



**FEAR OF CRIME AND PERCEPTION OF RISK: A SOCIOLOGICAL
ANALYSIS OF TWO NEIGHBOURHOODS IN ESKİŞEHİR**

Master of Arts

Alper ERDEM

Eskişehir 2023

**FEAR OF CRIME AND PERCEPTION OF RISK: A SOCIOLOGICAL
ANALYSIS OF TWO NEIGHBOURHOODS IN ESKİŞEHİR**

Alper ERDEM

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Fuat GÜLLÜPINAR

Eskişehir

Anadolu University

Graduate School of Social Sciences

July 2023

FINAL APPROVAL FOR THESIS

This thesis titled “.....” has been prepared and submitted by in partial fulfillment of the requirements in “Anadolu University Directive on Graduate Education and Examination” for the Degree of Master of Science/Master of Arts/Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)/Proficiency in Arts in Department has been examined and approved on/...../.....

Committee Members

Signature

Member (Supervisor)	:		
Member	:		
Member	:		
Member	:		
Member	:		

.....

Director

Graduate School of

ABSTRACT

FEAR OF CRIME AND PERCEPTION OF RISK: A SOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF TWO NEIGHBOURHOODS IN ESKİŞEHİR

Alper ERDEM

Department of Sociology

Anadolu University, Graduate School of Social Sciences Month/Year

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Fuat GÜLLÜPINAR

Numerous studies on the fear of crime, which is believed to have a negative impact on an individual's quality of life, sense of social cohesion, and mutual trust, have been conducted primarily in Europe and the United States. For this reason, this research, the primary objective of which is to produce descriptive information on fear of crime and risk perception through two neighbourhoods and to determine the factors affecting fear of crime, is important for understanding the dynamics in Türkiye and comparing it to other studies. In numerous studies, it has been asserted that there are several factors that influence fear of crime, including gender, socioeconomic status, individual perceptions of their own neighbourhoods, prior crime victimisation, and risk perceptions. In this sense, the study provides a comprehensive analysis of these factors, which are assumed to influence fear of crime. In the Yenibağlar and Gültepe neighbourhoods of Eskişehir, a total of 260 individuals, including 130 men and 130 women, were surveyed. According to the findings of the study, women are more fearful than men, and this disparity becomes even more pronounced when sexual offences are considered. While individuals' perceptions of disorder in their neighbourhoods can increase their fear of crime and risk perception, a weak negative correlation between neighbourhood cohesion and fear of crime was discovered. The relationship between risk perception and fear of crime is robust and positive. The most unexpected finding of the research is that 70 out of 260 individuals have been victimised in the past year and that those who have been victimised have less trust in police. Finally, while avoidance behaviour reduces fear of crime and risk perception, defensive behaviour can increase fear and risk.

Keywords: Fear of crime, Risk Perception, Coping Mechanisms, Incivilities, Eskişehir.

ÖZET

SUÇ KORKUSU VE RİSK ALGISI: ESKİŞEHİR'DE İKİ MAHALLENİN SOSYOLOJİK ANALİZİ

Alper ERDEM

Sosyoloji Anabilim Dalı

Anadolu Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ay Yıl

Danışman: Prof. Dr. Fuat GÜLLÜPINAR

Bireylerin hayat kalitesi, toplumsal birliktelik duygusu ve karşılıklı güven ortamına negatif yönde etki ettiği varsayılan suç korkusuna ilişkin birçok çalışma ağırlıklı olarak Avrupa ve Amerika gibi bölgelerde yürütülmüştür. Bu sebeple de temel amacı, iki mahalle üzerinden suç korkusu ve risk algısına dair betimsel bilgi üretmek ve suç korkusuna etki eden faktörleri belirlemek olan bu araştırmanın, Türkiye'deki dinamiklerin anlaşılması ve diğer araştırmalarla karşılaştırılması açısından önemli olduğu ifade edilebilir. Birçok çalışmada toplumsal cinsiyet, sosyo-ekonomik statü, bireylerin kendi mahallelerine dair algıları, geçmişte yaşadıkları suç mağduriyetleri ve risk algıları gibi suç korkusuna etki eden birçok farklı faktörün var olduğu iddia edilmiştir. Dolayısıyla bu çalışmada suç korkusuna etki edeceği varsayılan bu faktörlere ilişkin genel bir analiz yapılmıştır. Eskişehir'in Yenibağlar ve Gültepe mahallelerinde 130 erkek ve 130 kadın katılımcıyı içerecek şekilde toplamda 260 katılımcıya anket uygulanmıştır. Araştırma bulgularına göre kadınların korku oranları erkeklere göre daha fazladır ve özellikle cinsel suçlar ele alındığında bu fark daha da anlamlı hale gelmektedir. Bireylerin mahallelerindeki düzensizliklere dair algıları, suç korkusunu ve risk algısını artırabilirken, mahalle uyumu ile suç korkusu arasında zayıf, negatif korelasyon tespit edilmiştir. Risk algısı ile suç korkusu güçlü ve pozitif bir ilişkiye sahiptir. Araştırmadan elde edilen en çarpıcı bulgu ise 260 katılımcının 70'inin son 12 ayda suç mağduriyeti yaşamış olması ve herhangi bir suçun mağduru olan katılımcıların, diğerlerine göre polis güçlerine daha az güven duyuyor olmasıdır. Son olarak uzak durma davranışı suç korkusu ve risk algısını azaltırken, savunma davranışının, korku ve riski artırabildiği saptanmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Suç korkusu, Risk algısı, Başa çıkma mekanizmaları, Düzensizlikler, Eskişehir

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND RULES

I hereby truthfully declare that this thesis is an original work prepared by me; that I have behaved in accordance with the scientific ethical principles and rules throughout the stages of preparation, data collection, analysis and presentation of my work; that I have cited the sources of all the data and information that could be obtained within the scope of this study, and included these sources in the references section; and that this study has been scanned for plagiarism with “scientific plagiarism detection program” used by Anadolu University, and that “it does not have any plagiarism” whatsoever. I also declare that, if a case contrary to my declaration is detected in my work at any time, I hereby express my consent to all the ethical and legal consequences that are involved.

.....

(Signature)

.....

(Name and Surname of the Student)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
FEAR OF CRIME AND PERCEPTION OF RISK: A SOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF TWO NEIGHBOURHOODS IN ESKİŞEHİR	i
FINAL APPROVAL FOR THESIS	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZET	iv
STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND RULES	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF THE TABLES	x
LIST OF ABBEVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS	xii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. The Research Problem.....	1
1.2. The Purpose of the Study	3
1.3. The Significance of the Research.....	5
1.4. Assumptions of the Research.....	6
1.5. The Limitations.....	11
1.6. The Design of the Thesis	13
CHAPTER 2: DEFINING DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR AND MAJOR CRIME THEORIES.....	15
2.1. Deviant Behaviour and Its Relation to Crime	15
2.2. Major Crime Theories.....	16
2.2.1. The roots of criminology: the classical school of criminology and the biological approach.....	16
2.2.1.1. Classical school of criminology	16

2.2.1.2. Implementation of biology in criminology.....	17
2.2.2. Functionalist approach: anomie and strain theory.....	18
2.2.2.1. Durkheim's theory of anomie	19
2.2.2.2. Merton's strain theory	21
2.2.3. Differential association theory and labelling theory under the roof of symbolic interactionism.....	23
2.2.3.1. The theory of differential association	25
2.2.3.2. Labelling theory	29
2.2.4. Subculture theories	33
2.2.5. Conflict theory.....	43
2.2.5.1. Pluralist approach.....	49
2.2.5.2. Radical approach	53
2.2.5.3. Left realism.....	53
2.2.6. Feminist criminology	55
2.2.6.1. Liberalist feminist criminology.....	60
2.2.6.2. Radical feminist criminology	62
2.2.6.3. Marxist feminist criminology.....	63
2.2.6.4. Socialist feminist criminology	64
2.2.6.5. Postmodern feminist criminology	65
CHAPTER 3: THE MEASUREMENT OF FEAR OF CRIME AND ITS THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES	67
3.1. Vulnerability Hypothesis.....	67
3.1.1. Shadow hypothesis	69
3.2. Victimization Hypothesis.....	71
3.2.1. Indirect victimization hypothesis.....	73
3.3. Social Disorganisation Theory.....	74
3.3.1. Subcultural diversity approach	75

3.3.2. Social cohesion/integration hypothesis	77
3.3.3. Social change hypothesis.....	78
3.3.4. Social and physical incivilities	79
3.4. Influence of Media on Fear of Crime	81
3.5. Defining And Measuring the Fear of Crime	83
3.5.1. Factors affecting fear of crime and empirical contradictions.	87
3.6. Fear of Crime Studies in Turkiye.....	93
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY	99
4.1. Type of the Study.....	99
4.2. The Design of The Questionnaire and The Pilot Study	100
4.2.1. Pilot study and the reconstruction of the questionnaire	107
4.3. Research Universe and Sampling.....	110
4.4.. Data Collection Technique and Tool.....	113
4.5. Data Analysis	114
4.5.1. Normality distribution of the dependent variables	115
CHAPTER 5: KEY FINDINGS AND NOTES	117
5.1. Demographic Characteristics.....	117
5.1.1. Gender	117
5.1.2. Age	117
5.1.3. Education levels.....	118
5.1.4. The levels of income, marital status and sheltering	119
5.1.5. Occupation	123
5.2. Media Consumption	124
5.3. Victimization	127
5.4. Neighbourhood Cohesion, Incivilities and Confidence in Police Force	129
5.4.1. Neighbourhood cohesion.....	129
5.4.2. The perception of surroundings	132

5.4.3. Confidence in police force.....	133
5.5. Descriptive Data For Risk Perception and Fear of Crime	134
5.6. Coping with Fear and Risk.....	138
5.7. Analysis of Relationships Between Variables and Key Results.....	140
5.7.1. Vulnerability, fear of crime and risk perception	140
5.7.1.1. Gender and fear.....	140
5.7.1.2. Is elderly more afraid than other?	142
5.7.1.3. The relationship between income and perception of risk	142
5.7.1.4. Education, fear of crime and risk perception.....	144
5.7.1.5. Sheltering, marital status and fear of crime.....	144
5.7.2. Media consumption, fear of crime and risk perception.....	147
5.7.4. Neighbourhood cohesion, fear of crime and perception of risk	149
5.7.5. The effects of social and physical incivilities on fear and risk perception	151
5.7.6. The impact of confidence in police force on fear of crime and risk perception: A gap between the institution and society	154
5.7.7. Victimization, fear of crime and risk: Is Eskişehir really safe?.....	157
5.7.8. Fear of crime and risk perception: A cognitive impact on emotions ...	160
5.7.9. Avoidance and defence as coping mechanism to counter fear and risk	163
5.8. Discussion & Suggestion.....	166
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION.....	178
REFERENCES	183
APPENDIX	
CIRCULUM VIATE	

LIST OF THE TABLES

Table 1 <i>Skewness and Kurtosis values</i>	116
Table 2 <i>Gender</i>	117
Table 3 <i>Age distribution</i>	117
Table 4 <i>Education levels</i>	119
Table 5 <i>Income levels</i>	120
Table 6 <i>Average number of people living in the household</i>	120
Table 7 <i>Income levels of Yenibağlar and Gültepe</i>	121
Table 8 <i>House ownership</i>	122
Table 9 <i>Household share</i>	122
Table 10 <i>Occupational distribution</i>	123
Table 11 <i>Gender based occupational distribution</i>	124
Table 12 <i>News content consumption frequency on social media</i>	125
Table 13 <i>News content consumption rates on television by gender</i>	126
Table 14 <i>Sexual harassment rates based on gender</i>	127
Table 15 <i>Attempted murder rates based on gender</i>	128
Table 16 <i>Sexual Assault rates based on gender</i>	128
Table 17 <i>The number of cases for relevant crime types based on location</i>	129
Table 18 <i>General mean of neighbourhood cohesion</i>	130
Table 19 <i>Cohesion means for each question</i>	130
Table 20 <i>Cohesion values for both neighbourhoods</i>	131
Table 21 <i>Cohesion means by age</i>	131
Table 22 <i>Incivility means for each question and in general</i>	132
Table 23 <i>Confidence in police force</i>	133
Table 24 <i>Perception of risk for each crime type and in general</i>	135
Table 25 <i>Possible criminal victimisation locations by crime each crime type</i>	136

