kızılay.

Table 37 Fear of crime in Kızılay and property crime victimization experience outside campus

Property Crime Victimization Experience outside Campus	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean Difference	t
Yes	52	6.1885	2.62325	.42711	1,112
No	445	5.7613	2.62119		

When we evaluate in terms of property crime victimization experience, there is no distinction between "inside campus" and "outside campus". Students who are victims of property crime victimization at campus are frightened that they may experience such a victimization again. In the meantime, students who are victims of these types of crimes do not have worries regarding Kızılay.

4.8.3. Indirect Victimization and Fear of Crime

Direct victimization is a concept used to explain victimization cases that individuals experience. As for defining the victimization of individuals' close contacts, indirect victimization concept is used. Even though, in broad sense, indirect victimization is considered as victimization which individuals learn from their close contacts and mass media, our study considers indirect victimization from its narrow sense.

Our study aims to measure indirect victimization in harmony with direct victimization. The purpose is to compare the effects of direct victimization and indirect victimization in a reliable way. In this respect, in accordance with the model we examined, our questions about indirect victimization cover questions about indirect personal crime victimization and indirect property crime victimization. In this sense, the questions of our study include indirect victimization questions on theft, robbery, simple attack, serious attack and sexual abuse.

So as to compare fear of crime of individuals who are exposed to indirect victimization and individuals who are not exposed to indirect victimization in terms of average fear of crime in campus, we apply independent sample t test analysis. In

the consequence of the analysis, it is found out that there is a statistically significant distinction between individuals who are exposed to indirect victimization and individuals who are not exposed to indirect victimization in campus in terms of average fear of crime in campus ($t = 2.826$ $p < 0.05$). On the other hand, effect size calculated using eta squared and the result is .01. This figure shows that in spite of statistically significant correlation between this two group, the actual difference in means of scores between these groups is quite small.

Table 38 Campus fear of crime and indirect victimization

Indirect victimization Experience in Campus	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	t
Yes	184	2.0103	1.84623	.46656	2.826
No	313	1.5438	1.73493		

Our study aims to examine the effect of off campus indirect victimization along with indirect victimization in campus on average fear of crime. Our study aims at measuring off campus indirect victimization with similar questions of indirect victimization in campus. In this sense, off campus indirect victimization scale includes questions related to theft, robbery, simple attack, serious attack and sexual abuse.

In our study, independent sample t test analysis is applied on the purpose of comparing the individuals who are exposed to indirect victimization and not exposed indirect victimization outside campus in terms of average fear of crime in Kızılay. As a result of analysis carried out, there is not statistically significant correlation

between individuals who are exposed to indirect victimization and not exposed to indirect victimization outside campus in terms of fear of crime in Kızılay. ($t = 1.837$ $p > 0.05$)

Table 39 Fear of crime and indirect victimization experience outside campus

Indirect Victimization Experience outside Campus	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	t
Yes	259	6.0139	2.42080	.43407	1.837
No	238	5.5798	2.81248		

When we evaluate indirect victimization phenomenon generally, we can state that it is a factor which is less effective in the matter of determining fear of crime in comparison to direct victimization. As a result of analysis carried out, it is put forth that especially indirect victimization outside campus does not have an effect in terms of average fear of crime in Kızılay. When it comes to average fear of crime in campus, we can state that indirect victimization in campus has a slight effect on average campus fear of crime in campus.

4.8.4. Enviromental Disorder and Fear of Crime

Risk perception of individuals related to their neighborhood is an element which has an effect on their risk perception and fear of crime. Social and physical disorders observed in neighborhood may evoke judgements for individuals about being unsafe of this area. Indicators about neighborhood disorder such as abandoned buildings, youth gangs etc. may develop perception related to the fact that this area is not

provided with public service and this directly shows that there can be problem about security.

Neighborhood disorder has two significant dimensions. First one of these two dimensions is physical neighborhood disorder and the other one is social neighborhood disorder. Physical neighborhood disorder includes indicators about physical neighborhood features such as garbages that are not collected, abandoned buildings, graffiti and posters. As to social neighborhood disorder, it includes indicators about social disorders related to security of this area. It involves behavioral patterns which are disapproved by a large section of the community such as selling drug at streets, existence of youth gangs, frequency of occurrence of beggars and tallymen in neighborhood , aggressive and tumultuous neighbors (Melde 2007:29).

Physical and social disorder questions in our study aim at measuring perception of neighborhood disorder both in campus and in Kızılay. Our study aims at measuring perception related to neighborhood disorder in accordance with Ferraro's (1995) risk assessment approach rather than objective evaluations about environment. When it is evaluated from this point of view, whether individual perception about neighborhood effects fear of crime or not will be examined.

This study inquires to what extent students' perception of neighborhood disorder, theft, robbery, attack and sexual abuse are recognized as a significant matter for campus and Kızılay. Apart from these questions, this study also includes questions that evaluate to what extent issues such as garbages that are not collected, graffiti, posters and inadequate lighting cause a problem for students. On the other hand,

campus questions related to social neighborhood disorder inquire to what extent people make a noise, drinkers and the drunk are recognised as a problem.

Neighborhood perception questions related to Kızılay, similarly, include evaluation of social and physical features belonging to Kızılay. A questions related to pick pocketing cases is added to Kızılay questions. The purpose of addition of this question is to ascertain whether this crime which is not observed in campus but common in city center, causes any problem or not.

Our study will examine correlation between perception of neighborhood disorder and fear of crime with correlation analysis method. If increase or decrease in a variable causes change in examined variable, it can be mentioned that there is a positive or negative correlation between these two variables according to this method of analysis. Our study separately handles correlation between perception of neighborhood disorder and fear of crime in terms of campus and Kızılay.

Our hypothesis prefers one tailed analysis method because it states that there is positive correlation between perception of neighborhood disorder and fear of crime. As a result of Pearson correlation analysis, it is found out that there is a positive correlation between perception of neighborhood disorder in campus and average fear of crime in campus. When it is evaluated from this point of view, it can be stated that as students' perception of campus neighborhood increases, average fear of crime in campus also increases.

Table 40 Campus neighborhood disorder and campus fear of crime correlation

		Campus neighborhood disorder	Fear of crime in campus
Campus neighborhood disorder	Pearson correlation	1	,401**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		,000
	N	497	497
Average fear of crime in campus	Pearson correlation	,401**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	N	497	497

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

When we evaluate correlation between perception of the campus neighborhood disorder and fear of crime in campus, r value's being equal to ,401 indicates that there is a positive correlation between perception of neighborhood disorder and average fear of crime in campus in line with our hypothesis. This value signifies that there is moderate correlation between two variables. If needed to express more clearly, perception of campus neighborhood disorder stands as an element which has an effect on average fear of crime in campus.

Our study, similarly, applies correlation analysis in order to test whether there is an correlation between perception of Kızılay neighborhood disorder and average fear of crime in Kızılay. One tailed analysis method is preferred because our hypothesis envisages that there is a positive correlation between Kızılay neighborhood disorder and average fear of crime in Kızılay. As a result of Pearson correlation analysis, it is found out that there is a positive correlation between the perception of Kızılay neighborhood disorder and average fear of crime in Kızılay. When we evaluate in this respect, it can be stated that as students' perception of neighborhood disorder belonging to Kızılay increases, average fear of crime in Kızılay also increases.

Table 41 Kızılay neighborhood disorder and Kızılay fear of crime correlation

		Kızılay neighborhood disorder	Kızılay fear of crime
Kızılay neighborhood Disorder	Pearson Correlation	1	,609**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		,000
	N	497	497
Kızılay fear of crime	Pearson Correlation	,609**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	N	497	497

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

When we evaluate correlation between perception of Kızılay neighborhood disorder and average fear of crime in Kızılay, r value's being equal to ,609 indicates that there is a positive correlation between perception of neighborhood disorder and average fear of crime in Kızılay in line with our hypothesis. This value signifies that there is strong correlation between two variables. If needed to express more clearly, perception of Kızılay neighborhood disorder stands as an element which has an effect on average fear of crime in Kızılay.

Another element that the perception of neighborhood disorder effect is constrained behaviors. Individuals' security perception related to neighborhood people live in effects precautions they take for their personal security. More clearly, if individuals regard their neighborhood as safe, in paralel with that, they will take less security precautions and they will constrain their behaviors less and less. Contrary to this, if individuals regard their neighborhood as insecure, they will enhance their personal security precautions and display more constrained behaviors patterns.

Our study will examine correlation between perception of neighborhood disorder and constrained behaviors in terms of both campus and Kızılay. Correlation analysis is applied to test proposition which is our hypothesis “As the perception of neighborhood disorder increases, constrained behaviors also increase.” One tailed analysis method is preferred because our hypothesis envisages that there is a positive correlation between campus neighborhood disorder and average of constrained behaviors in campus. As a result of Pearson correlation analysis, it is found out that there is a positive correlation between the perception of campus neighborhood disorder and average of constrained behaviors in campus terms of fear of crime. When we evaluate in this respect, it can be stated that as students’ perception of campus neighborhood disorder increases, average of constrained behaviors in campus also increase.

Table 42 Campus neighborhood and campus constrained behaviors correlation

		Campus neighborhood disorder	Constrained behaviors in campus
Campus neighborhood Disorder	Pearson Correlation	1	.403**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.000
	N	497	497
Constrained behaviors in campus	Pearson Correlation	.403**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	
	N	497	497

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

Our study, similarly, will examine perception of neighborhood disorder and constrained behaviors in terms of Kızılay. Correlation analysis is applied to test proposition which is our hypothesis “ As the perception of neighborhood disorder increases, constrained behaviors also increase.” One tailed analysis method is

preferred because our hypothesis envisages that there is a positive correlation between Kızılay neighborhood disorder and average of constrained behaviors in Kızılay. As a result of Pearson correlation analysis, it is found out that there is a positive correlation between the perception of Kızılay neighborhood disorder and average of constrained behaviors in Kızılay in terms of fear of crime. When we evaluate in this respect, it can be stated that as students' perception of Kızılay neighborhood disorder increases, average of constrained behaviors in Kızılay also increase.

Table 43 Kızılay neighborhood disorder and Kızılay constrained behaviors correlation

		Kızılay neighborhood disorder	Constrained behaviors in Kızılay
Average Kızılay neighborhood Disorder	Pearson Correlation	1	.466**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.000
	N	497	497
Constrained behaviors in Kızılay	Pearson Correlation	.466**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	
	N	497	497

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

4.8.5. Perceived Risk of Victimization and Fear of Crime

Perceived risk of victimization is a concept used to express individuals' probability of being exposed to any crime. Risk perception of the victimization, in first glance, can be supposed to be as concept which has same meaning and characteristics with fear of crime. Even though they are close concepts, risk perception of the victimization is a concept that measures risk of individuals being exposed to crime rather than fear of their being exposed to crime. When we evaluate in this respect, perception of risk victimization will gain importance as a concept that enables us to distinguish individuals' victimization risk and fear of being victim.

Individuals' risk of being exposed to crime and their fear of being exposed to crime can be different from one another. For instance; as the risk of an individual's, belonging to criminal subculture, possibility of being exposed to crime is too high, individual's fear of crime can be low because of his/her neighborhood and interaction with people who have criminal careers. Similarly, even though an individual who feels himself/herself relatively defenseless considers his/her risk of being exposed to crime as low, his/her fear of being exposed to crime can be evaluated as high.

Our study differentiates fear of crime and perceived risk of victimization in line with Ferraro's model (1995). After it evaluates individuals' risk of being exposed to crime separately, it aims to discuss effects of this risk on fear of crime. Before our study tests hypotheses about risk perception of victimization, it will handle how risk perception of victimization shows a change according to gender in terms of both campus and Kızılay. After that, it will be discussed in what way risk perception of victimization effects fear of crime.

Our study aims to measure risk perception of victimization on the basis of questions which measure fear of crime in order to make more sound comparison. Our study, similar to fear of crime, includes questions which measure the risk of being exposed to crimes such as theft, robbery, simple attack, serious attack and sexual abuse in terms of campus and Kızılay. Survey questions include questions which want to evaluate risk perception of daytime and nighttime in order to examine what sort of differences exist in risk perception of victimization between day and night.

4.8.5.1. Perceived Risk and Gender

As we mentioned before, perceived risk is a concept which examines probability of being victim of a crime rather than individuals' fear of crime. If individuals' probability of being exposed to any crime is high, this affects fear of crime. One of the elements which are of vital importance for risk perception of victimization is gender. Studies carried out on this subject indicate that females carry much more risk perception in comparison to males. Warr (1984:690) expresses that females consider any place where males regard secure as insecure. The reason is that females feel themselves defenseless against some crimes. For instance; sexual abuse is type of crime which effects females' risk perception of victimization. However; it can be stated that males carry higher risk perception of victimization when it comes to violent crimes such as robbery in comparison to females (Reid and Konrad 2004:407).

Independent sample t test analysis is applied in order to determine whether there is a difference between female and male students' risk perception of victimization in campus. Female and male students' campus risk perceptions of victimization are compared with this analysis method. As a result of analysis carried out, it is observed that difference between average campus risk perception of victimization of female and male students is statistically significant. ($t=-5,459 < 0,05$)

Table 44 Perceived risk of victimization in campus and gender

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	t
Male	223	1.5314	1.31738	-.76241	-5.459
Female	274	2.2938	1.79215		

When we evaluate the correlation between perceived risk of victimization in campus and gender, we can state that females carry higher risk perception of victimization in comparison to males in parallel with studies about risk perception of victimization. Similar to our fear of crime analysis, it comes into view that risk perception of victimization increases in nighttime. When we look at questions about risk perception of victimization, we observe that the most significant difference between female and male appears in probability of being exposed to sexual abuse at campus in daytime and nighttime as it is in fear of crime.

When it comes to another point that is really important for our study, this point is that males carry lower risk perception of victimization in terms of violent crimes such as robbery in comparison to females by contrast with study carried out by Reid and Konrad (2004:407). Females give higher points to all questions concerning probability of being exposed to theft, robbery, simple attack, serious attack which takes place in our study.

Table 45 Gender differences in campus fear of crime

	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
Male	2.33	2.87	1.02	1.38	.82	1.43	1.47	1.87	.79	1.33
Female	2.89	3.63	1.38	2.31	1.17	2.05	1.66	2.31	2.28	3.26
Mean D.	-0.56	-0.76	-.36	-0.93	-.35	-.62	-.19	-.44	-1.49	-1.93

S1. Please estimate the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc) without being exposed to violence at campus in daytime?

S2. Please estimate the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc) without being exposed to violence at campus in nighttime.

S3. Please estimate the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc) by using violence in daytime.

S4. Please estimate the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc) by using violence in nighttime.

S5. Please estimate your probability of being attacked by using sharp object at campus in daytime.

- S6. Please estimate your probability of being attacked by using sharp object at campus in nighttime.
- S7. Please estimate your probability of being attacked simply at campus in daytime. (without using sharp object)
- S8. Please estimate your probability of being attacked simply at campus in nighttime. (without using sharp object)
- S9. Please estimate your probability of probability of exposure to sexual abuse at campus in daytime?
- S10. Please estimate your probability of exposure to sexual abuse at campus in nighttime.

Our study, similar to campus risk perception of victimization, examines the correlation between risk perception of victimization in Kızılay and gender. Questions about risk perception of victimization inquire probability of being exposed to theft, robbery, simple attack, serious attack and sexual abuse similar to questions of risk perception of victimization in campus. Similarly again, our study wants students evaluate probability of being exposed to these crimes in daytime and in nighttime separately.

Independent sample t test analysis is applied to determine whether there is any difference between risk perception of victimization levels of male and female students in Kızılay. With this analysis method, averages of the male and female students' risk perception of victimization in Kızılay are compared. As a result of analysis carried out, it is observed that there is statistically significant difference between male and female students in terms of average risk perception of victimization in Kızılay. ($t=-11.689 < 0,05$)

Table 46 Perceived risk of victimization in Kızılay and gender

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	t
Male	223	5.2242	2.01607	-2.02250	-11.689
Female	274	7.2467	1.83535		

When we evaluate the correlation between risk perception of victimization in Kızılay and gender, we can state that females carry higher risk perception of victimization in comparison to males in parallel with studies about risk perception of victimization. Similar to our fear of crime analysis, it comes into view that risk perception of victimization increases in nighttime. When we look at questions about risk perception of victimization, we observe that the most significant difference between female and male appears in probability of being exposed to sexual abuse and theft in nighttime.

When it comes to another point that is really important for our study, this point is that males carry lower risk perception of victimization in terms of violent crimes such as robbery in comparison to females by contrast with study carried out by Reid and Konrad (2004:407). Females give higher points to all questions concerning probability of being exposed to theft, robbery, simple attack, serious attack which takes place in our study. While probability of being exposed to theft in daytime and in nighttime and probability of being exposed to simple attack in nighttime constitute the most highest risk perception of victimization from the point of males, being exposed to theft in nighttime and in daytime and sexual abuse in nighttime constitute the highest risk perception of victimization from the point of females.

Table 47 Gender differences in Kızılay fear of crime

Gender	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10
Male	5.67	6.74	4.69	6.20	4.26	6.13	4.96	6.26	3.11	4.23
Female	7.36	8.34	6.26	7.67	5.54	7.43	6.26	7.61	7.34	8.66
Mean D.	-1.69	-1.60	-1.57	-1.47	-1.28	-1.30	-1.30	-1.35	-4.23	-4.43

S1. Please estimate the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc) without being exposed to violence in Kızılay in daytime?

S2. Please estimate the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc) without being exposed to violence in Kızılay in nighttime.