Table 26 <i>Fear of victimisation means by gender</i>	137
Table 27 <i>Fear of victimisation frequencies for each type of crime</i>	138
Table 28 <i>Avoidance and defensive behaviours of the participants</i>	139
Table 29 <i>Fear means for both gender</i>	141
Table 30 <i>Mann-Whitney U test results for gender and fear of crime</i>	141
Table 31 <i>Mann-Whitney U test results for gender and risk perception</i>	141
Table 32 <i>Income levels and mean rank of fear of crime.....</i>	143
Table 33 <i>Education levels and mean ranks of fear of crime.....</i>	144
Table 34 <i>Differentiation of risk and fear based on marital across genders</i>	145
Table 35 <i>Risk and fear ranks of individuals who share her/his house with others</i>	145
Table 36 <i>Correlation regarding incivilities, fear of crime and risk perception</i>	152
Table 37 <i>Difference between the two neighbourhood in terms of incivility scores</i>	152
Table 38 <i>The correlation results of confidence in police force.....</i>	155
Table 39 <i>Confidence in police force and risk perception based on neighbourhoods ..</i>	156
Table 40 <i>Spearman correlation results of cohesion and confidence in police force ...</i>	156
Table 41 <i>Prior victimisation rates of the participants.....</i>	157
Table 42 <i>Mann-Whitney mean results of victimisation and fear of crime</i>	158
Table 43 <i>Mann-Whitney mean results of victimisation and risk perception.....</i>	159
Table 44 <i>Mann-Whitney results of victimisation and confidence in police forces.....</i>	160
Table 45 <i>Fear of crime mean values for all participants</i>	160
Table 46 <i>Comparison of serious and other crime's fear ranks</i>	161
Table 47 <i>Fear and risk mean ranks of Yenibağlar and Gültepe</i>	162
Table 48 <i>The number of people who adopted avoidance and defensive behaviour</i>	164
Table 49 <i>The impact of avoidance on fear and risk</i>	164
Table 50 <i>The impact of defensive behaviours on fear and risk.....</i>	165

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

- α : The Cronbach Alpha value
- et la : and others
- i.e. : That is
- KW : Kruskal-Wallis test
- p : Probability value
- r : Correlation Coefficient
- Sig. :Significance level, also the p value
- Std :Standard
- TÜİK :Turkish Statistical Institute

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Research Problem

Behavioural patterns that can be used as examples of deviant behaviour are nearly as old as known history. This situation can be evaluated as having a close relationship to the definition of deviant behaviour. Deviant conduct is characterised by behaviours that differ from the prevalent standards of a group or groups. In this context, the dominant group condemns and punishes these actions (Kaplan, 2006; Kristiansen, 2017). Acts that resemble deviant behaviour but are classified as crimes break the legal rules imposed by societies or groups. Therefore, the types of conduct that constitute a crime may also vary from one culture to another.

After a criminal act has occurred, it can be claimed that it has repercussions for both individuals and societies. While it is true that crime can lead individuals to experience shock, fear, anxiety, loss of self-confidence, and increased vulnerability, it can also play a role in reducing social connections and fostering a sense of unease (Dolu et al, 2010; Morrall et al, 2010). Fear of crime can therefore be viewed as a phenomenon that negatively impacts individual and society life in the same manner as crime in general.

Although there is no consensus on how old the literature studies on fear of crime are, the emergence of fear of crime does not require extremely high crime rates or an actual threat (Baker et al, 1983; Doran & Burgess, 2012). In this sense, it can be claimed that fear arises from how reality is perceived or comprehended, rather than from what it actually is. Among the adaptive behaviour patterns that emerge as a result of this perception, the most observed behaviours that have the potential to harm social life are avoidance, restriction of one's own routines, a feeling of isolation due to loneliness, vulnerability, a general sense of insecurity, and carrying a firearm or sharp object for protection (Garofalo, 1981; Hale, 1996; Miceli et al, 2004). Restriction of routines, avoiding specific regions or groups, and a sense of isolation are factors that interrupt reciprocal contacts in the broadest sense and can lead to greater alienation of individuals from the community and environment they inhabit. Consequently, it might be claimed that a lack of mutual trust will lead to a cycle of fear and thus social breakdown. In addition to this problem, it can also be said that certain resources are required for the opportunity to relocate away from crime-ridden neighbourhoods. Regarding this condition, Hale (1996) claimed that fear of crime can increase both the cultural and

physical barrier between those with and without economic competence and that the gap between social classes may widen when people with enough resources move to different neighbourhoods. Furthermore, it might be stated that fear of crime can erode individuals' faith in justice and law enforcement, and that calls for harsher punishments for crimes motivated by fear can weaken the civil rights (Baker et al., 1983; Box et al., 1988). In addition to calls for harsher punishment, it is possible to highlight that legalised xenophobia and racism may emerge due to the resulting insecurity and alienation (Miceli et al., 2004).

As can be seen, the fear of crime is a phenomenon that does not require an actual threat and can affect the integrity and future of society, as well as diminish the quality of life of individuals on both micro and macro scales. In addition to the aforementioned basic consequences, it is also important to note that fear of crime has diverse effects on different social segments. Several research on this topic have shown, for instance, that women feel greater fear of crime than men and that older people feel more fear of crime than younger people (Ferraro, 1996; Fisher & Sloan, 2003; Keane, 1998; LaGrange & Ferraro, 1987; Taylor & Hale, 1986; Warr, 1984). Considering the coping mechanisms adopted in response to fear of crime, it can be argued that this situation may lead to the withdrawal of certain groups from public life in general, negatively impact feminist achievements in certain situations and geographies, and cause those with low voices to become silent. Thus, it can be claimed that groups with various sources and qualities are more likely to dominate others and acquire social control. The tendency of avoiding groups and individuals associated with criminal activity is another significant social separation. Box and others (1988) noted that avoiding particular ethnic groups and individuals who are associated with crime might be another potential effect of fear of crime. For this reason, fear can also be interpreted as a variable that increases the distance between certain ethnic groups and triggers conflict by making an impact on the ongoing alienation due to cultural differences.

As a result, it can be claimed that the fear of crime, which does not require a real threat to emerge, has significant consequences on both individuals and societies. Fear can result in isolation, alienation, and social insecurity, which, when viewed as self-constructing phenomena, may contribute to the escalation of fear of crime. As noted, various demographic segments and groups do not experience fear of crime in the same manner. This circumstance may lead people who are vulnerable to fear of crime to avoid

social life and refrain from participating in the public arena. In addition, when resources are taken into account, the interaction between the upper social classes and the lower classes can drastically diminish due to their different social and economic sources. Therefore, it may be deduced that economically capable classes can exert a stronger influence on social control, because of their stronger presence in public life. With the oppressed groups' silence, it is possible to produce masses that conform to the laws of the rich minority. In addition to these effects, mistrust of the justice and security authorities due to fear of crime and the demand for human rights-violating punishments for offenders have a negative impact on fundamental human rights, which are among humanity's achievements. Moreover, taking into account the demand for harsher punishments, increased security, and defence and attack instruments such as weapons and knives, it can be claimed that fear of crime gives economic benefits to various social sectors and, by extension, property owners. In light of these findings, it can be claimed that it is crucial to understand the phenomena of fear of crime on a macro scale and to explain its various causes in the context of future research and social policies.

1.2. The Purpose of the Study

In terms of criminology and victimology science, the national literature in Türkiye is still in its early stages of development. In this context, although there are a few studies on the fear of crime in city centres and various neighbourhoods in Türkiye (Akyuz, Akbas, & Onat, 2021; Aytaç, Derdiman, Baştürk, & Öngen, 2015; Çetin, 2010; Erkan Ç. & Sevin, 2018; Gaziarifoğlu, 2009; Kul, 2009; Öztürk, Kocacık, & Gönültaş, 2016; Sipahi, 2016; Taşçı, 2020), there are no studies that compare the rates and types of fear of crime in Eskişehir neighbourhoods or provides a general assessment about the entire city. In addition to the absence of research on Eskişehir, the selection of this city for study is also influenced by the city's crime rates. In 2021 and 2023, Eskişehir was cited in the news as one of the ten safest cities in the globe ([http-1](#) and [http-2](#)). However, according to a report by the Turkish Statistical Institute (2021), a comparison of the number of people sent to prison between 2011 and 2020 indicates that there is no discernible difference in the crime rate between Eskişehir and the rest of Türkiye, and in some cases, more crimes are committed in Eskişehir than in the rest of Türkiye. For example, when Istanbul and Eskişehir are compared according to the populations of 2014-2022, it is observed that the crime rate in Eskişehir is higher than in Istanbul (TÜİK, 2022b). Thus,

it is questionable whether or not Eskişehir is truly safe, and as stated, there is no correlation between the actual presence of risk and fear of crime. Even in cities with extremely low crime rates, elevated crime fear and risk perception can be observed. Therefore, the primary objective of the research conducted for this thesis is to generate descriptive information regarding the fear of crime and risk perception likely to be encountered in everyday life practises, and to examine the factors influencing fear of crime and risk perception in two Eskişehir neighbourhoods with different socioeconomic structures and locations. However, the research is not merely descriptive. It attempts to evaluate the hypotheses produced within the context of both national and international literature, to examine the correlations between the determined variables, and to compare the results of various research. Additionally, it is possible to perform region-specific tests by selecting two different neighbourhoods and to evaluate the effects of the variables. In this sense, it can be stated that the research also has relational and comparative characteristics.

The research questions that will be addressed within the scope of this thesis are;

- a) What is the extent of fear of crime that is potentially experienced by the residents of in the two selected neighbourhoods of Eskişehir?
- b) What level of risk perception do residents have?
- c) Does gender variable affect fear of crime?
- d) Does gender variable affect risk perception?
- e) Does age variable affect fear of crime?
- f) Does age variable affect risk perception?
- g) Does having a high income decrease risk perception?
- h) What is the relationship between high education level and fear of crime?
- i) What is the relationship between high education level and perception of risk?
- j) Does going out at night increase fear of crime?
- k) Does news content consumption on media affect fear of crime and risk perception?
- l) Is there a relationship between neighbourhood cohesion and fear of crime?
- m) Is there a relationship between neighbourhood cohesion and risk perception?
- n) Does perception of incivilities positively affect fear of crime?
- o) Does perception of incivilities positively affect perception of risk?

- p) Is there a correlation relationship between confidence in police force and fear of crime?
- q) Is there a correlation relationship between confidence in police force and perception of risk?
- r) Does being a victim of a crime raise a person's fear of crime?
- s) What are the most feared crimes?
- t) In which areas is fear of crime greater?
- u) Is there a correlation between risk perception and fear of crime?
- v) What adaptive behaviours do individuals who have high fear of crime adopt?
- w) What adaptive behaviours do individuals who have high perception of risk adopt?
- x) Does avoidance behaviour reduce fear of crime and risk perception?
- y) Does defensive behaviour increase fear of crime and risk perception?

1.3. The Significance of the Research

Despite the fact that criminology and fear of crime are studied in Turkish literature, it can be claimed that both fields of study are still in their early phases when compared to Western research. Furthermore, a number of research have employed quantitative screening techniques devoid of emotional and risk measurement distinctions (Alkan, 2021; Karakus et al, 2010; Karasu, 2018; Uludağ, 2010). Additionally, it can be said that many studies in Türkiye that have contributed to national and international literature do not claim to be representative, however, it is safe to state that the nature of these studies is comparative. (Aytaç et al, 2015; Çardak, 2012; Çetin, 2010; Gaziarifoğlu, 2009; Gökulu, 2011; Kul, 2009; Mıstaçoğlu, 2021; Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017; Öztürk et al, 2016; Taşçı, 2020; Uludağ, 2010). Similarly, the research conducted for this thesis is unable to represent the city as a whole. However, in conjunction with the comparison of the selected neighbourhoods, it will be possible to observe the effectiveness of neighbourhood and economic factors that possibly influence the resident's fear of crime. In addition to this difference, rather than assessing fear of crime with formless fear questions, several indicators were employed, that is, many forms of crime were included by using the Turkish Penal Code. At the same time, risk perception, fear of crime and behavioural reactions to fear were measured simultaneously to increase the likelihood of capturing social reality. When measuring individual's fear of crime, participants were

also asked where and how frequently they felt fear of crime. Using these questions, it was assessed to what extent the fear of crime poses a problem for various socio-demographic categories and which regions are viewed as dangerous. Finally, in this study, the victimisation rates of participants, the confidence in the police force and the comparison of neighbourhoods' fear of crime are presented. Thus, even though a representative sample could not be achieved, it is possible to determine the most prevalent categories of crimes and the impact of the dimensions of crime on various groups and regions.

1.4. Assumptions of the Research

To comprehend the assumptions of this study, which focuses on fear of crime, it is necessary to have a firm grasp of the concept of fear of crime. There is no consensus in the international and domestic literature regarding the conceptual definition and operationalisation of fear of crime. Warr and Stafford (1983) underlined that despite the claims that fear of crime is measured by surveys like the British Crime Survey and the National Crime Survey, which are conducted on a national scale and are still in use, those are actually measures of fear of crime combined with risk perception. The researchers, who noted that even different crimes were not included in these large-scale studies, also discovered through their research that different sorts of crimes generate fear at different scales due to their varying severity and in this regard, they advised using questionnaires to measure fear and risk for various sorts of crimes (Warr & Stafford, 1983). Similarly, Ferraro and LaGrange (1987), who also said that studies were conducted without an agreed conceptual definition in the literature on fear of crime, stated that risk perception is cognitive and emerges with cognition, whereas fear is an emotional response. In this sense, according to them, fear of crime should be defined as "a negative emotional reaction to crime or the symbols associated with crime" (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987). For this reason, in this thesis, fear of crime is discussed within the framework of Ferraro and LaGrange's definition. Emphasizing that fear of crime and perception of risk are not separated in questionnaires such as the British Crime Survey and the National Crime Survey, Ferraro also changed the definition of fear of crime, which he had previously created with LaGrange: "Fear of Crime is defined as an emotional reaction of dread or anxiety to crime or symbols that a person associates with crime." (Ferraro, 1995, p.21-39). Parallel to these perspectives, Hale (1996) asserted that in studies such as the British Crime Survey, which he discussed under the name of formless fear, question patterns

such as "how safe do you feel being out alone in the dark" were insufficient for measuring fear of crime and that the term crime was not mentioned. Therefore, instead of employing a single indication, he emphasised that a questionnaire should be developed using a wide variety of crime kinds. Thus, it can be said that due to their ambiguity, question patterns including only a single crime type generate commentary responses from participants. Without mentioning criminal actions, participants may show feelings of unsafe due to several other reasons such as stray dogs, traffic or illness. As a result, this kind of research's measuring reliability can be questionable.

Even though better measurement methods have been developed, researchers must realise that there is no perfect measurement method. Ferraro and LaGrange (1987) suggested, however, that the phrase "how afraid are you of becoming a victim of (particular crimes) in your everyday life?" should be used in order to reflect the level of fear of crime in daily life. It was also highlighted that the use of the concept of daily life in the question was intended to replicate the participants' routine lives.

Ferraro (1995, p.7-39), who also said that risk perception impacts fear, advised that in addition to the emotional measurement of fear of crime, it is also important to ask participants how likely they are to become victims of particular crimes. Within the framework of these literature recommendations, both emotional and risk perception were measured in the scope of this thesis. Different forms of crime were established using data from the Turkish Statistical Institute (2021) and the researcher's own assessment of significant offences. Thus, in addition to the most convicted crimes in Eskişehir, serious crimes such as sexual assault and homicide were included in the research. For ten distinct sorts of crimes, the participants were asked how much they fear being the victim of these crimes in their daily lives and how likely they are to be victims of these crimes in the next year. Taking into account the Turkish Penal Code, instead of providing the crimes as concepts on the questionnaire form, their broad definitions were included in the questions. The use of criminal law is justified by the fact that criminal behaviour is defined as deviating from the behaviours prescribed by the law in the first place, and the questionnaire is designed in a way that leaves no room for interpretation in this context in order to obtain results that are close to social reality (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.70-71).

In addition to emotional and cognitive measures of fear of crime, participants were asked how often they experienced fear in the past year, where they experienced fear, and

where they were most likely to experience victimisation. In order to prevent the fear of crime from being viewed as a large or insignificant social problem, it has been argued that it is a deficiency in the research that participants are not asked how frequently they experience fear (Gray et al, 2008; Warr, 2000). In addition, not asking in which places the fear or risk is greatest within the fear of crime studies can be considered a deficit in offering foresight for future study and policy. For this reason, the participants were asked where they fear these crimes the most and where they are most likely to become victims.

In the design of the research conducted within the scope of this thesis, several elements influencing the fear of crime were also included in the context of the relevant literature review. In this sense, the vulnerability approach, the victimisation hypothesis, neighbourhood cohesion, participants' perceptions of social and physical incivility in their neighbourhoods, and their confidence in the police were tested as fear-inducing factors.

The vulnerability approach, which is discussed in greater detail in the following sections of the thesis, is concerned with the fact that individuals with different demographic characteristics and who perceive themselves as vulnerable are more fearful, but this approach yields contradictory results when utilising different types of measures (Doran & Burgess, 2012; Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987; Taylor & Hale, 1986). When comparing studies that do not include specific types of crime, such as the British Crime Survey or the National Crime Survey, which measure formless fear in general, to those that include specific types of crime by measuring emotionally and cognitively separately, it was not always possible to verify the hypothesis that elderly and females, who are deemed more vulnerable than young and males, show more fear in general (Ferraro, 1995, p.67-83; Rountree & Land, 1996; Warr, 1984). One critique of the vulnerability approach is about the women's high rate of fear of crime in comparison to men. Accordingly, while the vulnerability approach states that women exhibit high fear even when there is no risk due to their inability to defend themselves physically and financially, the shadow hypothesis developed in opposition to this argument asserts that the factor that causes women to feel high fear is the potential sexual assault crime that lurks behind the crimes that occur in face to face encounters (Ferraro, 1996; Warr, 1984).

The victimisation hypothesis claims that being a victim of a crime in general has a positive effect on the fear of crime. However, when studies that measure formless fear and studies that include specific forms of crime are compared, the victimisation

hypothesis cannot be validated (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.26-27; Ferraro, 1996; Mesch, 2000; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, p.59-69). One of the issues to be considered here is that the impacts of crimes of varying degree and significance are neglected if specific sorts of crimes are omitted. In addition, it has been emphasized in the literature that the effect of being a victim of a crime does not last for a long time and that people can recover psychologically after a certain time (Skogan, 1987; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, p.59-69). Furthermore, Yin (1980) stated that if the crime did not have a significant impact on the victim, victimisation may indirectly have a negative influence on fear through the development of adaptive behaviours. In order to gain insight into ongoing uncertainties and to test these hypotheses in the Eskişehir sample, the participants in this thesis study were asked about their perceptions of their own vulnerabilities, the crime victimisation they have experienced in the past year, and how many times and where they were victimised.

The first of the other two factors reviewed within the framework of the literature that influence fear or risk perception is the social and physical incivilities that individuals perceive in their surroundings, that is, their perceptions of whether or not the place in which they reside is in collapse (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.36). In general, incivilities have been reported as a factor influencing a person's fear of crime, both within formless fear measures and in research that differentiate between emotional and cognitive measures (Borooah & Carcach, 1997; Chadee et al., 2017; Gray et al., 2011; Lane & Meeker, 2003; McCrea et al., 2005; Özascilar, 2013; Pantazis, 2000). Taylor and Hale (1986) argued that the influence of physically observed incivilities on fear is insignificant, however LaGrange and others (1992) stated that social and physical incivilities affect fear via risk perception.

Neighbourhood cohesion or integration is basically about how much control the community has over the individual (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.36). There is a negative association between community cohesion and fear of crime, according to the results of numerous studies in which participants were asked about their communication with their neighbours and whether they belonged to the neighbourhood (Box et al., 1988; Karakus et al., 2010; Rountree & Land, 1996; Scarborough et al., 2010; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, p.80-124). Importantly, no emotional or cognitive measurements were employed in the collection of these research results. Therefore, in this study, it is not possible to be sure that the neighbourhood cohesion factor will have a significant effect on fear of crime.

The final consideration within the framework of this thesis is the relationship between confidence in police force and fear of crime. Based on the literature findings, it can be said that there is no consensus regarding the relationship between trust in police and fear of crime. For instance, data analyses drawn from several studies showed that high confidence in police force has a negative effect on fear of crime (Alda et al., 2017; Box et al., 1988; Jackson et al., 2009), however Gray and others (2011) claimed that there was no significant correlation between trust in police and fear of crime. In addition to these studies, a research investigating the link between trust in police and fear of crime in Türkiye revealed that as trust in police increases, fear of crime declines (Çakar, 2015).

- On average, women experience a greater fear of crime than men.
- Regarding fear of crime, there will be no significant difference between the elderly and the young.
- As the severity of the crimes increases, so will the fear of crime.
- Women fear sexual offences more than males do.
- For crimes that involve face-to-face interaction, women have higher fear of crime rates than men.
- A high-income level is negatively associated with risk perception.
- There is a negative correlation between neighbourhood cohesion and fear of crime.
- There is a negative correlation between neighbourhood cohesion and risk perception.
- There is a positive correlation between neighbourhood incivilities and fear of crime.
- There is a positive correlation between neighbourhood incivilities and risk perception.
- There is negative correlation between confidence in police force and fear of crime.
- There is a negative correlation between confidence in police force and risk perception.
- There is a positive correlation between confidence in police force and neighbourhood cohesion.

- There is a significant and positive relationship between risk perception and fear of crime.
- People who adopted avoidance behaviour show less fear than others.
- People who adopted avoidance behaviour show less risk than others.
- People who adopted defensive behaviour show higher fear than others.

1.5. The Limitations

Although the study conducted for this thesis within the scope of national and international literature can be evaluated as significant and distinctive in terms of research universe and methodology, there are also numerous limitations. Using quota sampling, the research encompasses only two distinct Eskişehir neighbourhoods. This is the greatest limitation. Furthermore, due to the use of quota sampling, it can be concluded that the research cannot be generalised and cannot represent urban and rural areas. The lack of open access to the population and demographic information of the Eskişehir population and the limited resources in terms of time, labour, and finances are the primary factors limiting the research population, sample, and sample selection in this manner. In addition, although access to the statistics of crimes with convictions for the entire city of Eskişehir is available for 2011 and 2020, there is no current version of these statistics for either neighbourhoods or the entire city. This circumstance precludes the possibility of comparing actual crime rates during the selection process of the neighbourhoods. Moreover, the effect of relatively high or low crime rates on fear of crime cannot be examined.