S3. Please estimate the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc) by using violence in Kızılay in daytime.

S4. Please estimate the probability of being stolen of your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc) by using violence in Kızılay in nighttime.

S5. Please estimate your probability of being attacked by using sharp object in Kızılay in daytime.

S6. Please estimate your probability of being attacked by using sharp object in Kızılay in nighttime.

S7. Please estimate your probability of being attacked simply in Kızılay in daytime. (without using sharp object)

S8. Please estimate your probability of being attacked simply in Kızılay in nighttime. (without using sharp object)

S9. Please estimate your probability of exposure to sexual abuse in Kızılay in daytime?

S10. Please estimate your probability of exposure to sexual abuse in Kızılay in nighttime?

When we assess the correlation between risk perception of victimization in Kızılay and gender, we can state that females feel higher risk perception of victimization than males in parallel with the studies about risk perception of victimization. As in campus risk perception of victimization, we can state that risk perception of victimization in Kızılay is higher in nighttime. Again, similar to campus, we can see that the highest difference between females and males occurs in the probability of being exposed to sexual abuse in daytime and nighttime in terms of risk perception of victimization in Kızılay. Another attention seeking situation about risk perception

of victimization in Kızılay is that in contrast to the study of Reid and Konrad (2004:407), males' probability of being exposed to violent crimes such as seizure is lower compared to females.

When we compare Kızılay and campus risk perception of victimization, we can state that risk perception of victimization in Kızılay is higher than campus risk perception of victimization in all questions. Another interesting point in our analysis is that there is a significant difference between campus and Kızılay in the way of robbery crime. Although students evaluate the probability of being exposed to robbery crime at campus as low, they evaluate this probability as really high in Kızılay. In terms of males, being exposed to theft, simple attack and robbery in nighttime create the highest risk perception of victimization. On the other hand, being exposed to theft and sexual abuse in nighttime and daytime create the highest risk perception of victimization among females.

When we assess statistics in this way, although robbery and violence crimes are lower in males than females in contrast to studies about this issue, males consider the probability of being exposed to these crimes on the front line. When we assess in this respect, we can state that especially in Kızılay, males evaluate the probability of being exposed to robbery and violent crime as high.

Risk perception of victimization is a concept concerned with individual's personal security. Individuals, in consequence of interaction with neighborhood, make neighborhood evaluations about their personal securities. When we assess in this respect, individual's risk perception of victimization is a concept which affects their

fear of crime. Our study aims at examining the correlation of risk perception of victimization and fear of crime in terms of campus and Kızılay.

Our study performed the correlation analysis to test the "as the average risk perception of victimization in campus increases, average fear of crime in campus increases" hypothesis. As our hypothesis set forth a positive correlation between risk perception of victimization in campus and average fear of crime in campus, one tailed method of analysis is chosen. In consequence of Pearson correlation analysis, it is found out that there is a positive correlation between risk perception of victimization in campus and average fear of crime in campus. When we evaluate from this point of view, we can state that as the students' risk perception of victimization increases, average fear of crime in campus increases. ($r=0.796$ $p<0.05$)

Table 48 Campus perceived risk of victimization and campus fear of crime correlation

		Perceived risk of victimization in campus	Fear of crime in campus
Perceived risk of victimization in campus	Pearson Correlation	1	,796**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		,000
	N	497	497
Fear of crime in campus	Pearson Correlation	,796**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	,000	
	N	497	497

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

When we evaluate the correlation between campus perceived risk of victimization and average campus fear of crime, we can infer that in accordance with our hypothesis, the increase of risk perception of victimization enhances average campus fear of crime. Being 0,796, r value which enables us to have knowledge about the

strenght and direction of correlation shows that there is a strong correlation between risk perception and fear of crime in campus.

Our study performed the correlation analysis to test the "as the average perceived risk of victimization in Kızılay increases, average fear of crime in Kızılay increases" hypothesis. As our hypothesis set forths a positive correlation between perceived risk of victimization in Kızılay and average fear of crime in Kızılay, one tailed method of analysis is chosen. In consequence of Pearson correlation analysis, it is found out that there is a positive correlation between risk perception of victimization in Kızılay and average fear of crime in Kızılay. When we evaluate from this point of view, we can state that as the students' risk perception of victimization in Kızılay increases, average fear of crime in Kızılay increases. ($r=0.852$ $p<0.05$)

Table 49 Kızılay perceived risk of victimization and Kızılay fear of crime correlation

		Perceived risk of victimization in Kızılay	Fear of crime in Kızılay
Perceived risk of victimization in Kızılay	Pearson Correlation	1	,852**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		,000
	N	497	497
Fear of crime in Kızılay	Pearson Correlation	,852**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	,000	
	N	497	497

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

When we evaluate the correlation between perceived risk of victimization and average fear of crime in Kızılay, we can infer that in accordance with our hypothesis, the increase of risk perception of victimization enhances average fear of crime Kızılay. Being 0,852, r value which enables us to have knowledge about the strenght

and direction of correlation shows that there is a strong correlation between perceived risk of victimization Kızılay and fear of crime Kızılay.

4.8.6. Constrained Behaviors and Fear of Crime

An individual who is in interaction with the society determines his or her behaviors as a result of this interaction. As in other social behavioral pattern, individual also acts as a result of this interaction about his or her security. Moreover, the level of interaction between individual and society and the societies that he is in interaction can differ. When we evaluate in the sense of our subject, individuals determine whether the neighborhood is safe or not on the basis of individuals or institutions that he or she is in interaction.

Risk assessment approach of Ferraro (1995) which we analyze emphasises that individuals make decisions about their securities as a result of this interaction. According to this approach, individuals impose restrictions in their certain behaviors in parallel with the level of fear of crime. In parallel with this approach, an individual worried about being victim of any crime imposes restrictions in his certain behaviors.

These constrained behaviors which emerge due to individuals' anxiety of security can be avoidance of being exposed to a probable crime or defensive against a probable crime. Our study aims at measuring individuals' constrained behaviors relevant to campus and Kızılay on the basis of avoidance and defensive behaviors. When we evaluate from this point of view, our questions which measure constrained behaviors include both avoidance and defensive questions.

Our study will examine the correlation of constrained behaviors with fear of crime in terms of both campus and Kızılay. Our study performed the correlation analysis to test the "as average campus constrained behaviors increase, average campus fear of crime increases" hypothesis. As our hypothesis set forths a positive correlation between constrained behavior in campus and average fear of crime in campus, one tailed method of analysis is chosen. In consequence of Pearson correlation analysis, it is found out that there is a positive correlation between constrained behavior in campus and average fear of crime in campus. When we evaluate from this point of view, we can state that as the students' constrained behaviors in campus increase, average fear of crime in campus increases. ($r=0.604$ $p<0.05$)

Table 50 Campus constrained behavior and campus fear of crime correlation

		Constrained behavior in campus	Fear of crime in campus
Constrained behavior in campus	Pearson Correlation	1	,604**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		,000
	N	497	497
Fear of crime in campus	Pearson Correlation	,604**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	,000	
	N	497	497

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

When we evaluate the correlation between constrained behaviors in campus and average fear of crime in campus, we can infer that in accordance with our hypothesis, the increase of constrained behaviors in campus enhances average fear of crime in campus. Being 0,604, r value which enables us to have knowledge about the strenght and direction of correlation shows that there is a moderate correlation between constrained behavior in campus and fear of crime in campus.

Our study performed the correlation analysis to test the "as average constrained behaviors in Kızılay increase, average fear of crime increases in Kızılay" hypothesis. As our hypothesis set forths a positive correlation between constrained behavior in Kızılay and average fear of crime in Kızılay, one tailed method of analysis is chosen. In consequence of Pearson correlation analysis, it is found out that there is a positive correlation between constrained behavior in Kızılay and average fear of crime in Kızılay. When we evaluate from this point of view, we can state that as the students' constrained behaviors in Kızılay increase, average fear of crime in Kızılay increases. (r=0.625 p<0.05)

Table 51 Kızılay constrained behavior and Kızılay fear of crime correlation

		Constrained behavior in Kızılay	Fear of crime in Kızılay
Constrained behavior in Kızılay	Pearson Correlation	1	,625**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		,000
	N	497	497
Fear of crime in Kızılay	Pearson Correlation	,625**	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	,000	
	N	497	497

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

When we evaluate the correlation between constrained behavior in Kızılay and average fear of crime in Kızılay, we can infer that in accordance with our hypothesis, the increase of constrained behavior in Kızılay enhances average fear of crime in Kızılay. Being 0,625, r value which enables us to have knowledge about the strength and direction of correlation shows that there is a moderate correlation between constrained behavior in Kızılay and fear of crime in Kızılay.

4.8.7. The Difference between Daytime and Nighttime Fear of Crime

Individuals' security perception is a concept which varies in accordance with period of time. In neighborhood, an individual who does not feel apprehension in daytime may not feel safe in nighttime. In the study about the effect of neighborhood impacts on fear of crime, Warr (1990:893) set forths that darkness is an element which increases the fear of crime. Since fear of crime is high in nighttime, municipalities which give public service are sensitive about this issue and it causes them to take precautions such as police patrol squad and lightning. In their study, Atkins and etc (1991) states that lightning has a decreasing effect on fear of crime especially in public spaces.

To determine whether there is a difference between daytime and nighttime or not, our study will compare the averages of fear of daytime and nighttime by performing paired samples t test. Our study will examine whether there is a difference between daytime and night time fear of crime both in Kızılay and in campus. First of all, our study examined the difference between daytime and night time in terms of fear of crime in campus and it also compared the average fear of crime in campus in daytime and average fear of crime in campus in nighttime. As a result of this analysis, it is observed that the difference of average fear of crime in campus between daytime and night time is statistically significant. ($t = -13.721 < 0.05$)

Table 52 Fear of crime and period of time in campus

Period of Time	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	t
Daytime	497	1.4781	1.71512	-.47686	-13,721
Nighttime		1.9549	1.93963		

To determine whether there is a difference between daytime and nighttime in terms of average fear of crime in Kızılay, our study will compare the averages of fear of daytime and nighttime by performing paired samples t test. Our study examined the difference between daytime and nighttime in terms of fear of crime in Kızılay and it also compared the average fear of crime in Kızılay in daytime and average fear of crime in Kızılay in nighttime. As a result of this analysis, it is observed that the difference of average fear of crime in Kızılay between daytime and nighttime is statistically significant. ($t = -24.844 < 0.05$)

Table 53 Fear of crime and period of time in Kızılay

Period of Time	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	t
Daytime	497	5.1646	2.69193	-1.28290	-24,844
Nighttime		6.4475	2.67696		

When we assess eta squared values belonging to both campus and Kızılay (0.2 for campus, 0.5 for Kızılay), we observe that the difference of fear of crime between daytime and nighttime is large effect size. It means that there are significant differences between individuals' daytime and nighttime fear of crime. When we evaluate from this point of view, that fear of crime in Kızılay between daytime and nighttime is high means that students consider this region less safe in nighttime. As in the study of Warr (1990:905), darkness and cosmopolitan neighborhood play a role that increases fear of crime. From this point of view, that Kızılay has relatively more cosmopolitan structure compared to campus and darkness plays a role which increases fear of crime.

4.8.8. The Difference between Campus and Kızılay Fear of Crime

Fear of crime can vary in different neighborhoods. Since individuals are always in interaction with neighborhood where they reside, the perception of security in different neighborhoods varies in accordance with this interaction. After our study handles the level of university students' fear of crime in terms of campus and Kızılay, it will examine what kind of variations fear of crime shows in terms of these two neighborhood.

Individuals' fear of crime shows increase in regions where neighborhood and social variations are numerous. For instance, in studies about race and fear of crime, it shows that whites living in regions that have numerous ethnic variation feel much more fear of crime compared to those living in regions that have less ethnic variation. Therefore, individuals' risk perception of security can increase in regions where differentiation is high. When we assess in terms of our study, it is set forth that students feel higher fear of crime in Kızılay which has higher variation compared to campus region around which there is wire fence and in the entrance of which security control is made.

In our study, to test "students' average fear of crime in Kızılay is higher than average fear of crime" in Campus hypothesis, paired samples t test is performed. As a result of this test, the averages of students' fear of crime in Kızılay and campus will be compared. Our study examined average fear of crime in Kızılay and campus and it compared fear of crime in both region. As a result of this analysis, it is observed that the difference between average fear of crime in Kızılay and average fear of crime in Campus is statistically significant. ($t= 39.029 < 0.05$)

Table 54 Kızılay and campus fear of crime

Fear of Crime	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	t
Kızılay	497	5.8060	2.62202	4.08954	39,029
Campus		1.7165	1.78936		

As can be seen on the table, there is a big difference between campus and Kızılay in terms of fear of crime. Our analysis which is handled in terms of students' average fear of crime does not show in what crimes there is a higher difference. To determine which crimes have higher fear differences in terms of the regions of Kızılay and campus, it is needed to compare the questions measuring fear crime in terms of the crime types considering their averages. The table compares fear of crime in terms of types of crime in the questions.

Table 55 The difference between fear of crime in campus and Kızılay and types of crime

	N	Kızılay Mean	Campus Mean	Mean Difference
Please indicate your fear about your belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen without being exposed to violence in daytime.	497	5.89	2.24	3.65
Please indicate your fear about your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen without being exposed to violence in nighttime	497	7.01	2.67	4.34
Please indicate your fear about your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen by using violence in daytime.	497	5.36	1.31	4.05
Please indicate your fear about your personal belongings (wallet, laptop, book etc.) to be stolen by using violence in nighttime.	497	6.72	1.77	4.95
Please indicate your fear about being attacked by using sharp objects in daytime.	497	4.69	1.06	3.63
Please indicate your fear about being attacked by using sharp objects in nighttime.	497	6.18	1.58	4.6
Please indicate your fear about being attacked simply in daytime. (without using sharp object)	497	5.08	1.30	3.78
Please indicate your fear about being attacked simply in nighttime. (without using sharp object)	497	6.40	1.77	4.63
Please indicate your fear about being exposed to sexual abuse in daytime.	497	4.79	1.48	3.31
Please indicate your fear about being exposed to sexual abuse in nighttime.	497	5.93	1.97	3.96

When we look at the difference between fear of crime in Kızılay and campus in terms of types of crime, we observe that the highest difference emerges in robbery and violent crimes. Students make an important distinction between Kızılay and campus in terms of fear of robbery and violent crimes. Another noticeable feature of the difference between fear of crime in Kızılay and campus is that the difference

belonging to these types of crime increases more in nighttime. It means that Kızılay is considered really dangerous in nighttime in terms of fear of crime. When we look at the types of crime in Kızılay and in campus, we observe that there is anxiety of being exposed to robbery, simple attack and serious attack in nighttime.

4.9. Multivariate Analysis of Fear of Crime

Fear of crime, like many social fact, has an complex structure which can not be degraded into a single reason. When we evaluate from this point of view, individuals' fear of crime takes form depending on lots of reason and it is affected by different socio-demographic variables. When we evaluate from this point of view, that trying to understand the multidimensional structure of fear of crime and taking in consideration factors which affects it will enable us to understand fear of crime fact.

Risk assessment perspective model with which we handle fear of crime aims at measure fear of crime on the basis of micro and macro reasons by taking into consideration the multidimensional structure of fear of crime. Ferraro (1995) states that it is inadequate to measure fear of crime on the basis of just demographic variables or macro social structures. According to him, fear of crime is a complex fact which takes forms as a result of macro and micro factors.

Risk assessment perspective emphasis that demographic variables, neighborhood and physical features and personal behavioral patterns are effective at fear of crime. For this reason, to analyze the fear of crime, it measures macro dimensions such as the perception of neighborhood disorder and the effects of social structure on fear of

crime in addition to personal variables such as age and gender. In this regard, risk assessment perspective examines not only the effects of demographic variables on fear of crime but also the effects of social structural factors on fear of crime.

Another significant approach that our model provides in terms of fear of crime is that it enables us to see the effects of personal security perception shaped as a result of individual's interaction with neighborhood upon fear of crime. If we express it clearly, risk assessment perspective brings a new dimension to fear of crime studies because it set forths that fear of crime can show a change as a result of personal and corporate interaction. In this regard, questions which measure the individuals' risk perception of victimization or perception of neighborhood dimension measure how individuals look at these facts rather than objective evaluations.

Our study, in line with risk assessment approach, aims at examining the personal and structural factors which affects fear of crime as a whole. In this sense, the effects of variables about risk assessment approach on fear of crime will be studied. In previous part, our study tested the hypothesis which are put forth in accordance with risk perception model. Furthermore, hypothesis that we handle measure the effect of a single variable on fear of crime. In multidimensional structure, observing the effect of each variable on fear of crime enables us to evaluate sociologic factors which affect it clearly.

In previous part, analysis in which we examine the effect of one variable on fear of crime did not enable us to make cause and effect correlation between variables and fear of crime. Our analysis about fear of crime tests whether there is a difference between groups in terms of fear of crime or whether there is a correlation of a

variable with the variable that we examine. When we evaluate from this point of view, correlation analysis provides us the factors which fear of crime is associated with, not the factors that fear of crime cause. We, on the other hand, can set forth factors that cause fear of crime by using regression analysis method. Eymen (2007) summarizes the difference between regression and correlation analysis and the probable results of it in this way:

“Regression analysis is a method of analysis that enables us to find the cause and effect correlation between variables. For example, the correlation between eating and gaining weight can be measured by regression analysis. In correlation analysis, on the other hand, the strength and direction of correlation between two variables is measured. However, this correlation does not have to be cause and effect correlation. For instance, there is a linear positive correlation between crowing of cocks in the morning and sunrise. However, this correlation does not mean sunrise is the result of crowing of cocks.” (Eymen, 2007:92)

Our study will examine the effect of variables on fear of crime by examining variables used in risk perception approach via regression analysis and it also will discuss that variables which we handle explain fear of crime to what extent. In this sense, apart from demographic independent variables such as gender and age, studied class and sheltering are included in our analysis. Along with these independent variables, direct victimization in campus and off campus and indirect victimization in campus and off campus are added to the list of independent variables which will be examined. Students' perception of neighborhood disorder, risk perception of victimization and variables of constrained behaviors are also other variables included in our regression analysis.