Considering the other limitations that should be mentioned, the self-assessment of health section, which is intended to be used in the vulnerability approach questions, was desired to be added to the research questionnaire. However, according to the findings of the relevant literature, there is no consensus on these questions (Cossman & Rader, 2011; Killias & Clerici, 2000; Rader, Cossman, & Porter, 2012; Ross & Mirowsky, 2001; Toseland, 1982), and the questions implemented within the scope of the pilot study were eliminated from the main study due to the unacceptable alpha result ($\alpha=.47$). In addition, the research encompasses two neighbourhoods, and the officially delineated neighbourhood boundaries were accepted to resolve the concept of neighbourhood. However, it is well-known that the local perceptions of individuals differ from the boundaries established by the legal system (Glas et al, 2019). This case may lead to the

conclusion that the conceptual framework does not match the social reality. The questionnaire questions related to past victimisation experiences represent a further limitation that should be regarded significant. The one-year limitation used in the questions is based on studies indicating that the impact of crime victimisation on fear of crime may diminish over time and even contribute to adaptive behaviours that reduce fear of crime (Skogan, 1987; Yin, 1980). However, given the diversity of crimes and their varying severity, the one-year time limit may neglect the long-lasting traumatic effects of crimes such as attempted murder and sexual assault (Killias, 1990). Additionally, due to the length of the survey questionnaire, the research does not examine the effect of indirect victimisation on fear of crime and risk perception. The size of the sample is a further limitation of the research. Therefore, the total number of required participants for each neighbourhood was 130, or 260 for the two neighbourhoods combined. In addition to equal representation of women and men at this time, it is desired that various age groups be adequately represented in the research. However, due to field conditions comparable to those of the pilot study, it was more difficult than anticipated to recruit older participants. Consequently, their position within the sample could not attain the desired level. To determine the size of the research sample, the minimum sample size was determined using a confidence level of 95 percent and an error margin of 5 percent. However, the required minimum sample size was exceeded to better represent social diversity. Due to the use of the Quota sample and the sample size's emphasis on inter-variable analysis, it cannot be asserted that descriptive data specific to regions have representative characteristic. Nonetheless, it can be asserted that this study can provide data for the city of Eskişehir and serve as a foundation for future research.

The non-parametric tests utilised for data analysis may also have an impact on the data obtained from the field study. Non-parametric tests are utilised when the applied scales do not have a normal distribution, and it is stated that they are less potent than parametric tests (Güriş & Astar, 2015). Therefore, this can be evaluated as another limitation.

The absence of multiple regression analysis is an additional limitation. Considering the dynamics of social life and the fact that multiple scales were applied to the participants of the study, it is important to recognise that the measured variables may have simultaneous effects. Consequently, multivariate non-parametric analyses must be

utilised when examining correlations between variables. However, the researcher's lack of access to python-based software precluded multivariate analysis from being conducted.

The final denominator, which should be evaluated within the limitations, is the inevitable effect of the researcher on the participants. According to Burawoy (1998), who discussed the precautions, reliability, repeatability, and representativeness ideals that the positivist scientific method proposes, social science researchers have never had a solid ground like the positivist framework suggests. Inevitably, the researcher interacts with the research object and is therefore always involved in social constructions on the field. Therefore, it cannot be asserted that the obtained data perfectly represents social reality.

1.6. The Design of the Thesis

Before delving into an in-depth examination of the phenomena of crime and fear of crime, as well as the results of the analysis of the research, it might be beneficial to clarify the general structure of the thesis in order to guide the reader. In an effort to comprehend the fear of crime and the perception of risk, chapter 2 discusses the distinction between deviant behaviour and criminal activity and includes theoretical perspectives, such as functionalist, critical, and symbolic interactionism, that address the causes and effects of criminal phenomena. In Chapter 3, the empirically supported hypotheses and theories considered to influence fear of crime and risk perception are examined. Thus, the origins of the variables analysed, and the starting point of the research conducted for this thesis are presented to the reader. Afterwards, a section on the different approaches in the literature on the operational definition of fear of crime and the conflicting empirical results resulting from these approaches is included. Lastly, the impact of methodological differences on the findings is discussed.

Chapter 4 describes the research methodology employed. Consequently, the primary characteristics of the research, its descriptive and comparative aspects, the process of creating the questionnaire used in the research, and its redesign based on a pilot study are discussed in detail. In addition, Chapter 4 discusses the sampling method used and the reasons why the data collected from the participants were analysed using particular techniques.

The general findings of the study are presented in Chapter 5. Consequently, the data obtained from the participants who were surveyed within the framework of the study were initially expressed descriptively and the sample's fundamental characteristics were

evaluated. In the following pages, the explanations and discussions of the analysis of the relationships between the variables are presented in detail. In the analyses, the results of the research questions and hypotheses that are important within the scope of the research are presented to the reader and a general picture of the relationships between the variables is created. Finally, Chapter 6 contains the discussion, suggestion and conclusion section where the origins, methodology and findings of the research are presented together with the recommendations put forward by the researcher. Discussion and suggestion provide the reader with a general summary of the research as well as suggested research and social policies in this context, whereas conclusion is a section that includes the general research findings and suggestions for future research based on those findings.



CHAPTER 2: DEFINING DEVIANT BEHAVIOUR AND MAJOR CRIME THEORIES

2.1. Deviant Behaviour and Its Relation to Crime

Modern Societies, compared to the traditional ones, have many different social layers and ethnic groups. Therefore, cultural and ideological diversity, which may determine how people see and understand social life, can be seen frequently and lead to a dispute on some concepts and phenomena. Deviance, crime and their impact on its victims are controversial in the same way. So, to understand why certain behaviours are considered crimes and how different segments of society adopt miscellaneous attitudes toward criminal activities, it is essential to include various definitions of deviant behaviour and to explain how such behaviours occur from sociological and psychological perspectives. If a general definition of deviant behaviour is to be given, from both sociological and psychological points of view, it refers to a behaviour that violates the prevailing norms or laws of a group or groups and is, therefore, negatively reacted, that is, sanctioned by a dominant group (Kaplan, 2006; Kristiansen, 2017). As inferred from this definition, not every deviant behaviour can be accepted as a crime defined by law. Therefore, adverse reactions to such behaviours can vary according to the characteristics of society. For instance, in today's modern, heterogeneous and less hierarchical societies, some non-normative actions can be evaluated under the name of cultural diversity, while the severity of the deviancy and by who it is carried out are important variables in determining the extent of possible sanctions (Goode, 2015; Lauderdale, 2017). In this context, deviance is assessed by the audience of the action depending on the balance of power and values in a society. Although the concept of crime has different definitions throughout the history, similar to deviance, the term crime can be defined as an act that violates a society's values, rules and criminal laws that regulate the functioning of a society (Turner, 2006, p.96-97). Furthermore, according to Marshall (1999, p.702-703), for an act to be considered a crime, the act must be noticed by public authorities and the necessary administrative action must be taken.

As a result, the definitions of both deviance and crime differ based on the values and norms of the society, and accordingly, the symbolic or criminal sanctions for such acts can also change. Another important point to be aware of is that not every deviation is a crime, and likewise, not every crime can be identified as deviance in accordance with the conditions and society. For instance, playing a video game during a business meeting

is an example of deviant behaviour, but it is not a crime. Correspondingly, even though a parent who slaps his or her child lightly to discipline the child can be deemed to have physically assaulted a minor by law, in many societies this kind of behaviour is not sanctioned and, in some cases, is approved. In this sense, it may be helpful to include some major crime theories that aim to define crime, understand its nature and describe its effects on its victims in order to eliminate the ongoing ambiguity in the literature.

2.2. Major Crime Theories

Before diving into the major crime theories within the criminology literature, perhaps it would be more beneficial to understand what criminology is. Criminology, which has various definitions, is fundamentally a multidisciplinary scientific field of study that aims to understand the causes and consequences of crime, penal systems and the effects of crime on victims (Akıncı Sokullu, 2020, p.40-43). In this regard, researchers from different fields have put forward numerous theories to understand the nature of deviance and crime. In the pages that follow, to comprehensively understand the effects of crime on its victim, major criminology theories will be argued, respectively.

2.2.1. The roots of criminology: the classical school of criminology and the biological approach

2.2.1.1. *Classical school of criminology*

Although the term was not in use until the late 1800s, Classical Criminology, known as the Classical School of Criminology, takes its name from the classical period and was mainly concerned with criminal law rather than studying the nature of crime and criminals (Williams & McShane, 2018, p.13). Some scholars trace the roots of Classical Criminology, which takes its origins from ethical philosophy to the work of Jeremy Bentham and Cesare Beccaria. However, according to Sherman (2008), Henry Fielding's writings on robbery laid the groundwork for the field. Even though how the discipline of criminology began in terms of history is still a matter of debate, it can be said that two leading names in Classical Criminology, Jeremy Bentham and Cesare Beccaria, pioneered research on theories of crime in the future (Williams & McShane, 2018). According to Bentham, the one of the leading members of this approach, crime emerges with rational choices, in other words, a punishment system that exceeds the rewards and pleasures resulting from criminal activity should be established to prevent people who calculate the benefits and harms of crime from committing crimes (Siegel, 2013, p.102-

104). Similar to Bentham's work on penal system, Beccaria stated that a specific and fixed penal system would be more effective in deterring crime, rather than inhuman sanctions inherited from the Middle-Ages such as arbitrary torture and the death penalty (Jenkins, 1984). Beccaria, who proposed that punishment should be given according to the seriousness of the crime, also emphasized that if the most severe penalty is given to each criminal act, the person who has committed a minor crime is directed towards serious crimes such as murder and rape since the person has nothing to lose (Siegel, 2013, p.102-104). In this sense, even though classical criminology tried to provide an explanation for the emergence of crime by presenting a view that people act rationally while committing crimes, the approach was mainly concerned with the penal system that could be useful for preventing crime. In addition, the understanding of the nonarbitrary penal system brought by Bentham and Beccaria at that time affected the creation of modern criminal law across the continent (Siegel, 2013, p.102-104). However, despite the new perspectives that this approach has theorized, the most fundamental criticism against classical criminology is that, by emphasizing only rational choices, they did not examine the social variables which can lead people to commit crimes (Jenkins, 1984). In summary, Beccaria and Bentham, two leading researchers of Classical Criminology, focused on the criminal law rather than the crime itself. While shaping the fundamentals of criminology, they also successfully contributed to the understanding of the penal codes with new and practical ideas. Having defined what classical criminology is, the following part will briefly discuss the biological approach in criminology, which can also be considered fundamental in the field.

2.2.1.2. Implementation of biology in criminology

Although biological and genetic analysis of criminals can be traced back to the 1750s, Cesare Lombroso's *Criminal Man* can be seen as the groundwork for this approach (Siegel, 2013, p.141-142). According to Lombroso's work in biological criminology, criminals are organic anomalies and to eliminate criminal activities, it is crucial to understand the genetic transmission of criminality, not solving social problems (Ellwood, 1912). For this reason, he studied cadavers to discover the heredity of criminality. Based on the finding of his research, he stated that some people are born criminals and primitive, and strong jaw and teeth structure are among the main indicators of these two qualities (Siegel, 2013, p.141-142). As a result, Lombroso thought to eliminate the existence of

crime by trying to understand the ancestral structure and phenotypic characteristics of criminality through observation and emphasized that people can be criminals due to their inherited features.

Biology and genetic studies in criminology continue today. With Comte's (2019) work *Course of Positive Philosophy*, which describes how to use the positivist scientific method in sociology, biology found a permanent place in criminology (Siegel, 2013). Unlike Lombroso's work, contemporary research studies the effects of genetic and environmental on each other and deviant behaviour (Baker et al, 2010). For instance, Baker and the others (2007), who studied the effects of genetic and environmental factors on the deviant behaviour of twins in their childhood, emphasized that heredity has a significant effect on deviance, and another study, which hypothesized that genetic factors influence anti-social or violent behaviour, suggested that anti-social behaviour and tendency to violence are inherited (Eley et al, 1999). Data from numerous research demonstrate that genetics is an effective influence on aberrant behaviour, which is similar to the findings of Lombroso's study. Contemporary studies, however, do not take inheritance into account as a single, deterministic variable, in contrast to Lombroso's study.

2.2.2. Functionalist approach: anomie and strain theory

The Structural-functionalist approach, commonly known as functionalism, is frequently associated with Talcott Parsons and Robert King Merton's work. However, it has its origins in the work of Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer, and Durkheim who was influenced by Radcliffe-brown and Malinowski's use of the approach in anthropology (Marshall, 1999, p.363-364; Poloma, 2010, p.31-33; Turner, 2006, p.218). Durkheim, who falls under the structural-functionalist spectrum, compared society to a biological organism and asserted that, like each limb attached to a body, each part of a society has a purpose, and within the context of this perspective, the fundamental thesis of functionalism has emerged: It considers society as an entirety composed of structures, and each portion has a function in terms of its interactions with each other and with the whole society (Marshall, 1999, p.363-364; Turner, 2006, p.218). It is also important to note that the term "function" has been defined differently by different theorists of this approach. In his book *Division of Labour in Society*, Durkheim (2020) used the term "function" in the meaning of meeting a need; that is, a function realised in a social process

is not only an action, but a fulfilled need in a broader system in which it is integrated. Furthermore, he also discussed the concept of labour division as means to foster solidarity and cohesion in diverse and specialised social organizations. In this sense, the division of labour is a must for modern societies; it serves as the social adhesive that hold the society together.

2.2.2.1. *Durkheim's theory of anomie*

Durkheim (2020), who evaluated morality and crime, which are the two concepts noteworthy to this thesis, from a functional perspective, such as the division of labour, asserted that morality derives from a shared consciousness and that some moral views remain constant despite the diversity of cultures and societies. In addition, he argued that crime is detrimental to common consciousness and the behaviour defined as a crime is indeed a crime, but not because the action itself is inherently criminal; rather, the action is criminal because it damages the collective consciousness. In a nutshell, the phenomenon of crime arises with the introduction of social norms and the delineation of specific boundaries. In this way, although he asserts that certain moral sentiments are consistent across time and culture, what constitutes a crime may differ from one society to another.

In his work *The Rules of Sociological Method*, Durkheim (2014) noted that while it is normal to engage in criminal activity in every society, and this normality depends on how often crime occurs, crime also plays a functional role in offering new moral foundations and reminding society of its boundaries. Stating that the frequency of crime is also related to the moral standing of a community, he suggested that the crime and suicide rates should be taken into account when assessing the immorality of a society (Durkheim, 2020, p.99-117). Two years later, in his study titled "Suicide," which is more empirical than his previous theoretical work titled "Social Division of Labour" and "Rules of Sociological Method," Durkheim (1986) analysed the suicide statistics in France and parts of Europe and explained in what circumstances suicidal behaviour occurs and how the relationship between the individual and society affects deviant behaviour. In this regard, Durkheim should be considered separately from the Classical School and the biological criminology theories that came before him by analysing the social elements that may be effective in the emergence of deviant behaviour.

In his study “Suicide”, Durkheim (1986) argued that prior to his time, suicide cases were handled on an individual basis, similar to the treatment of deviant or criminal behaviour, and were explained solely by individual-based factors, and that a very personal issue like suicide is essentially social. He first operationalized which cases should be classified as suicide, and then critically analysed biological and psychological studies that try to explain suicide phenomenon. Subsequently, he identified three varieties of suicide, which he labelled egoistic, altruistic and anomic, and asserted that individuals who were unable to integrate with society and who could not meet the common denominator with society tended to commit egoistic suicide. In addressing the role of family, religion, and social life in the realisation of egoistic suicide, he suggested that participation in such groups may have a negative impact on the occurrence of suicide. In this regard, he highlighted that excessive individuation has a positive effect on suicide rates. In the contrary instance, i.e., the altruistic suicide type, he stated that in cases of excessive integration and total acceptance of the rules, the individual can sometimes sacrifice himself. This sort of suicide, according to Durkheim, was more prevalent in homogeneous societies, such as the Vikings and Celts, since suicide was a socially acceptable and valued alternative to old age. In the chapter of anomic suicide type, which is most pertinent to this thesis, he pointed out that some social depressions can have a negative impact on suicide rates because they can serve as unifying and solidarity-creating elements in society. On the other hand, Durkheim, who stated that suicide rates increase in times of economic depression, also maintained that a social depression cannot be considered a suicide trigger on its own. He hypothesised that number of suicides rises in times of disorder that societies experience throughout major transitions, i.e., when there are no laws. Therefore, he termed this condition, in which rules are no longer followed, anomie.

Durkheim’s research is crucial for comprehending the nature of both aberrant and criminal behaviour from. Prior to this study, it was challenging to predict how social circumstances influence the emergence of aberrant and criminal behaviour because both classical and biological criminology viewed criminal and criminal behaviour as pathological to the survival of society.

In providing a distinctive perspective on the study of deviant behaviour, there are also criticisms of Durkheim that have affected future research. In his work *The Division of Labour in Society and Suicide*, the concept of anomie is employed in two distinct

settings. According to DiCristina (2016), Durkheim defines anomie in *The Division of Labour in Society* as the breakdown of the norms governing relations based on the division of labour; in other words, anomie refers to the disintegration of the rules that define the boundaries of interactions. On the other hand, in *Suicide*, anomie refers to the homo duplex structure of the individual, i.e., boundless desires and the control of these impulses. According to Durkheim (1986), these impulses should be constrained by rules so that they do not damage the collective consciousness and in this perspective, anomie is the state in which there are no such limitations or rules are broken. DiCristina claims that these two distinct definitional frameworks are related in Durkheim's writings and that the anomie described in *The Division of Labour in Society* indirectly influences the anomie depicted in the *Suicide*. Consideration should be given to the relationship between the onset of social depression and the collapse of rules that limit the individual throughout this process of loss of regulation of social interactions (DiCristina, 2016).

In addition to employing anomie in two distinct ways, Lehmann (1995) draws attention to a contradiction. Mentioning that Durkheim describes men as socially active and dynamic in the social hierarchy, while he considers women to be in a static and unchanging status, Lehmann states that women are positioned in a passive situation outside the division of labour. In this context, contrary to Lehmann's argument that women should have higher suicide rates due to their incapacity to integrate and remain outside of social integration, Durkheim hypothesised and found that women have low suicide rates. In this sense, according to him, Durkheim's theory contradicts his empirical findings.

2.2.2.2. *Merton's strain theory*

Robert K. Merton, who, like Durkheim, was on the functionalist spectrum, disagreed with the idea that deviance is merely pathological. Even while Merton (1938) emphasised the influence of social variables on deviant behaviour and used the term "anomie" in conjunction with Durkheim's theory, he claimed that deviant behaviour is generated by specific social conditions and not by anomie. In this regard, Merton also rejected the notion that social norms must control the homo-duplex nature of man. In his article, he stated that our social world has culturally established goals and rules that regulate how we accomplish them. In addition, he emphasized that these two aspects are intertwined and that sometimes the normative methods are ineffective in accomplishing

the culturally given aims. Thus, he defined anomie as the ineffectiveness of socially approved means for achieving culturally desired goals.

One of the best illustrations of Merton's definition of anomie is the scenario in which having a decent economic situation is a cultural objective, but individuals lack the necessary resources to achieve it. At this juncture, the individual has difficulty utilising the means given by societal norms to achieve the desired outcome, and in this context, he or she may resort to other actions, which may include deviant behaviour.

Similar to Durkheim, Merton modified the definition of anomie throughout time. According to Featherstone and Deflem (2003), Merton repeatedly revised his 1938 article on anomie, and years later, he defined anomie as a culture's lack of interest in the rules that regulate the means by which goals with significance are achieved. Merton (1968) stated that if winning culturally is the primary objective, it becomes a highly plausible alternative to win by adopting the most effective method, even if it is illegal, as opposed to winning by adhering to the laws. This is intended to generate anomie by separating goals and regulations, allowing for the observation of abnormal behaviour.

Merton (1938) also claimed in his article *Social Structure and Anomie* that in an anomie scenario, individuals tend to engage in five distinct sorts of behaviour. Conformity behaviour indicates acceptance of cultural objectives and methods to them, whereas innovation behaviour indicates acceptance of cultural goals but rejection of ways to them. Ritualism is a condition in which the paths to the objectives are followed, but the goals themselves change, whereas retreatism is a situation in which both the paths to the goals and the goals themselves are rejected. In addition to these four distinct types of conduct, he emphasized the rebellion behaviour, in which cultural goals and the paths leading to them are sometimes rejected and replaced with alternative goals and paths. Merton described retreatism as the least observed behaviour in every sort of community, but conformity is the most observed and vital behaviour for the survival of a society. In addition, he noted that persons who embrace retreatism behaviour are entirely alienated, and finally, in the fifth behaviour type, rebellion, He discussed the transformation of the social structure and the cultural revolution.

The Strain Theory of Robert K. Merton was an examination of American culture, which places a great deal of emphasis on obtaining wealth for the lower and upper classes. However, the lower classes are less likely than the upper classes to accomplish goals such as wealth and success. Because they lack the resources to achieve the objectives.

Therefore, they may deviate from the institutionalised norms. According to Thio (1975), Merton's theory is predicated on the premise that both the upper and lower classes are equally motivated to pursue cultural goals. Moreover, Thio claims that while Merton completely ignored the presence of middle class in his research, and he did not address the upper classes' ability to conceal their deviant behaviour due to their advantages in a society. Another criticism that can be made is that in his Strain Theory, Merton has never examined aberrant behaviours on the axis of gender. In light of these arguments, it can be asserted that Merton's theory cannot be fully applied to the practical world.

2.2.3. Differential association theory and labelling theory under the roof of symbolic interactionism

In attempt to explain criminal behaviour, Edwin Sutherland's theory of Differential Association takes an interactionist approach by addressing the person and the groups with which the individual interacts (Bruinsma, 2014). Similarly, labelling theory refers to the phenomena of aberrant behaviour and crime that occurs through social interaction, arguing that crime is created by those who try to control criminal activity; that is, deviance is not inherent but acquires meaning in the eyes of the action's observers (Muncie, 2010). In this regard, both criminological theories differ from the biological approach, which holds that crime is inherited and inevitably emerges, the classical approach, which asserts that criminal behaviour is the result of rational choice, and the functionalist viewpoint, which examines deviant behaviour through the lens of anomie. Therefore, in order to comprehend Sutherland's Differential Association Theory and Labelling Theory, it is highly beneficial and necessary to refer to the basic theses of the symbolic interactionism approach, which has served as the intellectual basis for both theories.

In the United States, the symbolic interactionist approach originated within the Chicago School. Despite its reputation for empiricist leanings, the Chicago School combined observation and theory into a cohesive whole (Bulmer, 1986, p.1-12). The symbolic interactionist paradigm, on the other hand, asserts that society is formed and exists within the framework of human interactions, as opposed to the sociological forms that emerged in Europe, which dealt with society on a macro scale. Even though Herbert Mead is generally recognised as the founder of the symbolic interactionist approach, the foundation of Mead's work is based on John Dewey's pragmatist studies on self in the

philosophy department of the Chicago School (Turner, 2013, pp.309-311). John Dewey was one of the significant proponents of the pragmatist philosophy, which greatly influenced the social sciences department of the Chicago School. The fundamental principle of Dewey's pragmatism is that truth and value are not inherent, that is, they acquire meaning through human interaction in society (Bulmer, 1986, pp.28-45; Mora, 2013, pp.38-45). Similarly, the symbolic interactionist perspective is founded on the same intellectual foundation. Despite Blumer's assertion that Dewey and Mead should be regarded as the two most influential figures in the establishment of the foundations of symbolic interactionism, according to him, Mead is the approach's primary creator. In addition, Blumer asserted that symbolic interactionism is predicated on the following three fundamental assumptions: People act within the framework of the meanings that objects or people have as a result of social interactions; the process by which these objects or people have meanings is the interaction between the individual and the social environment. Thirdly, and finally, Blumer asserted that people interpret meanings in a continual and dynamic way (Blumer, 1969, p.1-5). In this sense, unlike classical sociology, meanings and values in the social setting cannot be viewed as intrinsically separate from the interaction of individuals. Individuals can influence the social world through their interactions and interpretive processes.