Regression analysis which aims to reveal variables affecting fear of crime is performed in campus and in Kızılay separately. Thus, it will enable us to evaluate factors that affect fear of crime in both regions better. Whether the rate of independent variables differs in their effect on fear of crime in campus and Kızılay will be understood by these two different regression analyses. After giving place to regression analysis belonging to campus and Kızılay, the effects of these variables on fear of crime will be discussed.

4.9.1. Multiple Regression Analysis of Campus Fear of Crime

The models having an impact on the campus fear of crime of the students will be subjected to the multiple regression analysis. Our study will show to what extent the independent variables we have determined affect the fear of crime in campus dependent variable and will enable to make interpretations on the explanatory case of the model.

The independent variables included in the multiple regression analysis are as follows: Age, Gender, Studying class [Grade], accommodation of student (in-campus, outside campus), direct victimization in campus, off-campus direct victimization, indirect victimization in campus, off-campus indirect victimization, Campus incivility perception, perceived risk of victimization in campus, constrained behaviors in campus.

The model summary showing the effect of 11 independent variables used in our study on the fear of crime in campus is given in the Table. As seen from the table, R

value of 0.828 shows that there is a strong relation between the fear of crime in campus, the independent variable and 11 independent variables used. R Square value of “0.684” shows that the regression model explains 68% of the change in the fear of crime in campus. Existence of very small difference between the adjusted r square value and r square shows us the regression model can be generalized.

Table 56 Model summary fear of crime in campus

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,828^a	,685	,678	1,01554

a. Predictors: (Constant), constrained behavior in campus, Off-campus indirect victimization, Age, Residential Status, direct victimization & indirect victimization in campus, Off-campus direct victimization, Campus environmental deterioration, perceived risk of victimization in campus, class
 b. Dependent Variable: campus fear of crime

Anova value enables us to see whether the model we deal with in our study is statistically meaningful. “f” value in the ANOVA analysis greater than 1 indicates that the model we have established is useful in explaining the dependent variable. We have a look at the values in the Table; we see that our model is statistically meaningful (Sig .000). F value greater than 1 indicates that the model is useful in explaining the campus fear of crime.

Table 57 ANOVA

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1087.915	11	98.901	95.898	.000 ^a
	Residual	500.190	485	1.031		
	Total	1588.105	496			

The coefficients relating to the independent variable arising from the multiple regression analysis are also shown in the table. “t” value in the table means the effect a change in the independent variable creates on the campus fear of crime, which is

the dependent variable. Whether this change is statistically meaningful is understood from the value in the significance Table. In this respect, the significance value must be smaller than 0.05 value in order for the independent variable to create a meaningful impact on the dependent value. Another significant indicator in the table is in the tolerance box. This indicator shows us whether there is a problem in terms of multicollinearity. The values in the table being close to 0 results in a problem in the regression analysis in this aspect. When we evaluate the table, it is seen that there is no problem in the collinearity for the regression analysis.

Examining the significance indicator in the table, it is seen that there are two major independent variable affecting the fear of crime. These variables are perceived risk of victimization and constrained behaviors in campus in this order. We can conclude the impact of these variables on the model as follows:

4.9.1.1. Perceived Risk of Victimization in Campus

According to the regression model we examine, the perception of risk of victimization of students with regard to the victimization is a factor determining their fear of crime in campus. To be more clear, the differences about students' being a victim of a crime at the campus result in differences of fear of crime of those students ($p < 0,001$).

When we evaluate the impact the campus perceived risk of victimization has over the fear of crime in campus through our model, we can say that 1 unit of increase in the perceived risk of victimization will lead to an increase of 0.728 in the fear of crime in

campus ($\beta=0.728$). Evaluated over the model, it is possible to assert that the perceived risk of victimization is the most significant variable affecting the fear of crime in campus.

4.9.1.2. Constrained Behaviors in Campus

According to the regression model we examine, the variable; constrained behaviors of university students in campus, is a factor determining their fear of crime in campus. More expressly, the frequency of constrained behaviors of students in campus is a factor resulting in variations of their fear of crime in campus ($p<0,001$).

Evaluating the impact of the constrained behaviors in campus on the fear of crime in campus via our model, we can say that one unit of increase in the constrained behaviors in campus will lead to an increase of 0.300 unit in the fear of crime in campus ($\beta=0.300$).

Table 58 Fear of crime in campus coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance
1	(Constant)	-1.267	1.014		-1.25	0.212	
	Age	0.074	0.053	0.068	1.392	0.164	0.269
	Gender	-0.114	0.106	-0.032	-1.08	0.281	0.753
	Class [Grade]	-0.101	0.063	-0.08	-1.606	0.109	0.264
	Residence	0.009	0.096	0.002	0.093	0.926	0.93
	Direct Victimization in Campus	-0.204	0.144	-0.04	-1.41	0.159	0.823
	Off-Campus Direct Victimization	0.181	0.126	0.041	1.438	0.151	0.808
	Indirect Victimization in Campus	0.109	0.101	0.03	1.08	0.281	0.869
	Off-Campus Indirect Victimization	-0.05	0.097	-0.014	-0.515	0.607	0.89
	Campus Environmental Deterioration	-0.028	0.026	-0.032	-1.072	0.284	0.709
	Perceived Risk of Victimization in Campus	0.728	0.036	0.667	20.353	0	0.604
	Campus Constrained Behavior	0.3	0.036	0.285	8.297	0	0.551

a. Dependent Variable: average campus fear of crime

Although the tolerance values pertaining to the independent variables used in the regression model do not refer to any problem in terms of multicollinearity, the fact that only perceived risk of victimization and constrained behaviors in campus from the independent variables are statistically meaningful, reinforces the probability that these two variables might be collinear with the other variables. Existence of a statistically meaningful relation between the independent variables such as campus incivility perception, gender, direct victimization, and the fear of crime in campus in the relevant correlation and t test analyses necessitates an evaluation by means of a separate regression model.

As we have stated before, multicollinearity is a situation occurring as a result of the fact that two or more variables are interconnected. Multicollinearity does not constitute a problem in terms of the definition impact of the independent variable by the model. When evaluated for our example, to what degree the model we have established explains the dependent variable of fear of crime in campus is a case independent from the multicollinearity phenomenon. Nonetheless, the fact that which independent variables have an impact on the fear of crime in campus creates a problem if there is multicollinearity.

For the purpose of testing whether the variables other than the perceived risk of victimization and constrained behavior in campus variables are statistically meaningful, our study has formed a regression model, which includes the variables of Age, Gender, Class, accommodation of student (in-campus – off-campus), direct victimization in campus, off-campus direct victimization, indirect victimization in campus, off-campus indirect victimization, perception of campus neighborhood deterioration.

Table 59 Model summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.463^a	.214	.199	1.60102

Campus neighborhood deterioration, off-campus indirect victimization, residence, age, direct victimization in campus, Gender, indirect victimization in campus, Off-campus direct victimization, Class studies.

The effect of this model created by removing two statistically meaningful independent variables (perceived risk of victimization in campus and constrained behaviors in campus) on the fear of crime in campus is given in the Table. As also will be seen from the table, removing of two independent variables decreased R value from 0.827 to 0.463. The new model created by omitting these two variables explains 21 percent of the fear of crime in campus. The fact that the variables not

having a statistically meaningful effect in the previous analysis explain 21 percent of the fear of crime in campus implies that the multicollinearity problem exists.

When we review the table showing the coefficient values pertaining to the model, the variables having a statistically meaningful effect on the fear of crime in campus in terms of 9 independent variables examined are direct victimization in campus and perception of campus incivility perception. Clear from our previous analysis, addition of the independent variables; perceived risk of victimization in campus and constrained behavior in campus, into the model reduces the effect of these variables. On the other hand, when we consider the two regression analyses as a whole in terms of our subject, we can say that gender, direct victimization in campus, perceived neighborhood deterioration in campus, perceived risk of victimization in campus and constrained behaviors in campus are the independent variables influencing the fear of crime in campus.

Table 60 Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	- 1.381	1.598		-0.864	.388
	Age	.123	.083	.114	1.478	.140
	Gender	.605	.153	.168	3.961	.000
	Class	-.194	.099	-.152	- 1.950	.052
	Residential Status	.134	.150	.037	.895	.371
	Direct Victimization in Campus	-.631	.225	-.123	- 2.805	.005
	Off-Campus Direct Victimization	-.020	.196	-.005	-.105	.917
	Indirect Victimization in Campus	-.256	.158	-.069	- 1.620	.106
	Off-Campus Indirect victimization	.248	.151	.069	1.639	.102
	Campus Neighborhood Deterioration	.301	.037	.345	8.170	.000

a. Dependent Variable: average campus fear of crime

4.9.2. Multiple Regression Analysis Kızılay Fear of Crime

Our study aims to investigate the fear of crime of students in Kızılay by multiple regression analysis after the regression analysis of the fear of crime in campus. The multiple regression analysis will assess the degree of the impact of the independent variables affecting the dependent variable “fear of crime in Kızılay”; and this will allow us to observe to what extent the model generally explains the fear of crime in Kızılay.

The independent variables which have been included in the multiple regression analysis where the Kızılay fear of crime has been determined as the dependent variable are as the following: Age, Gender, Class, Accommodation status of student (in-campus – off-campus), direct victimization in Campus, Off-Campus direct victimization, indirect victimization in Campus, Off-campus indirect victimization, incivility perception in Kızılay, perceived risk of victimization in Campus, and constrained behaviors in Kızılay.

The model summary showing the effect of 11 independent variables used in our study on the fear of crime in Kızılay are given in the Table. As seen in this Table, R value of 0.872 points at the fact that there is a strong relation between the fear of crime in Kızılay; the dependent variable and the 11 independent variables used. R Square value of 0.760 shows that regression model explains 76 percent of the change in the fear of crime in Kızılay. A very small difference between the adjusted r square value and r square value shows us that the regression model can be generalized.

Table 61 Model summary fear of crime in Kızılay

	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.872 ^a	.760	.755	1.29890

a. Predictors: (Constant), Kızılay constrained behavior, Age, Off-Campus indirect victimization, Residential status, direct victimization in Campus, indirect victimization in Campus, Off-Campus direct victimization, Kızılay neighborhood deterioration, Gender, perceived risk of victimization in Kızılay, Class studied

b. Dependent Variable: fear of crime in Kızılay

Anova value enables to comprehend whether the model we work on in our study is statistically meaningful. f value in the Anova analysis being greater than 1 indicates the usefulness of the model we have formed in explaining the dependent variable. When we look at the values in the Table, we see that our model is statistically meaningful (Sig .000). F value being greater than 1 points out the model is also meaningful in explaining the fear of crime in Kızılay.

Table 62 ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2591.738	11	235.613	139.652	.000 ^a
	Residual	818.264	485	1.687		
	Total	3410.002	496			

The coefficients relating to the independent variables resulting from the multiple regression analysis about the fear of crime in Kızılay are given in the Table. t value in the Table means the impact created by a change occurring in the independent variable on the fear of crime in campus; the dependent variable. Whether this change is statistically meaningful is understandable by looking at the values in the Sig. Table. In this regard, the sig value must be less than .05 value in order for the independent variable to have a meaningful impact on the dependent variable, the fear of crime in Kızılay. Another significant indicators in the Table is given in the

tolerance box. This indicator shows us whether there is a problem in terms of the multilinearity. Values being closer to 0 in the Table creates from this point of view a problem in the regression analysis. Evaluating the Table, there is not any problem in the collinearity in terms of regression analysis.

When we examine the significance indicator in the table, we see that there are two significant independent variables affecting the fear of crime. These variables in the order are perceived risk of victimization and constrained behaviors in Kızılay. We can put the impact of these variables on the model in the following way.

4.9.2.1. Perceived Risk of Victimization in Kızılay

According to the regression model we have examined, the perceived risk of university students regarding Kızılay is a factor determining their fear of crime in Kızılay. Stating in a more clear manner, the differences about the probability of being the victim of a crime in Kızılay cause differentiation of fear of crime in Kızılay ($p < 0,001$).

When we evaluate the impact of the perceived risk of victimization in Kızılay on the fear of crime in Kızılay via our model, we can tell that one unit of increase in the perceived risk of victimization in Kızılay will lead to an increase of 0.863 unit in the fear of crime in Kızılay ($\beta = 0.863$). Evaluating through the model, perceived risk of victimization in Kızılay is the most significant variable establishing the fear of crime in Kızılay.

4.9.2.2. Constrained Behaviors in Kızılay

According to the regression model we investigate, the variable of constrained behaviors in Kızılay of university students seems as a factor determining their fear of crime in Kızılay. Articulating it, the differences in the frequency of constrained behaviors of students in Kızılay is an element resulting in differences in their fear of crime in Kızılay ($p < 0,001$).

If we assess the impact the constrained behaviors in Kızılay have on the fear of crime in Kızılay via our model, we can say that one unit of increase to be seen in the constrained behaviors in Kızılay will increase the fear of crime in Kızılay with a unit of 0.235 ($\beta = 0.235$).

Table 63 Fear of crime in Kızılay coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	
1	(Constant)	-0.773	1.301		-0.594	0.553	
	Age	0.024	0.068	0.015	0.354	0.723	0.268
	Gender	0.066	0.143	0.013	0.462	0.644	0.669
	Class	-0.038	0.082	-0.021	-0.47	0.639	0.259
	Residence	0.024	0.121	0.005	0.198	0.843	0.941
	Direct Victimization in Campus	-0.049	0.182	-0.006	-0.268	0.789	0.843
	Off-Campus Direct Victimization	-0.21	0.161	-0.032	-1.309	0.191	0.811
	Indirect Victimization in Campus	-0.028	0.129	-0.005	-0.215	0.83	0.876
	Off-Campus Indirect Victimization	0.04	0.123	0.008	0.321	0.748	0.899
	Kızılay Neighborhood Deterioration	0.034	0.046	0.023	0.754	0.451	0.518
	Perceived Risk of Victimization in Kızılay	0.863	0.042	0.713	20.498	0	0.409
Constrained Behavior in Kızılay	0.235	0.034	0.203	6.988	0	0.586	

a. Dependent Variable: fear of crime in Kızılay

Tough the tolerance values pertaining to the independent variables used in the regression model of fear of crime in Kızılay do not show any problems in terms of multicollinearity, the fact that only the variables; perceived risk of victimization in Kızılay and constrained behaviors in Kızılay, from the independent variables are

statistically meaningful, strengthens the probability that these two variables might be collinear with the other variables. Existence of a statistically meaningful relation between the independent variables such as, incivility perception in Kızılay, gender, direct victimization in the relevant correlation and t test analyses makes it necessary for an evaluation by means of a separate regression model.

As stated earlier, multicollinearity is a situation occurring as a result of the fact that two or more variables are interconnected. Multicollinearity does not create a problem in terms of the definition impact of the independent variable by the model. When evaluated for our example, to what extent the model we have established explains the dependent variable of campus fear of crime is a case independent from the multicollinearity phenomenon. Nonetheless, the fact that which independent variables have an impact on the fear of crime in Kızılay creates a problem if there is multicollinearity.

For the purpose of testing whether the variables other than the perceived risk of victimization in Kızılay and constrained behavior in Kızılay variables are statistically meaningful, our study has created a regression model, which includes the variables of Age, Gender, Class, accommodation of student (in-campus – off-campus), direct victimization in campus, off-campus direct victimization, indirect victimization in campus, off-campus indirect victimization, incivility perception in Kızılay. The data regarding the model are given in the Table.

Table 64 Model summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.693 ^a	.480	.471	1.90763

a. Predictors: (Constant), Kızılay neighborhood deterioration, direct victimization in Campus, Residential status, Age, Off-Campus indirect victimization, direct victimization in Campus, Age, Off-Campus direct victimization, Class studied.

b. Dependent Variable: fear of crime in Kızılay

The impact of this new model created by removing two independent statistically meaningful variables (perceived risk of victimization and constrained behaviors in Kızılay) on the fear of crime in campus is given in the table. As will be seen from the table, removing of two variables reduced the R value of the model from 0.872 to 0.693. The new model formed by the omission of two independent variables explain 48 percent of the fear of crime in campus. Explanation of 48 percent of the fear of crime in campus by the variables, which did not make any statistically meaningful impact in the previous analysis shows that the multicollinearity problem exists.

When we examine the table showing the coefficient values pertaining to the model, we can say that the most significant variable having a statistically impact on the fear of crime in campus in terms of 9 independent variables examined is the perceived neighborhood deterioration in Kızılay. The second most significant impact among these variables is the gender independent variable. Class [grade] and indirect victimization in campus are the other independent variables affecting the fear of crime in Kızılay. Evaluating these two regression analysis in terms of fear of crime in Kızılay, we can say that gender, class, indirect victimization in campus, perceived neighborhood deterioration in Kızılay, perceived risk of victimization in Kızılay and constrained behavior in Kızılay variables are the independent variables creating an effect on the fear of crime in Kızılay.

Table 65 Coefficients

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-1.908	1.909		-.999	.318
	Age	.134	.099	.085	1.350	.178
	Gender	1.613	.184	.306	8.748	.000
	Class	-.346	.118	-.185	-2.927	.004
	Residence	.082	.178	.015	.458	.647
	Direct Victimization in Kızılay	-.214	.268	-.028	-.798	.425
	Off-Campus Direct Victimization	-.276	.233	-.042	-1.183	.237
	Direct Victimization in Campus	-.415	.188	-.076	-2.208	.028
	Off-Campus Indirect Victimization	.035	.181	.007	.193	.847
	Kızılay Neighborhood Deterioration	.743	.051	.502	14.567	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Fear of Crime in Kızılay

CHAPTER

5. CONCLUSION

Although fear of crime studies have a history of over forty years in developed countries, it is a relatively new area of study for Turkey. The reason why the concept has gained importance for social scientists and criminologists is that it has a role of affecting individuals' daily lives and the quality of life accordingly. Fear of crime studies, which have started towards the end of 1960s in developed countries such as United States and England, have become a considerably popular subject today and they have started to take attention of not only academicians but also security forces and municipalities which are in charge of citizens' security. Evaluated in this sense, the concept of fear of crime has become an important notion empirically and in practice as well as theoretically.

The concept of fear of crime does not have only institutional importance about security. Fear of crime is a significant concept, which has also an individual aspect, as an element affecting the individuals' daily lives and behavioral patterns. Clemente and Kleiman underline the effect of fear of crime on individuals as such, "People are forced to change their usual behavior. They stay off the streets at night, avoid strangers, curtail social activities, keep firearms, buy watchdogs and may even move to other neighborhoods" (1977:519). In this respect, the fear of crime can be seen as an important sociological problem at least as the crime case itself. Laying bare the reasons causing the notion of the fear of crime, which is a drawback influencing individuals' daily lives and routine activities, would help developing policies aimed at resolving the negative effects of this concept.

As we have noted before, the fear of crime is seen as an element affecting the individuals' life quality. Garafalo and Laub (1978:242) highlight the fact that the fear of crime is not only an anxiety of being exposed to crime but also it includes concepts oriented towards social consolidation and life quality. In this sense, studies related to the fear of crime contribute to the increase in the scientific knowledge aimed at preventing crime and the effects it would create.

In order to fight against the factors identifying the individuals' fear of crime and to abolish their harmful effects, the first thing is to know which factors have an impact on the fear of crime. Therefore, policy implementers also need empirical studies along with their technical and theoretical knowledge about community safety. Our study will try to examine to what extent theoretical approaches related with the fear of crime are explanatory on Metu students. Concordantly, the study aims to contribute to the empirical knowledge about the fear of crime, which is a scarcely studied concept in Turkey.

The study was carried out for undergraduate students in Metu whose ages change between 18 and 24. The study aims to examine these students' fear of crime about the campus and Kızılay multi-dimensionally. In this respect, to see what kind of dimensions the students' fear of crime has in the campus and in Kızılay, and to present in which aspects differences between campus and Kızılay exist, facilitate our better understanding of university students' fear of crime.

Although there is a vast number of a foreign literature on the fear of crime, there is not any broad participation study analyzing the dimensions of the fear of crime at a national level in Turkey (Dolu and etc 2010:72). In this sense, this study will contribute to the diversifying of fear of crime studies in Turkey. Another characteristic of the study is that it was intended for university undergraduates aged

between 18 and 24. The fear of crime studies generally aim at measuring women's, minorities' and old people's fear of crime. The reason is the comparison of the level of fear of crime of the groups, which has a high probability of being victimized, to the other groups in a parallel approach to victimization. Besides, there are limited studies intended for measuring young people's level of fear of crime. In this respect, this study aims at filling such a gap.

Our study evaluates the fear of crime in a multi-dimensional manner. Having an important role in the appearance of fear of crime studies, National Crime Survey emerged firstly in United States of America in 1973 (U.S. Department of Justice, 1997:150 in Polat and Gül 2010:1296). In addition to this, there are criticisms about these studies' measuring the fear of crime in a one-dimensional way. Ferraro and LaGrange (1987:74) underline the fact that the evaluation of the fear of crime in a common and a general way would cause incorrect results. Therefore, such a question as "To what extent do you feel safe when you wander alone at nights in your neighborhood" imply that the fear of crime is tested in a very general and abstract way.

Thus, rather than measuring the concept of fear of crime on the basis of a probable abstraction, our study includes questions intended for measuring to what degree certain crimes are being feared for. In this respect, our study intends for measuring university students' fear of crime on the basis of certain crimes which they might face and they might be worried to face. Evaluated from this point, our study measures the fear of crime in terms of students' anxiety of being exposed to theft, robbery, simple attack and serious attack and lastly to sexual harassment.

One of the distinctions on the fear of crime is the one between anticipated fear and actual fear. Actual fear suggests that fear is being formed at the time of an event's occurrence. On the other hand, anticipated fear is used to express a fear which is felt without a condition of an occurrence of any event. Our study will analyze the concept of the fear of crime on the basis of an anticipated fear approach. The advantage of this approach is that it enables the measuring of not the individuals' fears at the time of any event but their fear of being exposed to a crime which they form as a result of their interaction with neighborhood.

Another characteristic of our study in terms of its evaluation of the concept of fear of crime is that it makes a distinction between risk perception in line with Ferraro's (1995) risk interpretation approach and fear of crime. In this sense, the study makes a distinction between an individual's risk of being exposed to any crime and the anxiety that he/she will feel as a result of this crime. Despite the fact that the concepts of risk perception and fear of crime seem to be interrelated, they can diverge in some cases. Considered in this sense, although a student may assess his/her risk of being exposed to sexual harassment at a lower degree, his/her anxiety of being exposed to this crime may appear higher. The advantage of this approach is that it facilitates our better understanding of the differences between risk and anxiety.

Risk perception approach makes a distinction between the fear of crime and the risk of being exposed to the fear of crime. On the basis of this approach lies the idea that there may be a difference between people's probability of being exposed to any crime and their anxiety of being exposed to a crime. Although individuals belonging to a criminal subculture may see their risk of being exposed to a crime as higher, they may evaluate their anxiety of being exposed to a crime as lower. However, there may be exactly opposite situations. For instance, in spite of the fact that women and old

people are exposed to crime less according to crime records, they may have higher level of fear of crime, which is called the fear risk paradox.

Our study aims to evaluate the fear of crime and victimization risk perception in terms of same questions. In this respect, a better measurement of the distinction between the fear of crime and victimization risk perception is possible only with the questions of fear of crime and victimization risk perception about the same types of crime. For this reason, along with the questions about the fear of crime of theft, robbery, simple attack, serious attack and sexual harassment, questions that require the evaluation of the possibility of facing these types of crimes were also addressed to students.

One of the indications of assessing the concept of fear of crime multi-dimensionally is to include environmental conditions to the fear of crime analysis. To include the individuals' safety perception about the environment to a study on the fear of crime enable us to see the effects of not only micro but also macro structural variables on the fear of crime. In this respect, our study also aims to examine the effects of individuals' safety perceptions about campus and Kızılay on the fear of crime.

Individuals are in an interaction with the environment they live within. Environmental factors are of the elements that contribute to the forming of individuals' behavior. In this sense, personal perception of safety can be regarded as a process being formed under the effect of physical and social environment. There are two main approaches that test the effects of environmental deterioration on the fear of crime. One of these approaches analyzes the impact of environmental factors

on the fear of crime. This approach asserts that a correlation between concrete observable environmental deterioration and the fear of crime should be set up.

Another approach which becomes prominent in the correlation between the environmental deterioration and the fear of crime is the notion that the perception of environmental deterioration affects fear of crime. According to this view, rather than objective criteria, how individuals perceive their environment is a more significant indication in terms of the fear of crime. Ferraro's (1995) risk perception approach suggests that perception of environmental deterioration as a macro determinant affects individuals' fear of crime. In parallel with this approach, our study analyzes the effects of perception of environmental deterioration on the fear of crime.

In our study, the effects of perception of environmental deterioration on the fear of crime are measured on the basis of physical and environmental perception. Questions of physical and environmental deterioration perception in our study, aim to test students' perception of environmental deterioration. The study evaluates the students' perception of environmental deterioration in terms of questions asking to what extent theft, robbery, attack and sexual harassment are important problems for the campus and Kızılay. The perception of physical environmental deterioration is tested through questions that assess how subjects such as unpicked garbage, graffiti, posters and insufficient lighting become problem for students. Questions related with the social environmental deterioration on the other hand, ask to what extent individuals who make noise, drink alcohol and wander drunk are seen as a significant problem.

The concept of victimization constitutes an important part of Ferraro's (1995) risk assessment approach. Suggesting that victimization, as an independent variable, affects the fear of crime is not a recent situation. Victimization approach comprises one of the first theoretical approaches about the fear of crime. Besides, assessing victimization as one-dimensional would mean to disregard the multi-dimensional and complex structure of the concept of fear of crime. The notion of victimization is generally examined under two main headings which are direct and indirect victimization.

Our study handles the concept of victimization as direct and indirect victimization and analyzes the effects of these types of victimization on the fear of crime. Our study also aims to measure the concept of direct victimization in terms of crimes that the students may face and in accordance with the questions of fear of crime. In this sense, our study intends to measure direct victimization on the basis of theft, robbery, simple attack, serious attack and sexual harassment questions in terms of the campus and Kızılay, which is in parallel with questions of fear of crime. Victimization questions ask students whether they have been the victim of this crime in the last year.

After handling the concept of direct victimization as a whole, our study makes a distinction between personal crime victimization and property crime victimization. Most of the studies done about victimization and the fear of crime analyze the effects of victimization on the fear of crime without making distinctions between crimes committed against property and against individual. Our study analyzes which of the concepts of personal crime victimization and property crime victimization are more effective on the fear of crime by examining the concept of victimization in a more detailed manner. When considered from this aspect, our study will enable us to see

which type of crime the university students are more sensitive to in terms of fear of crime in the crimes committed against property and against individual.

On the other hand, indirect victimization constitutes another part of the victimization approach. Indirect victimization is a significant concept in terms of risk assessment perspective, which suggests that individuals' safety perception is composed of their interaction with the environment, and fear of crime. In order for us to measure the effects of indirect victimization on the fear of crime, our study has included the questions of indirect victimization, which are compatible with the questions of fear of crime, to the analysis. In this respect, the students are asked whether any of their acquaintances has been exposed to theft, robbery, simple attack, serious attack and sexual harassment in the last one year or not. Our study discusses victimization in terms of the campus and Kızılay therefore it asks these questions separately for each of the two areas.

The concept of restricted behavior constitutes one of the other subscales of the model we have used. Some studies about the fear of crime try to measure the fear of crime on the basis of restricted behavior by thinking that restricted behavior is a concept producing the fear of crime. Studies that try to measure the fear of crime in terms of behavior tend to measure which safety measures individuals take against the fear of crime or which types of behavior they avoid against the fear of crime (Skogan, 1993:137). According to this approach, the attitudes that individuals have done or have refrained from doing with the reasons of safety determine their fear of crime.

Although identifying the fear of crime by observing the individuals' avoidance behavior or defensive behavior enables us to see their manner against crime, these

attitudes does not depict to what extent they are anxious about the crime. Restricted behaviors are patterns of behavior that appear as a result of the fear of crime. Individuals may show restricted behavior as a consequence of their interaction with environment and their safety perception. In this sense, evaluating the restricted behavior not as an indication of the fear of crime but as a concept that affects the fear of crime will facilitate our performing healthier analyses.

Our study defines restricted behavior as an independent variable which affects the fear of crime. It handles this independent variable separately both for the campus and Kızılay area. In our study, restricted behavior is discussed in two different dimensions, which are avoidance behavior and defensive behavior. While defensive behavior is used to express the precautions that individuals take against fear of crime, avoidance behavior is used to express the attitudes that individuals refrain from doing because they are afraid of being exposed to crime. In this sense, to what extent individuals' restricted behavior affect their fear of crime will be discussed in our study.

An important part of our study is constituted by the Campus and Kızılay distinction. Studies about fear of crime generally analyze the correlation between individuals' environment and their fear of crime. Besides, especially the studies measuring the university students' fear of crime (Fisher and Sloan 2003, Hilinski 2007) analyze the correlation between the campus and fear of crime. Our study aims to examine the campus fear of crime of Middle East Technical University undergraduate students. In this respect, this study is the first example which analyzes the undergraduate students' fear of crime about the campus in Turkey. Another characteristic of the study is that it analyzes undergraduate students' fear of crime about Kızılay area, which is the center of the city, along with its analysis of the undergraduate students' fear of crime about the campus.

The comparison of the students' fear of crime about the campus and about the city center has various advantages. One of them is that it enables a comparison between the students' campus fear of crime and Kızılay fear of crime. Thus, it enables us to see to what extent the campus is a safe place for the students of Middle East Technical University. The campus structure of Metu differs from the ones in the universities of United States. Many campuses in the United States are open to public. However, Metu can be defined as a protected area which is protected with the security forces and where nobody except the students and workers can enter. In this respect, comparing students' campus fear of crime and Kızılay fear of crime enables us to notice the differences between them and to make healthier evaluations of the safety perception about the campus.

Another advantage of measuring the university students' campus fear of crime and Kızılay fear of crime separately enables the model to test its relevance for these areas. In this respect, the explicatory level of the risk perception approach for the campus and Kızılay enables us to see how successful this approach is in explaining the fear of crime for each area.

Through this comparison we can see whether the effect of independent variables, which affect fear of crime, has disappeared or not. In this sense, our study analyzes the two different models by discussing the fear of crime in terms of the campus and Kızılay and it enables us to compare the model's explanatoriness. Also, our study discusses the difference of fear of crime that is formed according to the types of crime between the campus and Kızılay and it presents which types of crime has more difference between the campus and Kızılay.

An important feature of the study in which we have analyzed the fear of crime of undergraduate students of Metu about the campus and Kızılay is that it makes a distinction between fears of crime at night and day. Fear of crime studies generally measure the anxiety that the individual will feel after being exposed to a crime. This situation means disregarding the temporal differences in the fear of crime. Our study makes a distinction between fears of crime at night and day by considering the temporal dimension of the fear of crime.

In studies about the fear of crime, it is asserted that there are significant differences between individuals' fears of crime at night and day. Gilchrist and etc (1998:288) suggest that there are considerable differences between fears of crime at daytime and fears of crime at night for especially women. The reason is that because the probability of arrest at night is more difficult than daytime, night is considered as more appealing by the criminals. Night time is a period of time when the formal and informal social control is decreased and the streets become desolate. In this respect, fear of crime of individuals especially of old people and women who feel vulnerable may appear higher in this time period.

Our study measures the case of fear of crime both on campus and in Kızılay by making a distinction between day time and night time. In this sense, the students are asked to evaluate separately their anxiety of facing the identified types of crime in terms of day time and night time. Our study has not used night and day distinction only in the scale of the fear of crime. Night time and day time questions are also included in the victimization risk perception and restricted behaviors which are considered as related with the concept of fear of crime.

Our study examines the demographic variables' fear of crime on campus and in Kızılay. According to the results of this study, age variable does not have any effect

on the campus fear of crime. When we make evaluations in terms of Kızılay area, it may be suggested that age factor has a negative and meaningful correlation with the fear of crime, though a low one. This situation means that as the students get older, their fear of crime about Kızılay will decrease. The fact that general fear of crime level for the campus has appeared low eliminates the correlation between age variable, which has a dimension of social vulnerability, and the fear of crime. Along with this, in Kızılay area, which has a more cosmopolitan structure, there is a meaningful correlation between age and fear of crime. We can connect the result that age factor has a lower effect to the fact that students' ages are close to each other.

Another independent variable that can be regarded as significant in terms of our study is gender. In researches about fear of crime, women appeared to have a higher level of fear of crime than men. Although women are less victims of crime than men, the fact that they have more fear of crime is tried to be explained with the justification that they are more vulnerable both socially and physically. As a result of our study, it appears that women have more fear of crime than men on campus and in Kızılay.

Another interesting result in terms of gender and fear of crime is that the biggest difference in crime appears to be in the fear of being exposed to sexual harassment in day time and at night time. While there is lower difference between woman and man in terms of fear of being exposed to other types of crime (theft, robbery, simple attack, serious attack), gender becomes a very important determinant in the fear of being exposed to sexual harassment. The fact that women have a higher level of fear of being exposed to sexual harassment stems from the higher possibility of their exposure to sexual harassment than men (Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998 in Scott 2003: 203).

The concept of social vulnerability constitutes another dimension of women's higher level of fear of crime than men. Social vulnerability brings out individuals' feeling of vulnerable as a result of being marginalized and their having more fear of crime when compared with the other individuals in society. Especially in patriarchal societies, the fact that women are pushed to secondary position, division of labor is established on the basis of gender and the mentality of considering woman with sexual identity rather than individual increase women's social vulnerability. The result that women's anxiety of exposure to sexual harassment is higher supports this view.

When we analyze the data between direct victimization and fear of crime, we can say that campus direct victimization is an element affecting fear of crime. Our study makes it clear that fear of crime of students, who are exposed to campus direct victimization, is higher than the students who are not victims. In this respect, we can suggest that the students who are the victims of crimes identified in the campus in the last one year have higher fear of crime than the students who have not experienced any victimization.