Herbert Mead's book *Mind, Self and Society*, which comprises the fundamental thesis of symbolic interactionism, attempted to shed light on the creation of self-consciousness, the self, and the rational individual from an evolutionary and behaviourist perspective. Although he was influenced by the theory of behaviourism, he separated himself from the general behaviourist spectrum by asserting that behaviour has both externally observable and internally unobservable parts (Mead, 2017). Regarding mind and self-formation processes, he discussed the forms of social communication, gestures, and language, as well as the impacts of these processes on the speaker and the audience. Emphasizing that the social interaction process is an absolute necessity in the process of self-formation, Mead stated that the actor in the process of self-formation is someone who observes himself/herself from the outside through social interaction. Thus, the individual gains self-awareness during the socialisation process, which begins with gestures and evolves to the use of symbolic language. In this process, the individual not only comprehends and interprets meanings and values, but also maintains a dynamic, constant interaction with the social setting. Moreover, although Mead did not directly address

deviance in his writings, he examines the relationship between societal control and the individual as follows: Through social processes, a person gets self-awareness and, consequently, the capacity for self-criticism when he is able to view himself from the outside. At this point, self-criticism can also be seen as a form of social control.

As mentioned, Herbert Mead was extremely influential in laying the foundations and drawing the theoretical framework of this approach, and H. Becker and Edwin Sutherland, who conducted empirical studies on deviance, which is also relevant to this thesis, made substantial contributions to the theoretical and empirical dimension of this approach. In addition, Becker's peer, Erving Goffman, made significant theoretical and empirical contributions to the approach by studying the stigmatisation process and the individual's response to stigma (Denzin, 1992, p.1-22). As a result, the primary tenets of Sutherland's Differential Association Theory, Labelling Theory, and Goffman's concept of stigmatization will be discussed, respectively.

2.2.3.1. The theory of differential association

Edwin Sutherland's Differential Association Theory is an evolving theory that benefits from sociology and psychology disciplines (Bruinsma, 2014). In his book *Principles of Criminology*, in which he presents his theory and the sociological roots of crime, Sutherland (1947, p.69-82) asserted that modern western societies are vastly different from the culturally harmonious, homogeneous societies of the past. According to him, as a result of geographical discoveries, the Enlightenment, and Industrialization, the old homogeneous social communities have been replaced by considerably more complex and diverse cultural organisations surrounding the individual. This situation has resulted in different cultural norms and, consequently, cultural conflicts in the heterogeneous society, and the need for a high level of social control has arisen as a result of the destabilisation of once-powerful authorities such as religion, which provided social control in the past.

Sutherland has linked the emergence of criminal behaviour in modern, heterogeneous societies, in which the traditional institutional authorities that he has outlined have been weakened, to ongoing variety and the cultural conflict environment that this diversity produces. Similar to thinkers such as Durkheim and Merton, Sutherland, who opposed the immanent and pathological diagnosis of criminal behaviour, emphasised that crime is dependent on a multitude of individual and social variables and

that these variables can have simultaneous effects on the emergence of crime (Sutherland, 1972). Sutherland, who considers that the interaction of the individual with the groups surrounding him is crucial to the emergence of criminal behaviour, argued that criminal conduct is also behaviour in its essence and that it should be evaluated in the same manner as any other behaviour (Bruinsma, 2014). In this context, according to his theory, "association" refers to the state of interacting with criminal and non-criminal groups, and "differential" refers to the different values and attitudes that two distinct groups attach to acts of illegal behaviour (Cressey, 1960). In this sense, according to Sutherland, criminal behaviour is learned, particularly through encounters within close group ties. He added that this process of the learning also includes basic or complex techniques based on the nature of criminal activity. A person who interacts with a crime-related cultural environment will be affected by the definitions and understandings of that culture's structure and become involved in crime-related patterns, according to his assertion. In addition, he claimed that interaction with the dominant and prior criminal or non-criminal behaviour in childhood is an effective variable in the emergence of criminal behaviour (Sutherland, 1972). The theory suggests, in a basic sense, that a person can learn criminal behaviour in a culturally conflicted social setting by having regular and effective communication with a group that already has criminal patterns. So, in contrast to the functionalist approach, Sutherland studied social phenomena such as crime through the interactions of individuals within a more micro-framework. This feature of his theory demonstrates his connection to the symbolic interactionist approach.

Sutherland (Sutherland et al, 1992, p.89-92) has developed nine hypotheses that constitute the core of his theory of the learning of criminal activity and the emergence of crime. These are;

1. "Criminal behaviour is learned." In this respect, criminality cannot be considered solely in relation to and as an intrinsic part of the individual, unlike previous assessments of biological and psychological criminology.
2. "Criminal Behaviour is learned in interaction with other persons in a process of communication." Communication can also take place in symbolic language or through gestures.
3. "The principal part of the learning of criminal behaviour occurs within intimate personal groups." The information retrieved from television and newspapers can therefore be deemed relatively ineffective.

4. "When criminal behaviour is learned, learning includes (a) techniques of committing the crime, which are sometimes complicated, sometimes very simple; (b) the specific direction of motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes."
5. "The specific direction of motives and drives is learned from definitions of legal codes as favourable or unfavourable." This argument asserts that the extent to which obeying the rules and engaging in criminal activity are respected and accepted as normal in an individual's immediate surroundings influences the emergence of criminal behaviour.
6. "A person becomes delinquent because of an excess definitions favorable to violation of law over definitions of unfavorable to violation of law." This assumption is fundamental to differential association theory. Sutherland asserted that a person will eventually be absorbed by the surrounding culture. He also claimed that the primary causes of crime are the individual's interaction with the criminal structure and his failure to connect with groups that avoid criminal behaviour.
7. "Differential Associations may vary in frequency, duration, priority and intensity."
8. "The process of learning criminal behaviour by association with criminal and anti-criminal patterns involves all of the mechanisms that are involved in other learning."
9. "While criminal behaviour is an expression of general needs and values, it is not explained by general needs and values since anti-criminal behaviour is an expression of the same need and values."

Sutherland's thesis differs from studies that evaluate the emergence of criminal behaviour on a macroscale or pathologically, as well as studies that focus solely on the lower classes' deviant behaviours. As can be seen, however, 9 different propositions were presented very briefly, and conflicting opinions were formed on their empirical testability. For instance, De Fleur and Quinney (1966) adapted the Differential Association Theory to set theory and articulated Sutherland's propositions mathematically. Because Sutherland's theory has a high level of abstraction, it is unlikely that it can be empirically tested, according to the researchers, who highlighted that the first six assertions represent the theory's primary arguments. Matsueda (1982), who re-

examined a data set used as empirical data for the differential association theory, stated that the theory has not yet been experimentally proven but defended the notion that it is applicable to conduct a field research.

The extent to which the Differential Association Theory is empirically useful is debatable. Regarding this case, Tittle et al. (1986) emphasized that this theory's lack of conceptual and operational definitions compels researchers to develop their own conceptual and operational definitions. According to them, this circumstance produces inconsistency and ambiguity between the empirically gathered data and the theory. To establish some boundaries on Sutherland's theory and update the theoretical modelling, researchers have confirmed that different definitions of criminal behaviour and learning have an effect on criminal behaviour in the field study they conducted on the theory. Nonetheless, the theory fails to adequately explain the emergence of criminal behaviour, which is consistent with the findings of prior findings.

In conclusion, although Sutherland has proposed a highly original criminological theory, the theory's empirical testability has decreased and become uncertain because he did not sufficiently detail the propositions he wrote about the emergence of criminal behaviour and did not adequately establish some theoretical boundaries. In addition to the critiques of empirical testability, it can be argued that Sutherland's theory is insufficient to explain the tendency of the upper and middle classes to commit crime, despite his claim that crime occurs in every socioeconomic class. Moreover, it has been stated that heterogeneous social structure and cultural conflicts are major theoretical variables, but it is known that criminal conduct is also existent in societies that are homogeneous and more harmonious than those of today (Akıncı Sokullu, 2020, p.210-212). Therefore, it may be asserted that the theoretical explanation of the roots of crime and how criminal behaviour originates from different social levels is insufficient.

Apart from the criticism, Merton (1997) considered Sutherland's theory and his own anomie theory as complimentary. According to him, Sutherland emphasised learning and asserted that criminal behaviour emerged as a result of socialisation and socio-cultural transitions; nevertheless, this does not explain the emergence of the first criminal behaviour. Indicating that there is a synthesis of both theories, he claimed that the sub-cultural diversity approach, which will be detailed in the following pages of this thesis, combines the missing denominators in Sutherland's differential association and his anomie theory.

2.2.3.2. Labelling theory

The labelling theory approach states that deviant behaviour emerges in the eyes of those attempting to control it, as opposed to the belief that deviance is inherent in the behaviour itself (Muncie, 2010). In other words, under the symbolic interactionist perspective, labelling theory suggests that the individual constantly views himself/herself through the eyes of another as a result of the interactions he/she encounters on a daily basis, and thus the self is in a continuous and dynamic state. In this sense, aberrant behaviour is only interpreted as such by the audience and the individual observing himself/herself through the audience's eyes (Burke, 2009, p.159-166). Therefore, under the framework of labelling theory, a behaviour cannot be labelled as deviant or criminal without consideration of the cultural context in which it occurs. This view also differentiates labelling theory from classical, biological, and functionalist perspectives. Because behaviours cannot be categorized as normative or non-normative, assuming a moral environment that cannot be shaken.

Since the labelling theory states that the definition of deviance and the labelling of deviant behaviour must be viewed through the eyes of the audience, what constitutes a crime or deviance and who can be labelled as such are contingent upon potency, and authority. Consequently, social class and status in social dynamics are two crucial elements for characterising aberrant behaviour. The existence of a social interaction environment in which the powerful can be shielded from labelling and their deviant activities can be ignored is a point that cannot be disregarded in the context of this theory's fundamental thesis.

Edwin Lemert and David Matza are the pioneers of labelling theory, which is based on the Chicago School and the symbolic interactionist perspective. However, it was Howard Becker who provided empirical support for the symbolic interactionist theoretical framework and served as the theory's central figure (Williams & McShane, 2018, p.92-94). For this reason, it will be beneficial to review briefly the contributions of Lemert and Becker to the construction of the labelling theory in terms of grasping the theory's fundamental ideas. In addition, although it is not assessed under the umbrella of labelling theory, addressing Goffman's concept of stigmatisation and the individual's reactions to stigmatisation would aid in comprehending the behaviour patterns of those who have been labelled as deviant or other.