Another point taking attention in terms of campus victimization is the distinction between property crime victimization and personal crime victimization. While property crime victimization includes crimes about properties that individuals own, personal crime victimization includes crimes such as attack and sexual harassment. While our study presents that the concept of personal crime victimization does not affect fear of crime, the concept of property crime victimization affects the fear of crime. In plain words, while a crime about a property in the campus affects fear of crime, crimes such as attack and sexual harassment does not increase their fear of crime. This situation shows a similarity between the results of studies analyzing victimization and fear of crime (Liska and etc 1982, Smith and Hill 1991). The most

important reason for this situation is the fact that on-campus theft victimization is the highest victimization type with a ratio of 10.3 %.

When we examine the correlation between off-campus direct victimization and fear of crime, we can suggest that off-campus victimization affects fear of crime. According to this, there is an average difference between the students who have been a victim of any crime and students who have not been a victim of a crime. Therefore, off-campus direct victimization can be seen as an element affecting Kızılay fear of crime. Analyzed in terms of personal crime victimization and property crime victimization, there appears a result opposite to the campus results. While off-campus personal victimization is an element affecting Kızılay fear of crime, off-campus property crime victimization does not affect students' Kızılay fear of crime.

Our study examines the impact of indirect victimization on the fear of crime along with direct victimization. In consequence of the analyses made, average campus fear of crime of the students who have been exposed to indirect victimization is higher than the students who have not been exposed to this victimization. When we analyze the impact of indirect victimization for Kızılay region, it appears that off-campus indirect victimization does not affect Kızılay fear of crime.

We can suggest that other independent variables used in our study such as perception of environmental deterioration, victimization risk perception and restricted behavior are statistically meaningful in terms of both on campus and in Kızılay. Similarly, period of time, which makes a considerable difference in terms of fear of crime, and the distinction of fear of crime also appear in our study. In this respect, both on campus and in Kızılay region the level of fear of crime is seen higher at night than day time.

In order to evaluate the effect of independent variables that we have identified according to Ferraro's (1995) risk interpretation approach, regression analysis for the campus and Kızılay fear of crime is applied in our study. We can suggest that gender, campus direct victimization, campus environmental deterioration perception, campus victimization risk perception and campus restricted behavior, which are variables included in this regression analysis, are independent variables that affect campus fear of crime. Similarly, the independent variables that affect Kızılay fear of crime are gender, the classroom of education, campus indirect victimization, Kızılay environmental deterioration perception, Kızılay victimization risk perception and Kızılay restricted behavior.

We can suggest that risk interpretation in our study is successful at explaining the fear of crime for campus and Kızılay areas. In this respect, independent variables such as gender, victimization risk perception, environmental deterioration perception and restricted behavior can be described as the main variables, which identify Metu undergraduate students' campus and Kızılay fear of crime.

As we have noted before, the concept of fear of crime is a recently studied subject in Turkey as opposed to the developed countries. "Turkey attended the International Crime Victims Survey carried out by United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute (UNICRI) in 2005" (Gaziarifoğlu 2009:84). Underlining that fear of crime study is a relatively new concept for our country, Gaziarifoğlu (2009) highlights the fact that studies in this subject should be a resource for the studies to be done in the future on a local scale. Our study in this sense has paid attention to take the fear of crime concept multi-dimensionally and has aimed to measure it in terms of different crime types by differentiating from victimization risk perception. Another innovation our study brings is that it discusses fear of crime and victimization risk perception in terms of two different time periods as day time and

night time. In this respect, the study makes it possible for us to see the effects of different time periods on the individuals' fear of crime and victimization risk perception.

Another side of the study is that it tries to analyze the concept of fear of crime not on the basis of one region but of two different regions. Fear of crime studies generally measure the fear of crime that individuals feel about the place they live at. This brings along the fact that the effects of demographic characteristics of individuals on the fear of crime is discussed rather than the structural characteristic of the fear of crime. Our study presents the effects of not only demographic variables but also regional and structural changes on the fear of crime by measuring individuals' fear of crime about the campus and Kızılay. For instance, the fact that there are considerable differences between the crimes of robbery and attack in terms of campus and Kızılay show that students are more anxious of the crimes against the individual in regions outside the campus. In this sense, our study is crucial in terms of its indication of the fact that fear of crime may appear higher in the regions where differentiation is intensive.

Individuals' anxiety of being exposed to any crime is a matter of fact which is important at least as the crime itself and which should be struggled with. In this sense, precautions taken against the fear of crime, which is a case affecting individuals' life quality negatively, are crucial in terms of providing social peace and security. In this respect, it is hoped that our study's being the first to analyze university students' fear of crime will contribute to the diversifying and development of following studies. The diversifying of studies related with crime and the fear of crime will also contribute to the policies, which are developed for that, to have a scientific content. Municipalities and security forces in developed countries have started to benefit from scientific researches to decrease the potential impact of the

fear of crime, and even they have started to carry out these activities by their own institutions. Increase in the studies for the fear of crime, which is a relatively new area of study for Turkey, will also be effective for the policy implementers and will contribute to the determining of new policies.

REFERENCES

- Adams, R. E., & Serpe, R. T. (2000). Social integration, fear of crime, and life satisfaction. *Sociological Perspectives*, 43, 605-629.
- Adler, F., Mueller, G.O.W, Laufer, W.S., (1991) *Criminology*, McGraw Hill, New York
- Akdemir, Ş, B., (2009). Kent Planlamasında Halkın Katılımı Ankara Örneği, Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Kamu Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi.
- Akers, A.R., Sellers, C.S. (2009) *Criminological Theories : Introduction, Evaluation, and Application* New York : Oxford University Press
- Altınay A.G, Arat Y. (2008). Türkiye’de Kadına Yönelik Şiddet. İstanbul, Punto Baskı Çözümleri.
- Anderson, S., Kinsey, R., Loader, I. and Smith, C. (1990). *Cautionary tales: a study of young people and crime in Edinburgh*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.
- Atkins, S., Husain, S., Storey, A., (1991). The influence of street lighting on crime and the fear of crime. *Crime Prevention Unit Paper 29*, Home Office, London
- Baker, M.H. & Mednick, B.R. (1990). Protecting the high school environment as an island of safety: Correlates of student fear of in-school victimization. *Children’s Environments Quarterly*, 7(3), 37-49.
- Barkan, S, E., (2006) *Criminology A Sociological Understanding*, Pearson Prentice Hall, New Jersey 3th Edition

Baum, K., & Klaus, P. (2005). Violent victimization of college students, 1995-2002 (NCJ 206836). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics .

Baur, J. (2007) Fear of crime: the impact of age, victimization, perceived vulnerability to victimization and neighborhood characteristics. Report No. I6, Australasian Centre for Policing Research www.acpr.gov.au/pdf/ACPR_I6.pdf; accessed 15 January 2009

Beirne, P, Messerschmidt, J., (1995) Criminology, Harcourt Brace College Publishers, For Worth, Second Edition.

Blumer, H (1962). "Society as Symbolic Interaction". in Arnold M. Rose. Human Behavior and Social Process: An Interactionist Approach. Houghton-Mifflin. Reprinted in Blumer 1969.

Blumer, H (1969). Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Braungart, M. M., Braungart, R. G., & Hoyer, W. J. (1980). Age, sex, and social factors in fear of crime. *Sociological Focus*, 13, 55–66

Bursik, R.J., Grasmick, H.G (1993). *Neighborhoods and Crime: The Dimensions of Effective Community Control*. New York: Lexington Books

Chiricos, T., Escholz, S., Gertz, M. (1997). Crime, News and Fear of Crime:toward an Identification of Audience Effects. *Social Problems*, 44(3), 342-357.

Cıkıt, G., Taçyıldız, Ö., (2010) http://www.sendika.org/yazi.php?yazi_no=30351 accessed 08 2010.

Clemente, F, Kleiman.M.B. (1977) “Fear of crime in the United States: a multivariate analysis.” *Social Forces* 56 (December): 519-531.

Clifford, W., (1978) "Culture and Crime in Global Perspective" *International journal of Criminology and Penology* 319-339

Cohen, L., Felson, M. (1979). "Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach." *American Sociological Review* 44:588–608.

Coleman, J. S., (1994), *Foundations of Social Theory*, Harvard University Press.

Conklin, J. E., (2006). *Criminology* Pearson, Boston Ninth Edition

Cook, Philip (1986). "The Demand and Supply of Criminal Opportunities," *Crime and Justice*, VII , 1–27

Covington, J., Taylor, R., (1991) "Fear of Crime in Urban Residential Neighborhoods: Implications of Between- and Within-Neighborhood Sources for Current Models." *Sociological Quarterly* 32:231–49.

De Donder, L., Verté, D., & Messelis, E. (2005). "Fear of crime and elderly people: Key factors that determines fear of crime among elderly people in West Flanders." *Aging International*, 30, 363–376.

Denzin, K. N., (2009). *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*, Aldine Transaction, New Jersey

Ditton, J., Chadee D., Farrall S., Gilchrist E. and Bannister, J. (2004). From imitation to intimidation: A note on the curious and changing relationship between the media, crime and fear of crime. *British Journal of Criminology* 44, 595–610.

Ditton, J., Farrall, S., Bannister, J., Elizabeth, G., & Pease, K. (1999). Reactions to Victimization: Why has anger been ignored? *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: An International Journal*, 1, 37-54.

Dolu, O., Uludağ, Ş., Doğutaş, C. (2010), "Suç Korkusu: Nedenleri, Sonuçları ve Güvenlik Politikaları İlişkisi" *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, Cilt 65 Sayı:1

DuBow, F., McCabe, E., Kaplan, G. (1979). "Reactions to Crime: A Critical Review of the Literature. Washington, D.C: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, U.S Government printing Office.

Eschholz, S., (1997). The media and fear of crime: a survey of the research. *Journal of Law and Public Policy* 9, pp. 37–59.

Eymen, E. U., (2007). Spss 15.0 veri analizi, İstatistik Merkezi.

Farrall, S. , Gray, E. and Jackson, J. (2007) "Theorising the fear of crime: the cultural and social significance of insecurities about crime" <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1012393> accessed 22 January 2010

Felson, M., (1994). *Crime and Everyday Life: Insights and Implications for Society*, Thousand Oaks, CA:Pine Forge Press.

Felson, M. (1998) *Crime and Everyday Life*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge, second edition.

Ferraro, K (1995). *Fear of Crime: Interpreting Victimization Risk*. Albany , N.Y. : SUNY Press.

Ferraro K. F (1996). Women's Fear of Victimization: Shadow of Sexual Assault? *Social Forces* Vol 75; Number 2, Pages 667-690

Ferraro, K, LaGrange. R. (1987). "The Measurement of Fear of Crime." *Sociological Inquiry* 57:70–101

Fisher B.S. and Sloan J.J. (2003). "Unraveling the fear of victimization among college women: Is the "shadow of sexual assault hypothesis" supported?", *Justice Quarterly* 20 , pp. 633–659

Fisher, B. S., Sloan, J. J., Cullen, F. T., & Lu, C. (1998). Crime in the ivory tower: The level and sources of student victimization. *Criminology*, 36, 671-710.

Fisher, B.S., Cullen, F.T., Turner, M.G. (2000) *The Sexual Victimization of Collage Women*. National Institute of Justice.

Foddy, W., (1994). *Constructing questions for interviews and questionnaires. Theory and practice in social research*. Cambridge: CUP.

Garafalo, J., (1979) "Victimization and the fear of crime" *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, January, 80-97.

Garafalo, J. (1981). *The Fear of Crime: Causes and Consequenses*, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 72(2), 839-857.

Garafalo, J., Laub, J. (1978) "The Fear of Crime:Broadening Our Perspective. *Victimology: an International Journal*, 3(3-4), 242-253

Gardner, C.B (1995). *Passing by: Gender and Public Harassment in Public Space* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press

Gaziarifoğlu, Y. (2009) *Suç Mağduriyeti Korkusu ve Algılanan Suç Mağduriyeti Riskinin Değerlendirilmesi*. İstanbul Üniversitesi Adli Tıp Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Anabilim Dalı. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi.

Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. (1976). *Living with television: The violence profile*. *Journal of Communication*, 26, 173-199.

Gibson, C., Zhao, J., Lovrich, N., & Gaffney, M. (2002). *Social integration, individual perceptions of collective efficacy, and fear of crime in three cities*. *Justice Quarterly* 19, 537-564.

Gilchrist, E, Bannister, J, Ditton J, Farrall, S (1998). "Women and the 'Fear of Crime'." *British Journal of Criminology* 38:283-298.

Goodey, J. 1997. *Boys don't cry: Masculinities, fear of crime and fearlessness*. *British Journal of Criminology* 37:401-418.

Gökulu, G. (2005) “Terör Eylemlerinin Medyaya Yansıması (15-20 Kasım 2003 İstanbul Saldırıları Örneği)” Polis Akademisi Güvenlik Bilimleri Enstitüsü Suç Araştırmaları Anabilim Dalı. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi.

Griffin, E. (1997). A First Look at Communication Theory. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies.

Hale, C., (1996) “Fear of Crime: A Review of the Literature”, International Review of Victimology 4(2): 79-150).

Hayward, K, Morrison, W., (2005). Theoretical Criminology: a starting point in Criminology Edited by Hale,C, Hayward ,K Wahidin, A, Wincup, E, Oxford University Press New York

Heath, L. and Petraitis, J., (1987). Television viewing and fear of crime: where is the mean world?. Basic and Applied Social Psychology 8, pp. 97–123.

Hickman, S. E. And Muehlenhard, C. L. (1997). College women's fears and precautionary behaviors relating to acquaintance rape and stranger rape. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21, 527-547.

Hilinski, C.M (2007). Fear of Crime Among Collage Women: A Test of the Shadow of Sexual Assault Hypothesis, Indiana University Pennsylvania Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation

Hollander, J. A.(2001). “Vulnerability and Dangerousness: The Construction of Gender Through Conversation About Violence.” Gender & Society 15:83–109.

<http://oak.cats.ohiou.edu/~ko371597/symbolic.htm> (accessed date 23/04/2009)

<http://odtu.edu.tr/about/misguide.php> accessed date 18/05/2010

<http://people.bath.ac.uk/ssxlw/Symbolic%20Interactionism.ppt#3>(accessed date 24/04/2009)

<http://web.grinnell.edu/courses/soc/s00/soc111-01/introtheories/symbolic.html>
(accessed date 23/04/2009)

<http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/files/RIC/Publications/e030917193-CP-Defined.pdf>
(accessed date 27/11/2007)

<http://www.e-sosyoloji.com/mead.htm> (accessed date 27/04/2009)

Hunter, A. (1978). "Symbols of Incivilities: Social Disorder and Fear of Crime in Urban Neighborhoods." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Dallas, TX, November.

Hwang, G. E (2006). "A Multilevel Test of Fear of Crime: The Effects of Social Conditions, Perceived Community Policing Activities, and Perceived Risk of Victimization in a Megalopolis" Michigan State University, School of Criminal Justice, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation

Innes, M. (2004), 'Signal Crimes and Signal Disorders: Notes on Deviance as Communicative Action', *British Journal of Sociology*, 55: 317–334.

Jackson J. (2009). "A Psychological Perspective on Vulnerability in the Fear of Crime", *Psychology. Crime and Law* 15:365–90.

Jackson, J, Farrall, S, Gray, E 2006 Everyday Emotion and the Fear of Crime: Preliminary Findings from Experience and Expression (April 2006). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1012354> accessed 2 October 2009

Jackson, J, Farrall, S, Gray, E (2007) Theorising the Fear of Crime: The Cultural and Social Significance of Insecurities about Crime (2007). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1012393> accessed 4 January 2009

Jackson, J. (2004). Experience and expression: Social and cultural significance in the fear of crime. *British Journal of Criminology*, 44(6), 946–966.

- Kacar, D., (2010). Ankara, a Small Town, Transformed to a Nation's Capital, *Journal of Planning History* 9(1) 43-65
- Katz, C., Webb, V., & Armstrong, T. (2003). Fear of gangs: A test of alternative theoretical models. *Justice Quarterly*, 20(1), 95–130.
- Kelly, K. D., DeKeseredy, W. S. (1994). Women's fear of crime and abuse in college and university dating relationships. *Violence and Victims*, 9, 17–30
- Kennedy, L.W. & Krahn, H. (1984). Rural-urban origin and fear of crime: The case for rural baggage. *Rural Sociology*, 49(2), 247-260.
- Killias, M. (1990). 'Vulnerability: Towards a Better Understanding of a Key Variable in the Genesis of Fear of Crime' , *Violence and Victims* 5, 97-108
- Koss M.P. (1985). The Hidden Rape Victim: Personality, Attitudinal, and Situational Characteristics. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 9,193-212.
- LaGrange, R. L., Ferraro, K. F. (1987). "The elderly's fear of crime: A critical examination of the research." *Research on Aging*, 9, 372–391.
- LaGrange, R. L. & Ferraro, K. F. (1989) Assessing age and gender differences in perceived risk and fear of crime. *Criminology* 27:697–717.
- LaGrange, R. L., Ferraro, K. F., & Supancic, M. 1992. Perceived risk and fear of crime: Role of social and physical incivilities. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 29: 311-334.
- Lane, J., & Meeker, J. W. (2003). Fear of gang crime: A look at three theoretical models. *Law and Society Review*, 37, 425–456.
- Larson, C.J. (1982). City Size Fear and Victimization. *Creative Sociology* 10, 13-22
- Lazar, J., (2001), İletişim Bilimi (Çev. Cengiz ANIK), Ankara, Vadi Yayınları.