Edwin Lemert is one of the earliest proponents of the labelling theory, which emphasises the reaction to the behaviour rather than the crime or the criminal. Lemert went beyond the reaction to the event by examining the individual's reaction to the societal response (F. P. Williams & McShane, 2018). In his work on Social Pathology and Human Deviance, Social Problems, and Social Control, he developed the concepts of primary and secondary deviance in this context (Beirne & Messerschmidt, 2011, p.152-153). Lemert drew attention to the fact that primary deviant behaviour is typically unplanned and not centred by the individual labelled as deviant. He emphasised that the behaviour he terms primary deviance can occur because of a variety of factors, such as sociocultural or psychological (Burke, 2009, p.141-142). In other words, the individual who commits the primary deviant act does not yet consider his or her identity to be completely deviant. Secondary deviant conduct, on the other hand, is generated by the labels given to the activity of the individual who committed the primary deviant behaviour; as a result of social reaction, the individual may be labelled as other, sick, or insane and excluded from the social plane (Beirne & Messerschmidt, 2011, p.152-153). This condition may force the individual to construct his personality and lifestyle inside the framework of the deviant labels he has been given. By accepting the role of the deviant, the individual can continue to engage in similar conduct (Burke, 2009; F. P. Williams & McShane, 2018). According to Muncie (2010), Lemert outlined an additional requirement for observing a secondary deviation. This requirement is the formal response to the first act of deviance. If this response is not provided, the secondary deviation may be unlikely to occur. In this respect, Lemert's theory on deviant behaviour implies that deviance is formed by social reaction and persists after it is produced, entwining the individual's identity. Therefore, deviant behaviour cannot be defined by focusing solely on the behaviour or the individual, in the absence of an audience and a respondent.

The Outsiders by Howard Becker represents the core of labelling theory. Becker (2019) defined the outsider as a person who does not comply with social standards and lives outside of these norms in his work, which provides empirical evidence for the theoretical framework of labelling. However, this definition emerges naturally from the perspective of the audience. Becker also argued that this label is created in accordance with societal norms and the seriousness of the deviant conduct, noting that the outsider can also identify as outsiders those who attempt to impose rules on him or her.

In modern cultures, individuals live in multiple sub-groups and perform certain roles within each group. Becker, who had a similar approach, claimed that deviant is a label given to behaviour that violates the norms, but he also stated that the question of which group established the rules is as crucial. Consequently, similar to the fundamental premise of labelling theory, the origin of the deviant label may not be fully understood without a comprehension of the power dynamics of society. Becker claimed in his work *Outsiders* that there was no inherent deviance in the act itself and that the establishment of norms was a matter of economic and political power. He also stated that deviance emerged after the rules were established.

In his research, Becker (2019) also identified various forms of deviant labels. Accordingly, he asserted that some individuals were falsely accused, while others persisted as secret deviants. The term secret deviant refers to a condition in which the deviant behaviour goes unnoticed. In addition to those two categories, there are also conforming and pure deviant concepts.

Similar to Sutherland's theory of Differential Association, Becker noted that a nondeviant person might learn deviant behaviour through interactions with people labelled as deviants and he also argued that a person who has been stigmatised as deviant may join subcultural group in which patterns of aberrant conduct are considered normal. In addition, he argued that stigmatisation as a deviant is accompanied by a process of social isolation, which is a significant factor in the formation of deviant subcultural groups and this process of social exclusion and isolation may result in deviation being a permanent and prolonged profession.

In line with Becker's theory that social exclusion causes deviance to become long-term, the findings of Schwartz and Skolnick's (1962) study indicate that even if an individual is innocent and has a letter from the court proving his innocence, being associated with a crime in the past and labelling it in this manner reduces job opportunities. This scenario deprives the individual of the required opportunities and the chance to be a functional member of society. Therefore, the label itself can be regarded as the causation of deviance. Another study that supports Becker's theory examined the effect of public labelling on deviant conduct and showed that both public labelling and cumulative sanctions increased deviant behaviours (Farrington, 1977).

Goffman, who did not wish to be mentioned within the frameworks of labelling theory and symbolic interactionism, examined the effects of stigma on the individual in

his book *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* and presented results similar to those drawn by Howard Becker (Goffman, 2020). According to Goffman, who defined stigma as a concept that entirely discredits the individual, stigma is an interaction and conflict between how the individual perceives himself and the stereotype established by others who observe the individual from the outside.

In his work, Goffman identifies three distinct categories of stigma: stigmas that refer to physical distinctions, stigmas that include elements such as ethnicity, nation, and religion, and stigmas that encompass characteristics such as deviant and unnatural. Regarding the process of understanding the stigma on the individual, he stated that stigmatisation may be noted if the individual believes he is not accepted and is perceived as inferior by the audience. Goffman also analysed in his work how an individual reacts to stigma, noting that a stigmatised person may withdraw into social groups that accept him as normal or attempt to impose himself by engaging in a social conflict against stigma. In this sense, Goffman's theory of withdrawal from the social sphere can also be interpreted as similar to Becker's analysis of joining subcultural groups and perpetuating deviance.

Goffman (2020, p.197-205), who wrote a separate chapter on the issue of deviance at the end of his work, defined the notion of deviant persons as those who breach the norms and do not demonstrate conformity in a community of individuals who adhere to social norms. So according to this definition, without the process of making sense of and interpreting the action by the audience, the action itself has no intrinsic meaning. Goffman further argued that the perpetrator of the deviant act would receive a reaction based on his social position and emphasised that upper-class individuals and leaders in homogeneous organisations might not receive a reaction to their deviant behaviour.

As a result, labelling theory, which derives from the symbolic interactionist perspective, accepts social interaction as its primary framework and focuses on the existence of the audience in the definition of deviant behaviours and how rules are formed and implemented. Furthermore, this theory highlights that labelling, which is a social response to deviant behaviour, may cause deviant behaviour to become permanent and more frequent over time. This emphasis is also highly pertinent to the question of who determines the rules and who controls the authority. Labelling theory, although concerned with who sets the rules and why, has been criticised from a Marxist perspective. The Marxist approach, which emphasises that we are in a class-based social organisation,

argues that the social reactions to individuals belonging to different classes will be on different scales, and that the labelling theory does not adequately examine the structural power balances in the formation of rules (Manders, 1975).

2.2.4. Subculture theories

To understand the theories formed within the framework of the concept of subculture in the field of criminology, it will be highly useful to provide a general theoretical overview of the concepts of culture and subculture.

Although it is vital to understand what the concept of culture implies in order to comprehend what the concept of subculture expresses, the concept of culture has various definitions. Culture is, in general, a pattern of values, practices, attitudes, and beliefs that influences how societies address daily problems and how they will approach similar challenges in the future. It sets the appropriate behaviours in a community and the values assigned to objects (Brake, 2013, p.3-12). Although the notion of subculture has been described differently by various intellectuals and academics, it can be characterised generally as the way in which distinct groups interpret social reality, particularly within heterogeneous social organisations. The subculture that exists within the dominant culture may adopt most of the normative norms, but it may also have values and behavioural patterns that are distinct from those of the prevailing culture (Williams, 2011, p.5-13). In a different sense, "subculture" is a relatively small denominator in a cultural spectrum that encompasses the entire nation and is influenced by elements such as class, status, ethnicity, and religion and can also be thought of as a child's small environment during the socialisation process (Gordon, 1997). In this regard, contrary to the views of certain criminology scholars, subculture should not always be associated with elements such as deviance and crime. The subculture, which defines how to engage with the social world, need not accept values and standards that are completely contradictory to those of the dominant culture. For this reason, according to Williams (2011), in order to characterise the concept of subculture, it is required to study the subculture's interaction with the dominant culture. Because, by definition, a subculture can only exist and function within the context of its relationship with the prevailing culture.

It was suggested that subcultures should be addressed within the context of their relationship with the dominant national culture. However, it is also necessary to explain how and why culture and subculture emerged in the first place. According to Albert

Cohen, whose work on subcultures has earned him a prominent place in criminology, every action reflects a solution to a problem; thus, in order to comprehend the action, one must examine the problem. The individual's cultural value system and its link to the situation he is in generate problems. In this sense, the current situation imposes limitations on what is feasible, and these boundaries include aspects such as available resources, normative procedures for achieving goals, and the physical environment. Within this constraint, the meaning of the problem, surroundings, and behaviour is defined by the individual's values. In summary, it may be stated that cultural structuring emerges reflexively within the context of the interaction between societal problems and responses to them. So, in this context, for a subculture to be defined as distinct from the dominant culture, it must have altered values, understandings, and approaches to resolving issues. Concerning the origin of this change, the emergence of different values and actions for the formation of a subculture was examined from the perspectives of hegemony and ideology, and some scholars stated that the working class developed different values and action forms to cope with the ongoing problems in capitalist societies resulting from the class conflict. Thus, this process resulted in the formation of subcultures (Clarke et al, 1997). Cohen (1997), adopting a similar theoretical stance, asserted that individuals experience status frustration in social life and construct new cultural solutions to this frustration due to the absence of socially acceptable alternatives. He also claimed that subcultural groups are established by interactions between individuals and classes. As an illustration, he argued that in the case of assimilation by whites, native Americans undergo a status crisis and find themselves in the lowest strata of the social structure; hence, this group reacts collectively by drawing closer to one another through individual responses. According to him, this circumstance has given rise to a subculture. This definition by Albert Cohen can also be interpreted as closely resembling Merton's Strain Theory, which has been covered in the preceding pages of this thesis.

Unlike theories focusing on class structure, there are also theories centred on urbanisation and heterogeneity, and these theories portray the formation of huge communes as the origin of subcultural formations. However, concerning this approach, the question can be asked whether there are no subcultural groups among the structures that are relatively more homogeneous than today (Brake, 2013, p.3-12).

It has been stated that subculture cannot be defined by always deviant or criminal behaviour patterns. In the field of criminology, however, subculture theory is sometimes

referred to as delinquency. Subcultural criminology approaches are related to the crimes committed by adolescent boys belonging to the working lower classes, and the core thesis of subcultural criminology is that the perpetrator's deviant behaviour is influenced by the group or gang with which he is affiliated. Even when an individual behaves independently, the effect of the subcultural group to which he belongs remains active on his behaviour (Shoemaker, 2010, p.141-151). Influenced by Edwin Sutherland's Differential Association Theory and Merton's Strain Theory, criminologists were interested in the cultural context of delinquent crimes committed by male adolescents. Albert K. Cohen, Richard A. Cloward, Lloyd E. Ohlin, and David Matza are famous scholars of this approach. In this regard, Albert Cohen's subcultural approach, the Delinquency and Opportunity Theory of Cloward and Ohlin, and Matza's contributions to this paradigm will be discussed briefly.