- Lea, J, Young, J. (1984) What's To Be Done about Law and Order London: Penguin
- Lewis, D.A and Maxfield, M.G (1980). "Fear in the Neighborhoods: an Investigation of the Impact of Crime", *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 17: 160 - 189.
- Liska, A E., Sanchirico A, Reed M.D. (1988). "Fear of Crime and Constrained Behavior: Specifying and Estimating a Reciprocal Effects Model." *Social Forces* 66:827-37.
- Liska, A., J. Lawrence, and A. Sanchirico. (1982). "Fear of Crime as a Social Fact." *Social Forces* 60: 760-777.
- Markowitz, F.E, Bellair, P.E, Liska A.E, Liu J. (2001). Extending social disorganization theory: modeling the relationships between cohesion, disorder, and fear. *Criminology* 39(2):293–319
- Maxfield, M.G (1984). "The Limits of Vulnerability in Explaining Fear of Crime: A Comparative Neighborhood Analysis" *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 21: 233-250.
- Mays, L.M (2001). Structural Determinants of Fear of Crime, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Texas at Arlington
- McConnell, E. H. (1997). Fear of crime on campus: A study of a southern university. *Journal of Security Administration*, 20(2), 22-46.
- McCrea, R. Shyy, T. Western, J. Stimson, R.J. (2005) Fear of crime in Brisbane: Individual, social and neighbourhood factors in perspective *Journal of Sociology*, Mar. 41:7-27.

Melde, E. C., (2007) Peer- Group Composition and The Percieved Risk of Victimization: Modeling Fear of Crime in a School- Based Sample, University of Missouri-St. Louis, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation

Merry, S. E. (1981). "Defensible Space undefended: Social Factors in Crime Control through Environmental Design." *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 16:397-422

Messner, F. S., Blau, R. J., (1987), "Routine Leisure Activities and Rates Of Crime: A Macro Level Analysis", *Social Forces*, Volume 65-4, p 1035-1052

Michael, J, Adler, M, J., (1971). *Crime Law and Social Science*, Patterson Smith, Monthclair, N.J

Moeller, G.L. (1989). Fear of criminal victimization: The effect of neighborhood racial composition. *Sociological Inquiry*, 59(2), 208-221.

Morrison, W., (2005). What is Crime? Contrasting definitions and perspectives, in *Criminology* Edited by Hale,C, Hayward ,K Wahidin, A, Wincup, E, Oxford University Pres New York

Mutlu, E., (1998), *İletişim Sözlüğü*, Ankara, Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.

Osgood, D. W., Wilson, J. K., Bachman, J. G., O'Malley, P. M., Johnston, L. D. (1996). Routine activities and individual deviant behavior. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 635–655.

Özaşçılar, M. Ziyalar, N. (2009) Suç korkusu: istanbul'da yaşayan 18–25 yaş grubu üniversite öğrencilerinin mağdur olma riskleri hakkındaki görüşlerinin değerlendirilmesi, *Adli Bilimler Dergisi*, 8 (1): 7 - 17, 2009

Pain, .R. (1997). Social Geographies of Women's Fear of Crime Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series, Vol. 22, No. 2 pp. 231-244

Pain, R. (2001). Gender, Race, Age and Fear in the City, *Urban Studies*, 38, 899-913.

Pain, R. (2003). "Old age' and victimisation" in Davis, P., et al. (Eds), *Victimisation, Theory, Research and Policy*, Macmillan Press, London.

Pantazis, C., Gordon, D, (1998) "Do The Poor Experience More Crime and Greater Fear of Crime Than The Rich?" In Dorling, D ., Simpson, L (eds) *Statistic in Society*, London, Arnold

Parker, K.D, Ray, M.C (1990). Fear of Crime: An Assesment of Related Factors, *Sociological Specturum*, 10, 29-41

Paulsen, J, D., Robinson, B, M (2004). *Spatial Aspect of Crime Theory and Practice*, Pearson, Boston

Polat, A. Gül, K, S. (2010) "Kriminoloji arařtırmalarında mađdur anketlerinin yeri ve önemi" *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, Cilt 7, S1, 1290-1310

Polat, A., Gül, S. K. (2009), "Kentlerde Güvensizlik Kaygısı: Erzincan Alan Arařtırması," BİLGİÇ, Veysel (ed.), *Deđişik Yönleriyle Yerelleşme* Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi

Powell, J. L, Wahidin, A. (2008) "Understanding old age and victimisation: a critical exploration" *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* v:28 n:3-4 p:90-99

Quann, N. and Hung, K. (2002). Victimization experience and the fear of crime. A cross-national study. In P. Nieuwbeerta (ed.) *Crime victimization in comparative perspective. Results from the International Crime Victims Survey, 1989–2000*, 301–16. The Hague: NSCR, BJU.

Reid, L. W., & Konrad, M. (2004). The gender gap in fear: Assessing the interactive effects of gender and perceived risk on fear of crime. *Sociological Spectrum*, 24, 399–425.

Renauer, C. B., (2007). “Reducing Fear of Crime Citizen, Police or Government Responsibility?”, *Police Quarterly* v: 10 n:1, page 41-62

Riger, S., Lebailly, R. K., Gordon, M. T. (1981). Community ties and urbanites' fear of crimes: An ecological investigation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 9, 653-665.

Ritzer, G, Goodman, D, J., (2004). *Classical Sociological Theory*, Forth Edition, Boston, McGrawhill.

Ritzer, G. (1998). “Emile Durkheim”, *Early Modern Social Theory: Selected Interpretive Readings*, ed Smith E.G, Toronto, Canadian Scholar's Press, page 110-150

Rose, D. R., & Clear, T. R. (1998). Incarceration, social capital, and crime: Implications for social disorganization theory. *Criminology*, 36, 441-480.

Ross, C, E., Jang, J, S., (2000) "Neighborhood Disorder, Fear, and Mistrust: The Buffering Role of Social Ties With Neighbors." *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 28(4): 401-20.

Sacco, F.V.(1995). “Media Construction of Crime” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol, 539, Reactions to Crime and Violence, 141-154.

Sampson RJ, Raudenbush SW, Earls F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: a multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science* 277:918–24

- Scheider, M. C., Rowell, T., & Bezdikian, V. (2003). The impact of citizen perceptions of community policing on fear of crime: Findings from twelve cities. *Police Quarterly*, 6, 363-386
- Scott, H. (2003). "Stranger danger: Explaining women's fear of crime." *Western Criminology Review*, 4(3), 203-214.
- Siehr, J. R. (2004). *Fear of Crime: its Impact, Causes, and Consequences*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Marquette University.
- Silver, E. and Miller, L. L. (2004), 'Sources of Informal Social Control in Chicago Neighborhoods', *Criminology*, 42: 551-83
- Skogan, W. G. (1987). The impact of victimisation on fear. *Crime and Delinquency* 33, 135-54.
- Skogan, W. G. (1986), *Fear of Crime and Neighborhood Change*, *Crime and Justice*, Vol. 8, *Communities and Crime*, pp. 203-229
- Skogan, W. G. (1990). *Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral or Decay in American Neighborhoods*. New York: Free Press.
- Skogan, W. G. (1993). The various meanings of fear. In W.Bilsky, C.Pfeiffer, & P.Wetzels (Eds.), *Fear of Crime and Criminal Victimization*. Stuttgart : Enke.
- Skogan,W,G Maxfield, M,G (1981) *Coping with Crime: Individual and Neighborhood Reactions*.Beverly Hills: Sage Publications
- Smith S. J. (1986) *Crime Space and Society* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Smith, L.N., Hill, G.D. (1991), "Victimization and fear of crime", *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Vol. 18 No.2, pp.217-39.

Smith, W. R. and M. Torstensson. (1997). "Gender Differences in Risk Perception and Neutralizing Fear of Crime: Toward Resolving the Paradoxes." *British Journal of Criminology*. 37(4):607-633.

Stafford, M, C. Galle R. O. (1984). "Victimization rates, exposure to risk, and fear of crime." *Criminology* 22:173-86.

Stanko, E.A (1985). *Intimate Intrusions: Women Experience of Male Violence*. London Routledge

Stanko, E. A. (1995). "Women, crime, and fear." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 539, 46-58.

Sutherland, E,H, (1947). *Principles of Criminology*, Lippincott, Philadelphia 4th ed.

Taylor, R. B., & Hale, M. (1986). Testing alternative models of fear of crime. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 77, 151-189

Tjaden, P, G. Thoennes, N., (1998) "Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey." *National Institute of Justice and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Research in Brief*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, NCJ 172837.

Tseloni, A., Zarafonitou, C., (2008) *Fear of Crime and Victimization: A Multivariate Multilevel Analysis of Competing Measurements* *European Journal of Criminology*, October 1, 2008; 5(4): 387 - 409.

U.S. Department of Justice (1997), *Criminal victimization in the United States*, Washington, Bureau of Justice Statistics (B.J.C.) publication.

Uludağ, Ş., Özdemir, S., Doğutaş, C. (2009), *Vatandaşların Suç Korku (Güvenlik Endişesi) Seviyesine Etki Eden Faktörler ve Alınabilecek Önlemler: Malatya Örneği*

(Polis Akademisi Başkanlığı Önleyici Hizmetler ve Çocuk Suçluluğu Araştırma Merkezi tarafından yayınlanan Ocak 2009 tarihli araştırma raporu).

Usluata, A., (1995), İletişim, İletişim Yayınları, Yeni Yüzyıl Kitaplığı, Cep Üniversitesi.

Velez, M. B. (2001). The role of public social control in urban neighborhoods: A multilevel analysis of victimization risk. *Criminology*, 39, 837-864.

Villarreal, A., & Silva, B. F. A. (2006). "Social cohesion, criminal victimization and perceived risk of crime in Brazilian neighborhoods". *Social Forces*, 84, 1725-1749.

Vito, F. G., Maahs, R. J., Holmes, M. R., (2007) *Criminology Theory, Research, and Policy*, Jones and Bartlett Publishers, Sudbury, Massachusetts.

Warr, M. (1985) "Fear of Rape among Urban Women" *Social Problems* 32:238-250

Warr, M. (1990). 'Dangerous Situations: Social Context and Fear of Victimization', *Social Forces*, 68(3):891-907.

Warr, M., & Stafford, M. (1983). Fear of Victimization: A Look at the Proximate Causes. *Social Forces*, 61(4), 1033-1043.

Wilcox, P. Quisenberry, N. Jones, S. (2003). The Built Environment and Community Crime Risk Interpretation *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 40: 322 - 345.

Will, J.A. & McGrath, J.H. (1995). Crime, neighborhood perceptions and the underclass: The relationship between fear of crime and class position. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 23(2), 163-176.

Williams, P. F., McShane, D. M (1999). *Criminological Theory*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey

Williams, P. Dickinson, J., (1993). The Relationship between Newspaper Crime Reporting and Fear of Crime, *British Journal of Criminology* vol:33, 33-56

Wyant, R.B. (2008). Multilevel Impacts of Perceived Incivilities and Perceptions of Crime Risk on Fear of Crime, *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, Vol. 45, No. 1, 39-64

Ziegler, R., and Mitchell, D. B. (2003). "Aging and fear of crime: An experimental approach to an apparent paradox." *Experimental Aging Research*, 29, 173-187.

APPENDICES

A. SURVEY

Üniversite Öğrencilerine Yönelik Suç Korkusu Anketi

Aşağıdaki cevaplanması istenilen sorular, sizin bazı konulardaki düşüncelerinizi öğrenmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu sorulara vereceğiniz cevaplar hiç bir şekilde şahsınızda değerlendirilmeyecektir. Sizden herhangi bir kişisel bilgi talep edilmemektedir. Bu nedenle lütfen anket kağıdı üzerine adınızı yazmayınız. Bu anketteki cevaplar doktora çalışmamın analiz kısmı açısından önem taşımaktadır. Zaman ayırdığınız için teşekkür ederim.

Gökhan Gökulu

ggokulu@metu.edu.tr

Demografik Sorular

1) Lütfen kaçınıcı sınıfta olduğunuzu belirtiniz?

() Hazırlık. () Birinci Sınıf. () İkinci Sınıf () Üçüncü Sınıf ()

Dördüncü Sınıf

2) Kaç Yaşındasınız?

3) Lütfen Cinsiyetinizi Belirtiniz: () Erkek () Kadın

4) Aşağıdakilerden hangisi barınma durumunuzu en iyi biçimde tanımlamaktadır?

Kampus içerisinde devlet yurdu ()

Kampus içerisinde özel yurt ()

Kampus dışında devlet yurdu ()

Kampus dışında özel yurt ()

Arkadaşlarımla apartman dairesi ()

Ailemle apartman dairesi ()

Akrabalarımın apartman dairesi ()

Tek başına apartman dairesi ()

Diğer (Lütfen belirtiniz) ()

.....

5) Kızılay'a ne sıklıkla gidiyorsunuz?

() Haftada bir gün. () Haftada iki-üç gün. () Hergün. () Onbeş günde bir.

() Ayda bir.

6) Kızılay'a genellikle hangi saatlerde gidiyorsunuz?

() Sabah 8:00-11:00 arası

() Öğle 11:00-14:00 arası

() Öğleden sonra 14:00- 17:00 arası

() Akşam 17:00-20:00 arası

() Gece 20:00 – 24:00

Mağduriyet Soruları

Aşağıdaki sorular; sizin kampüs yaşamında ve kampüs dışında belirtilen olayları yaşıyıp yaşamadığını öğrenmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Lütfen sizin için uygun olan kutucuğu işaretleyiniz.

Doğrudan Mağduriyet

	Kampüs İçi		Kampüs Dışı	
	Evet	Hayır	Evet	Hayır
1) Son bir yılda, herhangi bir şiddete <u>maruz kalmadan</u> bir şeyiniz çalındı mı?				
2) Son bir yılda, herhangi bir gasp olayına maruz kaldınız mı?				
3) Son bir yılda, herhangi biri silah, kesici alet vb. <u>kullanmadan</u> size saldırdı, yaraladı				

ya da dövüldü mü?				
4) Son bir yılda, herhangi biri kesici alet <u>kullanarak</u> size saldırdı, yaraladı ya da dövüldü mü?				
5) Son bir yılda, herhangi biri tarafından cinsel tacize maruz kaldınız mı?				

Dolaylı Mağduriyet

	Kampüs İçi		Kampüs Dışı	
	Evet	Hayır	Evet	Hayır
1) Son bir yılda, tanıdığınız herhangi birinin, şiddete maruz <u>kalmadan</u> bir şeyi çalındı mı?				
2) Son bir yılda, tanıdığınız herhangi biri, gasp olayına maruz kaldı mı?				
3) Son bir yılda , tanıdığınız herhangi biri, silah, kesici alet vb. <u>kullanılmadan</u> saldırıya uğradı, yaralandı ya da dövüldü mü?				
4) Son bir yılda, tanıdığınız herhangi biri, kesici alet <u>kullanılarak</u> saldırıya uğradı, yaralandı veya dövüldü mü?				
5) Son bir yılda, tanıdığınız herhangi biri, cinsel tacize maruz kaldı mı?				

Çevresel Özellikler

Aşağıdaki sorular sizin çevresel güvenlik algınızı ölçmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Lütfen aşağıdaki olayların sizce Kampüs/Kızılay açısından ne derecede önemli bir sorun

olduğunu belirtiniz? Lütfen, her iki bölgeyi ayrı ayrı değerlendiriniz. 10 rakamı, çevresel sorun açısından en yüksek değeri ifade ederken 0 rakamı hiç bir sorun bulunmadığını ifade etmektedir.

1 Hırsızlık Kampüs/Kızılay açısından ne derecede önemli bir sorundur? (Lütfen her iki bölgedeki mevcut duruma göre değerlendiriniz)

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

2 Gasp Kampüs/Kızılay açısından ne derecede önemli bir sorundur? (Lütfen her iki bölgedeki mevcut duruma göre değerlendiriniz)

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

3 Saldırı Kampüs/Kızılay açısından ne derecede önemli bir sorundur? (Lütfen her iki bölgedeki mevcut duruma göre değerlendiriniz)

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

4 Cinsel Taciz (sözlü ya da fiili) Kampüs/Kızılay açısından ne derecede önemli bir sorundur? (Lütfen her iki bölgedeki mevcut duruma göre değerlendiriniz)

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

5 Gürültü Çıkaran Kişiler Kampüs/Kızılay açısından ne derecede önemli bir sorundur? (Lütfen her iki bölgedeki mevcut duruma göre değerlendiriniz)

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

6 Duvar Yazıları, Afişler Kampüs/Kızılay açısından ne derecede önemli bir sorundur? (Lütfen her iki bölgedeki mevcut duruma göre değerlendiriniz)

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

7 Yetersiz Işıklandırma Kampüs/Kızılay açısından ne derecede önemli bir sorundur? (Lütfen her iki bölgedeki mevcut duruma göre değerlendiriniz)

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

8 Sarhoş Gezen Bireyler Kampüs/Kızılay açısından ne derecede önemli bir sorundur? (Lütfen her iki bölgedeki mevcut duruma göre değerlendiriniz)

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

9 **Toplanmayan Cöpler** Kampüs/Kızılay açısından ne derecede önemli bir sorundur? (Lütfen her iki bölgedeki mevcut duruma göre değerlendiriniz)

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

10a **Kampüste başıboş gezen köpekler** ne derecede önemli bir sorundur? (Lütfen mevcut duruma göre değerlendiriniz)

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

10b **Kızılay'daki sokak satıcıları** ne derecede önemli bir sorundur? (Lütfen mevcut duruma göre değerlendiriniz)

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Mağduriyet Risk Algısı

Aşağıdaki sorular sizin belirtilen olaylara uğrama olasılığınızı ölçmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Lütfen bu olayların başınıza gelme ihtimalini değerlendirerek size uygun olan cevabı veriniz. 10, en yüksek olasılığı belirtirken 0 bu olaya uğrama riskinizin bulunmadığını ifade etmektedir.

1 Kişisel bir eşyanızın (cüzdan, diz üstü bilgisayar, kitap vb), gündüz vakti, şiddete maruz kalmadan çalınma ihtimali

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

2 Kişisel bir eşyanızın (cüzdan, diz üstü bilgisayar, kitap vb), gece vakti, şiddete maruz kalmadan çalınma ihtimali

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

3 Kişisel bir eşyanızın (cüzdan, diz üstü bilgisayar, kitap vb), gündüz vakti, şiddet kullanılarak çalınma ihtimali

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

4 Kişisel bir eşyanızın (cüzdan, diz üstü bilgisayar, kitap vb), gece vakti, şiddet kullanılarak çalınma ihtimali

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

5 Gündüz vakti, kesici bir aletle saldırıya uğrama ihtimali

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

6 Gece vakti, kesici bir aletle saldırıya uğrama ihtimali

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

7 Gündüz vakti, basit saldırıya uğrama ihtimali (herhangi bir kesici alet kullanılmadan)

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

8 **Gece vakti**, basit saldırıya uğrama ihtimali (herhangi bir kesic alet kullanılmadan)

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

9 **Gündüz vakti** cinsel tacize uğrama ihtimali

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

10 **Gece vakti** cinsel tacize uğrama ihtimali

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Suç Korkusu

Aşağıdaki sorular, belirtilen olayların, sizi ne derecede endişelendirdiğini ölçmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Lütfen ifade edilen olayların, sizi Kampüste/Kızılay'da ne derecede **endişelendirdiğini** değerlendiriniz. Lütfen, her iki bölgeyi ayrı ayrı değerlendiriniz. 10, en yüksek endişe değerini belirtirken, 0, rakamı bu konuda bir endişe yaşamadığınızı ifade etmektedir.

1 **Gündüz vakti** kişisel bir eşyanızın (cüzdan diz üstü bilgisayar kitap vb.) **siddet kullanılmadan** çalınma endişeniz

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

2 **Gece vakti** kişisel bir eşyanızın (cüzdan diz üstü bilgisayar kitap vb.) **şiddet kullanılmadan** çalınma endişeniz

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

3 **Gündüz vakti** kişisel bir eşyanızın (cüzdan diz üstü bilgisayar kitap vb.) **şiddet kullanılarak** çalınma endişeniz

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

4 **Gece vakti** kişisel bir eşyanızın (cüzdan diz üstü bilgisayar kitap vb.) **şiddet kullanılarak** çalınma endişeniz

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

5 **Gündüz vakti**, kesici bir alet kullanılarak, saldırıya uğrama endişeniz

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

6 **Gece vakti**, kesici bir alet kullanılarak, saldırıya uğrama endişeniz

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

7 **Gündüz vakti** basit saldırıya uğrama endişeniz (herhangi bir kesici alet kullanılmadan)

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

8 **Gece vakti** basit saldırıya uğrama endişeniz (herhangi bir kesici alet kullanılmadan)

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

9 **Gündüz vakti** cinsel tacize uğrama endişeniz (sözlü ya da fiili)

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

10 **Gece vakti** cinsel tacize uğrama endişeniz

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Kısıtlanan Davranışlar Kampüs

Aşağıdaki sorular belirtilen davranışları ne sıklıkla gerçekleştirdiğinizi ölçmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Lütfen bu davranışları ne sıklıkla gerçekleştirdiğinizi uygun kutucuğu işaretleyerek belirtiniz. 10, en yüksek sıklık değerini ifade ederken 0 bu davranışı gerçekleştirmediğinizi belirtir.

1. Son bir yıl içerisinde, biber gazı, bıçak ya da benzeri bir aleti kendinizi koruma amaçlı olarak yanınızda ne sıklıkla bulundurdunuz?

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

2. Son bir yıl içerisinde, kendinizi daha güvende hissetmeniz için, tanıdığınız herhangi birinden gideceğiniz yere kadar kendinize eşlik etmesini ne sıklıkta istediniz?

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

3. Son bir yıl içerisinde, bulunduğunuz ortamdan kısa süreli olarak ayrılmanız gerektiğinde, tanıdığınız herhangi birinden eşyanıza göz kulak olmasını ne sıklıkta istediniz?

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

4. Son bir yıl içerisinde, kampüs dışına çıkarken güvenlik endişesi nedeniyle otostop çekmekten vazgeçtiğiniz durumlar ne sıklıkla meydana geldi?

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

5. Son bir yıl içerisinde, **gündüz vakti**, herhangi bir suçla maruz kalma korkusuyla kampüsün belirli bölgelerine gitmekten çekindiğiniz durumlar ne sıklıkla meydana geldi?

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

6. Son bir yıl içerisinde, **gece vakti**, herhangi bir suçla maruz kalma korkusuyla kampüsün belirli bölgelerine gitmekten çekindiğiniz durumlar ne sıklıkla meydana geldi?

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

7. Son bir yıl içerisinde, güvenlik endişesi gerekçesi nedeniyle herhangi yetkili biriyle (yurt müdürü, bekçi, okul yönetimi vb.) görüşme yaptığınız durumlar ne sıklıkla meydana geldi?

KAMPÜS

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

8. Son bir yıl içerisinde **gündüz vakti**, herhangi bir suçla maruz kalma korkusuyla Kızılay'a gitmekten çekindiğiniz durumlar ne sıklıkla meydana geldi?

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

9. Son bir yıl içerisinde, **gece vakti**, herhangi bir suçta maruz kalma korkusuyla Kızılay'a gitmekten çekindiğiniz durumlar ne sıklıkla meydana geldi?

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

10. Son bir yıl içerisinde, **gündüz vakti**, herhangi bir suçta maruz kalma korkusuyla Kızılay'dan erken ayrıldığınız durumlar ne sıklıkla meydana geldi?

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

11. Son bir yıl içerisinde **gece vakti**, bir suçta maruz kalma korkusuyla Kızılay'dan erken ayrıldığınız durumlar ne sıklıkla meydana geldi?

KIZILAY

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

B. TURKISH SUMMARY

Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi lisans öğrencilerinin suç korkusunu incelediğimiz çalışmamızda Ferraro'nun (1995) risk assesment yaklaşımı temel alınmıştır. Bu yaklaşım bireylerin suç korkusunu bireysel özellikler, victimization, çevresel özellikler, perceived risk of victimization ve constrained behavior kavramları üzerinden ölçmektedir. risk assesment yaklaşımına göre bireylerin suç korkusunu age, gender, race gibi sosyodemografik özellikler bireylerin suç korkusunu belirleyen etmenlerdir. Çalışmamız, yaş, cinsiyet ve studying class gibi sosyodemografik değişkenlerin öğrencilerin suç korkusuna etki edip etmediğini inceleyecektir.

Çalışma öğrencilerin sosyodemografik özelliklerinin suç korkusuna etki edip etmediğini görebilmek için bu değişkenlerle ilgili hipotezleri test etmektedir. Çalışmamız bireysel özelliklerle ilgili hipotezleri, suç korkusu literatürüne ve incelediğimiz örneklemin özelliklerine uygun bir şekilde belirlemiştir. Örneğin yaş ve suç korkusu çalışmalarında genellikle yaş ve suç korkusu arasında pozitif bir ilişki ortaya çıkmaktadır. Bununla birlikte gençlerin suç korkusunu inceleyen çalışmalar yaş arttıkça suç korkusunun azaldığını ortaya koymaktadırlar (Melde 2007).

Çalışma ilgili literatür ve çalışmalara paralel olarak, yaş ve suç korkusu arasındaki ilişkiyi yaş arttıkça suç korkusu azalır hipotezi üzerinden incelemektedir. Bununla birlikte ilgili analizler sonucunda yaş değişkeninin öğrencilerin suç korkusuna etkisinin bulunmadığını söyleyebiliriz. Bunun nedeni anketin 18-24 yaş aralığına uygulanması ve öğrencilerin yaşlarının birbirine yakın olması sonucunda yaş değişkeninin social vulnerability'e yol açmamasıdır.

Çalışmamızda yaş değişkeni suç korkusu açısından belirleyici olmasa da studying class öğrencilerin suç korkusuna etki etmesi dikkat çekicidir. Bu bakımdan yaş değişkeninden bağımsız olarak öğrencilerin kampüste geçirdiği sürenin artması

onların suç korkusunu azaltan bir rol oynamaktadır. Bu bakımdan öğrencilerin arkadaş ilişkileri çevreye olan aşinalığı arttıkça suç korkularının azaldığını söyleyebiliriz.

Çalışmada kullanılan sosyodemografik değişkenlerden bir diğerini gender oluşturmaktadır. suç korkusu çalışmalarında kadınların social vulnerability yüzünden daha fazla suç korkusu taşıdıkları vurgulanmaktadır. Çalışmamız kadınların suç korkusu erkeklere oranla daha fazladır hipotezini kampüs ve Kızılay bölgelerinde test etmektedir. Yapılan analizler sonucunda hem kampüs hem de Kızılay bölgesinde kadınların erkeklere oranla suç korkusu daha yüksek çıkmıştır.

Risk assesment yaklaşımının ikinci boyutunu victimization oluşturmaktadır. çalışmamız victimization boyutunu doğrudan mağduriyet ve dolaylı mağduriyet üzerinden ölçmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Doğrudan mağduriyeti ölçen sorular öğrencilerin uğrama ihtimali yüksek suçlar üzerinden seçilmiştir. Bu bakımdan doğrudan mağduriyet soruları, hırsızlık, gasp, basit saldırı, ciddi saldırı ve cinsel taciz sorularını içermektedir.

Çalışmamız öğrencilerin kampüs ve kampüs dışı mağduriyetini ölçen soruları içermektedir. bu ayrımındaki amaç kampüs mağduriyetin kampüs suç korkusuna olan etkisini ve kampüs dışı mağduriyetin Kızılay bölgesine etkisini ayrı bir biçimde değerlendirmektir. Bu bakımdan mağduriyet değişkeninin farklı bölgelerdeki etkisi hangi suç türlerinin hangi bölgede suç korkusuna yol açtığı ayrıntılı olarak analiz edilmektedir.

Analizleri incelediğimizde kampüs bölgesinde hırsızlık gibi mala yönelik suçların kampüs suç korkusunu artırdığı görülmektedir. Kampüs doğrudan mağduriyetle ilgili descriptive data'lara baktığımızda hırsızlığın en çok görülen mağduriyet türü olduğu görülmektedir. Bu nedenle öğrencilerin kampüs mağduriyet korkusu ve maruz kalınan suç türü arasında uyum olduğunu söyleyebiliriz.. Bununla birlikte, Kızılay bölgesine baktığımızda öğrencilerin şahsa yönelik suç türlerinden daha fazla

korktuğunu söyleyebiliriz. Kızılay'ın kampüse göre korumalı bir bölge olmaması, farklı toplumsal kesimlerin ve heterojen bir yapının bulunması, öğrencilerin şahsa yönelik suç korkusunu etkileyen faktörler olarak görülebilir.

Çalışmamız doğrudan mağduriyet ile birlikte dolaylı mağduriyet olgusunun da suç korkusu üzerindeki etkilerini incelemektedir. Bu bakımdan çalışmamız hem kampüs dolaylı mağduriyet hem de kampüs dışı dolaylı mağduriyet sorularını içermektedir. kampüs ve kampüs dışı dolaylı mağduriyet soruları dolaylı mağduriyet sorularıyla uyumlu olarak öğrencilerin tanıdığı herhangi birinin hırsızlığa, gaspa, basit saldırıya, ciddi saldırıya ve cinsel tacize uğrayıp uğramadığını sormaktadır. Dolaylı mağduriyetle ilgili analizleri incelediğimizde dolaylı mağduriyet oranının doğrudan mağduriyete göre yüksek çıkmasına karşın suç korkusunu doğrudan mağduriyet kadar etkilemediği görülmektedir.

Risk assesment yaklaşımı sadece bireysel özelliklerin suç korkusu üzerine olan etkisini incelemez. Bu yaklaşım, yaş, cinsiyet gibi sosyo demografik değişkenlerin yanında çevresel bozulmanında (enviromental disorder) suç korkusu üzerine etkilerini inceler. Bu yaklaşımın çevresel bozulmayla ilgili diğer bir özelliği çevresel bozulmayı objektif kriterlerden ziyade bireylerin algıları üzerinden ölçmesidir. Bu bakımdan bireylerin yaşadığı çevreyi ne şekilde algıladığı ve bu algının suç korkusu üzerine etkileri risk assesment yaklaşımın özelliklerinden biridir. bu anlamda çevresel bozulmaya ait bireysel algı farklılıkları ve bu farklılıkların suç korkusu üzerine etkileri risk assesment yaklaşımının üzerinde durduğu konulardan birini oluşturur.

Çalışmamız bireylerin çevresel bozulma algısını kampüs ve Kızılay üzerinden ölçmeyi amaçlamaktadır. bu bakımdan öğrencilerin kampüs ve Kızılay'la ilgili çevresel bozulma algısını ölçen sorular bulunmaktadır. çevresel bozulma algısı sosyal ve fiziki çevresel bozulma olarak ikiye ayrılmaktadır. Sosyal çevresel bozulma sarhoş gezen bireylerin varlığı, sokak satıcıların bulunup bulunmaması gürültü çıkaran kişiler gibi toplumsal çevreye ilişkin soruları barındırır. Fiziki

çevresel bozulma ise toplanmayan çöpler, ışıklandırmanın yetersiz oluşu ve terk edilmiş binalar gibi fiziki bozulmaya ilişkin soruları içerir.

Çalışmamız kampüs ve Kızılay çevresel bozulma algısını fiziki ve sosyal çevresel bozulmaya ilişkin sorularla ölçmektedir. bu bakımdan öğrencilere kampüs ve Kızılay'la ilgili çevresel bozulmayla ilgili özelliklerin ne derece önemli bir sorun olarak gördüğüne dair sorular bulunmaktadır. yapılan analizlerde öğrencilerin kampüsle ilgili en önemli çevresel bozulma olarak değerlendirdikleri soru kampüste başıboş gezen köpekler olmuştur. Kızılay çevresel bozulmaya baktığımızda ise sarhoş gezen bireylerin önemli bir sorun olarak görüldüğünü söyleyebiliriz.

Çevresel bozulma algısını kampüs ve Kızılay bölgesi açısından değerlendirdiğimizde, öğrencilerin kampüs ve Kızılay çevresel bozulma algısı açısından önemli bir fark olduğunu söyleyebiliriz. öğrencilerin genellikle kampüse dair çevresel bozulma algısını düşük olduğunu söyleyebilir. Buna karşın Kızılay çevresel bozulma algısına baktığımızda öğrencilerin bu bölgeye ait çevresel bozulma algısı yüksek çıkmaktadır.

Risk assesment yaklaşımının suç korkusu çalışmalarına getirdiği yeniliklerden biri perceived risk of victimization ve suç korkusu arasında bir ayrıma gitmesidir. Bu yaklaşımdan önce suç korkusuyla ilgili yapılan çalışmalar perceived risk ve suç korkusu ayrımına gitmemiş ve suç korkusunu suça maruz kalma riskiyle eşdeğer tutmuşlardır. Bu bakımdan risk perception yaklaşımı bireylerin suç korkusuyla suça maruz kalma riski arasında ayrıma giden ilk çalışmalardan biridir.

Bireylerin suça maruz kalma riskiyle suça uğrama korkusunu ayırt etmek suç korkusunu daha iyi ölçmemize olanak tanır. Bir birey herhangi bir suça maruz kalma riskini düşük görse dahi bu suça maruz kalmaktan çok korkabilir. Bu bakımdan bireylerin suç korkusunu bir suça uğrama riskini sorarak ölçmek doğru analizler yapmamıza engel olur. Örneğin yaşlı ve kadınlar kendilerini savunmasız(vulnerable) hissetmeleri nedeniyle bir suça maruz kalma riski düşük dahi olsa bu suça maruz kalmaktan korkabilirler.

Perceived risk of victimization ve fear of crime ayrımının getirdiđi avantajlardan bir diđeri ise suçlu alt kltre ait bireylerin suç korkusunu daha dođru biçimde ölçebilmesine olanak tanımaktadır. Bu bakımdan yetiştiđi suçlu alt kltrn etkisiyle bir suç maruz kalma riski yüksek olan bireyler bu suç maruz kalmaktan çok fazla korkmayabilir. Kısaca ifade etmek gerekirse suç korkusu ve perceived risk of victimization ayrımı suç maruz kala korkusunun o suç uđrama olasılıđıyla ölçleyemeyeceđini korkunun riskten daha farklı bir anlamı olduđunu ifade eder.

Çalıřma, daha sađlıklı analizler yapabilmek iin, perceived risk of victimization kavramını suç korkusunu ölçmek iin kullanılan benzer sorularla ölçmeyi amalamaktadır. bu bakımdan öđrencilerin hırsızlık,gasp basit saldırı, ciddi saldırı ve cinsel tacize uđrama olasılıklarını ölçen sorular bulunmaktadır. Çalıřma, öđrencilerin bu suç türlerine uđrama olasılıđını hem kamps hem de Kızılay bölgesi iin ayrı ayrı deđerlendirmelerini istemektedir.

Öđrencilerin perceived risk of victimization'la ilgili deđerlendirmelerini incelediđimizde kamps ve Kızılay arasında ciddi bir fark olduđunu söyleyebiliriz. öđrenciler Kızılay bölgesinde bir suç maruz kalma riskini olduka yüksek görmektedirler. Bununla birlikte kamps aısından deđerlendirdiđimizde öđrencilerin perceived risk of victimization'ı kamps suç korkusuna paralel bir biçimde düşük çıkmıřtır.

Risk assesment yaklaşımının suç korkusunu etkileyen bađımsız bir deđerşken olarak ele aldıđı bir diđer kavram constrained behaviordur. Bu kavram bireylerin belirli bir bölgede suç korkusu nedeniyle gerçekleřtirdiđi davranıřları ifade etmek iin kullanılır. Constrained behavior savunma ve kaınma(avoidance) davranıřları şeklinde kendini gösterir. Savunma davranıřları bireylerin suç korkusu nedeniyle almıř olduđu önlemleri ierir. Kaınma davranıřları ise bireylerin suç korkusu nedeniyle gerçekleřtirmedikleri eylemleri iermektedir. savunma davranıřlarına bireylerin yanında kesici alet bulundurması örnek verilebilir. Benzer biçimde

kaçınma davranışlarına suç korkusu nedeniyle bir yere gitmekten vazgeçme örnek verilebilir.

Çalışmamız constrained behavior kavramını hem kampüs hem de Kızılay bölgesi için ölçmektedir. yapılan analizleri incelediğimizde Kızılay bölgesi constrained behavior ortalamasının kampüs constrained behavior'dan yüksek olduğunu görürüz. Kızılay bölgesinde en yüksek constarined behavior'ı kampüste olduğu gibi herhangi bir yere giderken tanıdık birinden eşyaya göz kulak olmasını isteme oluşturmaktadır. Bu açıdan değerlendirdiğimizde kampus ve Kızılay açısından en önemli güvenlik tedbiri olası hırsızlık mağduriyetine karşı alınmaktadır.

Çalışmamız her bilimsel araştırmada olduğu gibi çalışmanın farklı bir boyutunu ele alan farklı alt bölümleri içermektedir. Burada, genel olarak çalışmanın alt bölümlerinde yapılmak istenen ve çalışmanın bütünlüğü ve bilimselliği açısından anlam taşıyan noktalardan kısaca bahsedilecektir. Çalışmanın ilk bölümünü suç ve suç korkusu kavramlarının tanımına yönelik farklı yaklaşımlara yer verilmiş ve hangi tanımın çalışmamız açısından ele alınacağı gerekçelendirilmiştir.

Bilimsel bir çalışmada gerekli bir prosedür olan kavramların tanımlanması, konu suç ve suç korkusu olunca daha da önem kazanan bir zorunluluk haline gelmektedir. zira suç kavramı üzerinde tartışılan pek çok farklı görüşün yer aldığı ortak bir fikir birliğine varılamamış kavramlardan biridir. bunun nedeni, suç kavramının göreceli bir kavram olmasından zaman içerisinde ve kültürler arasında değişiklik göstermesinden kaynaklanmaktadır.

Çalışmamız suç kavramını açıklamaya çalışan farklı görüşleri ele alacak ve bu görüşlerin suç kavramını hangi bakış açısına göre ele aldığını ortaya koyacaktır. Bu açıdan suç olgusunu açıklamaya çalışan makro sosyal teorilere kısaca değindikten sonra bu teorilerin güçlü ve zayıf yönleri değerlendirilecektir. Bu çabanın altında yatan amaç ise suç olgusunun kompleks ve tek bir boyutla açıklanamayacak bir sosyal gerçeklik olduğunun altını çizmektir.

Çalışmamız suçla ilgili makro sosyal teorileri 3 ana başlık altında kısaca incelemektedir. Kısaca ifade edersek, suç olgusunu toplumun bütünleşmesi açısından olumlu olarak karşılayan consensus yaklaşımı toplumun birlikteliğine zarar verdiği durumlarda işlenen suça ağır yaptırımlar uygulandığını ifade etmektedirler. Conklin (2009:6) consensus yaklaşımının suça neden olan davranışların kamu yararına aykırı öğeler içerdiğini vurgulamaktadır.

Suç olgusunu açıklamaya çalışan makro sosyal teorilerden bir diğerini toplumsal süreç teorisi oluşturmaktadır. Bu görüşe göre suç öğrenilen bir olgudur ve bireyler suç işlemeyi aile, arkadaş çevresi gibi suçlu alt kültürle etkileşimde bulunarak içselleştirir. Bu bağlamda bireylerin suça yönelmesi pek çok farklı kaynakla kurduğu iletişim ve etkileşim sonucunda oluşmaktadır. İnternet, televizyon, akran çevresi hatta kimi durumlarda aile bireyin suça yönelmesinde bir etken olarak rol oynayabilmektedir.

Suçlu açıklamaya çalışan diğer bir ana yaklaşım ise conflict teorisidir. Bu yaklaşım uzlaşma yaklaşımının aksine suç olgusunun toplumun bütününün fikir birliğine vardığı ve yaptırımın bu yolla belirlendiği bir olgu olarak değerlendirmez. Conflict teoriler suçun toplumda belirli imtiyazlara sahip bir sınıfın bu çıkarları korumak adına kendi değerlerini empoze etmesi ve neyin suç olacağını belirlemesi neticesinde oluşur. Çatışmacı teorisyenler suçun belirli bir uzlaşma sonucunda gerçekleşen bir

olgu olmadığının görülebilmesi için kanunları kimlerin belirlediğine bakmak gerektiğinin altını çizmektedirler.

Suç olgusunu açıklamaya yönelik bu çalışmalar toplumsal realitenin belli bir yönünü ele alarak suçla ilgili bütün olayları açıklama iddiasındadırlar. Bununla birlikte suç olgusu tek bir nedene indirgenemeyecek kadar kompleks bir olgudur. suçu genelleme değilde olay üzerinden ele aldığımızda, farklı suç türlerinde toplumun bütün kesimlerinde uzlaşma sağlanabileceği gibi beyaz yaka suçların daha az cezai yaptırma maruz kalması gibi belirli bir sınıfın çıkarını kollamaya yönelik işaretler gözlemlenebilir.

Suç olgusunu mikro düzeyde suç türleri üzerinden incelemek ve bu suç türlerini açıklamaya çalışan teorilerle desteklemek çok büyük genellemelerin düşüreceği sorunlardan kurtulmamıza neden olur. Bu bakımdan çalışmamız suç ve suç korkusu olgusuyla ilgili genellemelere gitmek yerine onu mikro düzeyde suç türleri üzerinden ele almayı tercih etmektedir. Bu bakımdan anketimiz suç mağduriyetini “bir suça maruz kaldınız mı?” gibi aşırı genellyici sorularla ölçmek yerine daha spesifik suçlar üzerinden ölçmeye çalışacaktır. Benzer biçimde suç korkusu olgusunu, “dışarıda gezerken bir suça maruz kalmaktan ne kadar korkarsınız?” gibi sorularla ölçmek yerine hırsızlığa, gaspa ya da saldırıya maruz kalmaktan ne derece endişe ettiğini ölçen soruları içermektedir.

Çalışmamız suç korkusuyla ilgili yaklaşımları açıkladıktan sonra suçun farklı tanımlarına yönelik yaklaşımları verecektir. Suç olgusunun ne şekilde tanımlandığı ve bu yaklaşımların neler olduğu belirlendikten sonra çalışmamız suçu sadece

hukuki tanımla ele almanın dezavantajlarına dikkat çekecek ve suç olgusunu sapma sosyolojisiyle paralel bir biçimde geniş anlamda kullanacağını altını çizecektir.

Suçun tanımına yönelik yaklaşımlara yer verdikten sonra birinci bölümde ele alacağımız bir diğer konu, suç korkusu kavramının tanımına yönelik farklı yaklaşımlara yer verilecektir. suç korkusu çalışmalarının kullandığı yöntem ve altında yatan teorik kabullere paralel olarak kullanılan tanımın özellikleri incelenecektir. Bu bağlamda suç korkusunu hangi şekilde tanımlandığı basit bir tercihten ziyade, suç korkusunu hangi teorik ve metodolojik zemin üzerinden ölçüldüğünü göstermektedir.

Çalışmamız suç korkusu tanımının endişe, davranış, risk algısı ve tehdit üzerinden yapmanın hatalı ve eksik olduğunu örneklerle ortaya koyacaktır. Bu yaklaşımların teorik ve metodolojik eksiklikleri vurgulandıktan sonra suç korkusunun genel değil spesifik suçlar üzerinden ölçülmesi gerektiğini ortaya koyacaktır. Bu bakımdan çalışmamız suç korkusunu Ferraro'nun (1995) risk perception yaklaşımına uygun olarak suç korkusunu genel suç algısı korkusu ya da tehdit yaklaşımından ziyade spesifik suç türlerine maruz kalma korkusu üzerinden ölçecektir.

Çalışmanın ikinci bölümünde genel olarak suç korkusu çalışmalarında kullanılan yaklaşımlar ve bu yaklaşımların teorik alt yapısı ele alınacaktır. Bu bağlamda 1960'lı yıllardan günümüz suç korkusu çalışmalarına kadar geçen süreçte, suç korkusu olgusunun hangi yöntem ve teorik yapı üzerinden çalışıldığı incelenecektir. Suç korkusunda ortaya çıkan bu yaklaşımların teorik alt yapısı bu konuyla ilgili yapılan çalışmalar incelenecek ve bu yaklaşımları destekleyen ve eleştiren görüşlere yer verilecektir.

Suç korkusuyla ilgili teorik yapı oluşturulurken dikkat edilen unsurlardan biri sadece teoriyle ilgili bilgiler vermekten ziyade teorinin yöntemle olan ilişkisi gösterilmeye çalışılmıştır.. Bu anlamda çalışma teori ve metod arasında keskin bir ayrıma gitmeyip bu iki alanın birbirleriyle bağlantılı kavramlar olduğunu savunmaktadır. Bu nedenle çalışmamız suç korkusuyla ilgili teorik bilgileri ortaya koyduktan sonra bu yaklaşıma dayanan çalışmaları da incelemiş ve yaklaşıma yönelik eleştirilere de yer vermiştir.

Çalışmamız, suç korkusuyla ilgili yaklaşımlar olan victimization, vulnerability, incivilities ve community concern yaklaşımlarını inceledikten sonra çalışmamızda kullanılan risk assesment yaklaşımını ayrıntılı bir biçimde inceleyecektir. Ferraro'nun (1995) risk assesment yaklaşımını oluştururken yararlandığı symbolic interactionism, incivility hypothesis ve routine activities teorilerini kısaca inceledikten sonra bu teorik görüşlerin risk assesment yaklaşıma ne şekilde uyarlandığı ele alınacaktır. Yaklaşımın suç korkusu açısından ne gibi yenilikler getirdiği, suç korku ve risk perception ayrımının neden gerekli olduğu gibi konular ayrıca irdelenecek ve bu yaklaşımın çalışma açısından önemi ayrıca ortaya konulacaktır.

İkinci bölümde suç korkusu çalışmalarında kullanılan yaklaşımlar ele alındıktan sonra Odtü kampüs yapısı ve Kızılay hakkında genel bilgiler verilecektir. Bu kısımda çalışma alanı açısından Odtü ve Kızılay bölgelerinin neden önemli olduğuna dair bilgiler yer alacaktır. Üniversite öğrencilerinin suç korkusunu ölçmeyi amaçlayan bu araştırmada, çalışma alanı olarak neden Odtü kampüsü seçildiği, Odtü kampüsüyle birlikte Kızılay bölgesinin neden çalışmaya dahil edildiğine dair gerekçeler yer alacaktır.

Çalışmamızın üçüncü bölümünde araştırmanın yöntem kısmına dair bilgiler yer alacaktır. bu bölümde yaptığımız araştırmada kullandığımız yöntemin içeriğine dair

bilgiler yer alacak ve kullanılan yöntemin suç korkusu açısından ne gibi boyutları bulunduğu tartışılacaktır. Yöntem bölümünde araştırmada kullandığımız veri tekniği olan anketin içeriğine ve oluşturulma sürecine dair bilgiler yer alacaktır. bu bakımdan anketin hangi kavramları ölçmeye çalıştığı, ölçülmeye çalışılan kavramın hangi soruları içerdiği gibi bilgiler çalışmanın metodoloji bölümünde yer alacaktır. Anketin ne şekilde oluşturulduğuna dair bilgiler verildikten sonra gerçekleştirilen pilot çalışmayla ilgili bilgilere yer verilecektir. Anketi uyguladığımız örnekleme ait veriler ve örneklemin demografik özellikleri de çalışmamızın metodoloji bölümünde yer alacaktır.

Metodoloji bölümünde ele alınacak unsurlardan bir diğeri ise yapılan çalışmaya ait araştırma soruları ve bu araştırma sorularıyla ilgili ortaya konulan hipotezlerdir. Bu bölümde araştırmanın ortaya çıkış sürecini sağlayan araştırma soruları ve bununla ilgili hipotezler kullandığımız yaklaşıma uygun bir şekilde incelenecektir. Metodoloji bölümünde yer vereceğimiz diğeri bir unsur ise bağımlı ve bağımsız değişkenlerin tanımlanması olacaktır. Bu açıdan araştırmada ölçmek istediğimiz bağımlı değişkenin olan suç korkusunun ne şekilde ölçüldüğü bağımlı değişkeni etkileyen bağımsız değişkene ait bilgiler bu bölümde yer almaktadır. Bağımlı ve bağımsız değişkenlerin tanımlanmasında dikkat çeken bir unsur ise bu noktada daha önce yapılan çalışmalara atıfta bulunarak bağımlı ve bağımsız değişkenleri ölçen soruların literatüre dayandırılarak seçilmesidir. Bu bağlamda çalışmanın yöntemi sadece kullanılan veri toplama yöntemlerinin basit bir anlatımı değil bu veri toplama tekniklerinin gerekçelerini de içerisinde barındırmaktadır.

Dördüncü bölümde yapılan ampirik çalışmaya ait analizler yer alacak ve çalışmayla ilgili hipotezlerin sonuçları irdelenecektir. Çalışmanın analiz bölümünde ilk olarak örnekleme ait descriptive istatistiklere yer verilecektir. anketin alt bölümünü oluşturan ölçeklere ait descriptive istatistiklere ait veriler çalışma konumuz açısından

değerlendirilecektir. Descriptive istatistiklere yer verildikten sonra hipotezlerle ilgili analizler yer alacak ve bu analiz sonuçları literatüre paralel bir biçimde tartışılacaktır.

Ankete ait descriptive bilgiler verildikten sonra çalışmada kullanılan alt ölçeklerin reliability analizine dair bilgiler çalışmamızda yer alacaktır. Her bir ölçeğe ait Cronbach's Alpha değerlerine ait rakamlara yer verildikten sonra bu bölümde, modelle ilgili olarak kurulan hipotezler test edilecektir. Bu anlamda yaş, cinsiyet, ikamet türü gibi demografik değişkenlerle ilgili hipotezlerin analizlerine yer verilecektir. Demografik değişkenlerle birlikte modelle bağlantılı olan doğrudan ve dolaylı mağduriyet, çevresel özellikler ve mağduriyet risk algısı kavramlarının suç korkusuna etkisi ilgili analiz yöntemleriyle tartışılacaktır.

Ankete ait verilerin analiz edildiği dördüncü bölümde, son olarak ilgili modelin bağımsız değişkenlerinin suç korkusuna ne şekilde etki ettiğini görmek adına regresyon analizine yer verilmiştir. Regresyon analizi bağımsız değişkenlerin bağımlı değişkenlere ne oranda etki ettiğini görmemize olanak tanıyan bir analiz biçimidir. Bu bakımdan çalışmamızda kullanılan modeldeki değişkenleri suç korkusu açısından değerlendirmemize olanak tanımaktadır. Çalışmamız hem kampüs hem de Kızılay suç korkusuna ilişkin iki ayrı regresyon analizine yer verecek ve sonuçları her iki bölge için ayrı ayrı tartışacaktır.

Çalışmamızın beşinci ve son bölümünde çalışmaya ait verilerin sonuçları hakkında genel bir değerlendirmede bulunacak olan sonuç bölümü yer alacaktır. Çalışmamızın sonuç bölümünde çalışmanın literatür açısından ne gibi sonuçları bulunduğu çalışmada kullanılan modelin anketin uygulandığı bölgeler açısından ne derecede geçerli olduğu gibi konular ele alınacaktır. Çalışmamızla ilgili genel bir

değerlendirme yapıldıktan sonra, Türkiye için çok yeni bir alan olan üniversite öğrencilerinin suç korkusunu ölçmeye yönelik, gelecekte ne tür çalışmalar yapılabileceğine dair örneklere yer verilecektir.

C. CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: GÖKULU GÖKHAN
Nationality: Turkish (TR)
Date and Place of Birth: 29 March 1976, Mersin
Marital Status: Married
Phone: +90 312 210 59 61
Email: gokhangokulu@hotmail.com

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Year of Graduation
MA	Police Academy, Institute of Security Sciences	2005
BA	Gazi University Department of Public Administration	2002
High School	Dumlupınar High School, Mersin	1993

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	Place	Enrolments
2004 - Present	METU Department of Sociology	Research Assistant

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Advanced English

INTERESTS

Sociological Theories, Terror and Terrorism, Media Representation of Crime, Criminology, Social Statistics.

HOBBIES

Swimming, Books, Tennis, Playstation Games.