Albert Cohen's *Delinquent Boys*, which is considered within the context of subculture studies, shares similarities with Merton's Strain Theory and Sutherland's Theory of Differential Association. In his work, Cohen researched adolescent deviant groups—gangs and analysed the crime committed by these groups in the cultural framework of American culture. While Cohen acknowledged that crime is not perpetrated only by young men from working lower classes, he also claimed that the limited resources of the lower classes prevented the children of the lower classes from attaining the middle-class values that dominate American culture (Tierney, 2009, p.137-139). Mentioning that there is a distinction between the cultural structure of the lower classes and that of the middle and upper classes, he asserted that the children of the lower classes acquire spontaneous and aggressive attitudes during the socialisation process, focus on the present, and are not accustomed to thinking in the long term. In contrast to the lower classes, he argued, the dominant values in the social structure and school system of the middle class include long-term planning, the functionality of obeying authority, and the differentiation between good and evil (Shoemaker, 2010, p.141-151). Focusing especially on the school period of youth, Cohen noted that the children from the lower-class experience status frustration when they realise that the people belong to the lower strata is doomed to lose their status in American society. According to him, the experience of this status frustration generates delinquency through the reaction formation process; in other words, this frustration causes a violent rejection of once-accepted dominant norms by lower-class youth through the formation of groups and gangs (Hallsworth & Young,

2010). At this point, it is essential to know the definition of reaction formation to understand Cohen's theory. Reaction formation, "in psychoanalytic theory, is a defence mechanism in which unacceptable or threatening unconscious impulses are denied and are replaced in consciousness with their opposite (VandenBos, 2007)." This concept, coined by Sigmund Freud, describes a situation in Cohen's theory in which the previously desired purpose is strongly rejected (Tierney, 2009). In this sense, Cohen argued that lower-class children, who first internalise the ideals and aspirations of the middle class, recognise that they cannot reach the socially declared goals due to persistent class deficiencies and differentiations in the socialisation process. According to him, this circumstance causes status frustration on individuals and initiates the process of reaction formation. In other words, a scenario arises in which values and objectives of the middle class are aggressively abandoned. At this point, the anger and antagonism towards the school, which is a reflection of middle-class ideals, might transform into grouping and ganging as a result of the interaction of the marginalised and lonely lower-class youngsters with their peers (Shoemaker, 2010, p.141-151). Consequently, a new subculture group, which can be formed through the process of grouping or ganging up, can create new goals and status gains as a result of achieving these objectives by valuing its spontaneous, hedonistic, and deviant behaviour patterns; and thus, a subculture can serve as a means for individuals to cope with status frustration (Hallsworth & Young, 2010; Tierney, 2009, p.137-139). Cohen also stated that participation in subcultural groups or gangs is not just a means of coping with status frustration, but also a component of the process of developing a new self (Cohen & Short, 1958). Cohen concluded that children from the labouring lower classes fail in a school system that reflects and imposes the values and aspirations of the middle class due to their natal social conditions and social class structure. In addition, it has been emphasised that children initially acquire middle-class beliefs but lose status and self-respect as a result of their inevitable failures. Therefore, adolescents in this circumstance attempt to overcome it by forming a subculture through grouping and ganging within the context of their interactions with their peers. Subculture groups, which have become hostile to middle-class values and aims as a result of the reaction formation process, have the purpose of giving their members a new status and identity with their new values and goals, which the dominant culture describes as deviant or delinquent. In this theoretical framework, it can be interpreted that Cohen was influenced by Merton's anomie and strain concepts and

Sutherland's theory, which stressed the value of interaction and learning processes on adopting deviant patterns.

Before discussing the criticisms of Albert Cohen's theory, it would be beneficial to note that Cohen also offered an explanation for the deviant or criminal behaviour of women. Accordingly, women are subject to gender-based double standards, and similar to young males, this circumstance causes status frustration by preventing them from meeting certain success standards and societal aspirations. Similarly, women become involved in sexually motivated crimes by adopting the behaviour of joining subcultural organisations, which was originally the reaction of young men, and by resolving their previous status frustration with new status positions and purposes within these subcultural groups (Williams & McShane, 2018, p.77-80). Although he explained the criminal or deviant behaviour of women parallel with the theory he originally developed for young men, Cohen's thesis provides essentially little further information on the deviant behaviour of women. Another significant critique is that women's participation in subcultural delinquent organisations was evaluated mainly on the basis of their involvement in sexual crimes.

The extent to which a theory can clarify questions when applied to the real world is also essential to the theory's utility and significance. In this way, Cohen's theory has been empirically examined in a number of research. According to Reiss and Rhodes (1963), Cohen's thesis emphasised that low-class adolescents suffer from comparatively high-status deprivation. Therefore, they administered a questionnaire to pupils from each socioeconomic class in forty-one schools. The findings of the study showed that 70% of students compare what they have to what their peers have, while only 18% suffer from status deprivation. In addition, the findings revealed that status deprivation is not exclusive to the lower classes, and no significant correlation was discovered between status deprivation and delinquent behaviour. On the other hand, Liazos (1978) emphasised that children from working-class families are seen as socially dangerous and doomed to failure, and hence society has a role in pushing youngsters into deviant subculture groups. In addition, he stated that while he discovered similar percentages of deviant or delinquent behaviour among middle-class and lower-class adolescents, lower-class youth suffered a significant deal of stigma and social rejection. Consequently, in the absence of a school system that integrates students from diverse cultural and

socioeconomic backgrounds, schools might contribute to the growth of deviance and crime rather than countering them.

In a different study that is critical of Cohen's theory, Jarjoura (1993) examined the data obtained from nationwide longitudinal measurements. According to this study, there is no direct cause-and-effect relationship between dropping out of school and engaging in criminal activity; rather, the occurrence of both phenomena has been interpreted as dependent on multiple variables. For instance, young people who dropped out of school due to dislike of school, expulsion, or unclear reasons had high levels of delinquency regardless of the type of crime. In contrast, the rate of engagement in crime or deviant behaviour did not change between those who dropped out of school for familial reasons and those who graduated. In a similar vein, Krohn et al. (1980) concluded that the assumption that high class status minimises deviant conduct or that there is a high level of deviant behaviour in lower classes could not be verified by scientific evidence. Due to the numerous variables in the real world, although Cohen's research of subculture explains some instances, it is not a complete and undeniably well-established theory.

In addition to Albert Cohen, Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin have made the most significant contributions to criminological subculture theory. Similar to Albert Cohen, they were highly influenced by Merton's Strain theory. They stated that both illegal and legal means are available to individuals for achieving culturally set goals within the social organisation and that the lower classes can have recourse to illegal means due to a lack of resources (Williams & McShane, 2018, p.81-83). In this respect, researchers highlighting that social and physical resources are not distributed equally across classes adopted Cohen's concept of status frustration and asserted that this scenario could have a significant impact on the propensity of lower-class youth to engage in delinquent behaviour (Adler, 2013, p.142-143). Cloward and Ohlin, in their studies of subculture, attempted to overcome the weaknesses they identified in Cohen's theory and better adapt it to the real world, despite the fact that their theories had very similar forms and common concepts to Cohen's.

Cloward and Ohlin (1960, p.1-30) asserted that at the beginning of their study, Delinquency and opportunity, they were particularly interested in answering two questions. Their first question is why criminal norms develop, and their second question focuses on the distinguishing characteristics of different criminal norm systems. Emphasizing that the cultural and social denominator of crime has not been adequately

examined in the theoretical studies developed before the subculture theory, and therefore there is an ongoing uncertainty in the literature, the authors have placed delinquent acts at the centre of their research. According to them, a delinquent act is a behaviour that violates social norms, the law, and evokes an official response.

According to Cloward and Ohlin (1960, p.1-30), every culture instructs its members on how to interpret the world around them and what actions to take, and subculture is no different in this regard. So, it can be stated that a subculture, which is tied to the social macro scale and has different meanings and value planes, imposes different types of activity and, thus, diverse duties on its members. In this context, even though there are different sorts of delinquent subcultures, a subculture can provide its members with patterns of behaviours, roles and meanings that the legal system considers criminal. According to them, displaying such actions also grants status and prestige within the context of subculture and enables young individuals to join adult criminal groups and rise in the criminal world in the future. The subculture may require each participant to do a delinquent act in accordance with its principles and the new behaviour patterns it imposes on its members; refusal to comply can result in exclusion from the subculture, analogous to rejection from the dominant culture (Cloward & Ohlin, 1960). Thus, the acts and norms of criminal subcultures can be examined in confrontation and opposition to the mainstream section of society's recognised culture. In contrast, Cloward and Ohlin stated that not all deviant behaviour should be interpreted as a rebellion against societal authority and regulations, unless the action is supported by the norms and values of the delinquent subculture.

In the second section of their paper, the Cloward and Ohlin (1960, p.31-46) explain that they do not view offenders as oblivious to societal norms, ill, or primitive. In contrast, they underlined that individuals, the majority of whom engage in deviant or criminal activity, can discriminate between right and wrong, are impacted by social norms, and can make sacrifices for the surrounding community under particular rules. Similarly, in subcultural groups, it was asserted that a person is able to delay his own goals and pleasures for the good of the collective. From this point of view, they did not characterise a deviant who is fully outside the social plane and has no ties to the rules. This description is also distinct from the subculture group features described by Cohen's theory.

Cloward and Ohlin, who produced theoretical answers about participation in subcultural groups, were influenced by Merton's Strain Theory as stated earlier in this thesis. In addition, researchers also adopted Sutherland's interactionist social learning perspective and rejected Cohen's view that school failure is the deciding variable on delinquent behaviour. moreover, they noted that the behaviour of emulating middle-class values, as Albert Cohen has discussed, is not equally prevalent among all lower-class youth and families. These two perspectives are two of the three key distinctions between their theory and the work of Albert Cohen.

Inspired by Sutherland's Theory of Differential Association, Cloward and Ohlin hypothesised that lower-class adolescents could acquire criminal or deviant behaviour through association with older individuals (Williams & McShane, 2018, 81-83). In this sense, even though their theory of subculture differs from Cohen's study again, one of the major differences is not their similar stance to Sutherland.

According to Cloward and Ohlin's (1960, p.1-30) Delinquency and opportunity, there are three subculture groupings, and the first one, criminal subculture derives income through components such as theft and extortion and aims to remain concealed. Secondly, the conflict subculture enables status promotion through the use of violence, and this conduct pattern exhibited by members of a gang on streets to boost up reputation. Lastly, the retreatist subculture, that is, a type of gang structure in which drug use is normalised. In addition to the different cultural internal schema and dynamics of each group type, the common element in each group is that they all adopted other rules that violated the dominant cultural norms. However, retreatist subculture refers to young people who, unlike the other two groups, have failed in both legal and illegal means and, as a result, have lost their status in both domains. This group focuses on drug usage and trafficking, and violence is rarely viewed as a status symbol (Williams & McShane, 2018, p.81-83).

The question of Cloward and Ohlin's theory's application to the empirical world is crucial for a theory to be regarded as solid and scientific. As mentioned before, Cloward and Ohlin's theory states that both illegal and legal means are available to individuals for achieving culturally set goals within the social organisation and that the lower classes can have recourse to illegal means due to a lack of resources. Exploring this assertion, Short and others (1965) have analysed the legal and illegal opportunities of lower- and upper-class children, as well as the disparities between black and white lower-class children and middle-class children of both races. According to the research findings, regardless of

whatever group they belong to, children have a positive attitude toward jobs and education that are superior to their father's. However, it has been found that children with gang members have a far more favourable attitude towards deviant behaviour patterns than children without gang members. In another study, Hagedorn (1994) conducted a research on drug addicts, reminding the assertion of Cloward and Ohlin that people who have joined subcultural organisations are nevertheless tied to the cultural values and standards of the majority of society. Drug dealing was described by the research participants as an occasional job, and it was also emphasized that people who do this job also perform other jobs that are considered normal in the market, simultaneously or in different time periods. Moreover, this study on male gang members in drug trafficking reveals that, despite their huge incomes, the majority of drug dealers value average jobs and stable salaries more. In light of these data, Cohen's claim that subculture norms entirely diverge from the dominant and that individuals' values become in opposition to the dominant culture is disproved. Therefore, it can be concluded that members of subcultural groups occasionally feel a sense of belonging to the recognised values and norms of society. In Warr's study, which can be viewed as a critique of the claim that subcultural groups have their own norms and organisational structures, national-scale survey data were analysed, and it was discovered that criminals usually commit a small number of crimes with a partner and the gangs they join are quite short-lived (Warr, 1996). According to Warr, the ephemeral nature of gangs and the tiny number of co-conspirators are significant impediments to developing a value and norm structure for these subcultural groupings. He also suggested that these groups should be classified as near-groups. In summary, it can be stated that the evidence from several studies partially supported Cloward and Ohlin's theoretical scheme and revealed the absences of key components in Albert Cohen's subcultural theory.

Matza and Sykes are two additional scholars who critiqued Albert Cohen's study on subculture and conducted research to eradicate its persisting flaws and uncertainties. They disagreed with the views of Albert Cohen, who used the concept of reaction formation and portrayed the link between subculture and dominant culture as being in direct contrast. Accordingly, Matza and Sykes (1961) investigated the subculture spectrum's values and meanings that underpin criminal behaviour and concluded that the subculture is not wholly alien and distinct from the prevailing culture. Because, according to them, violence and easy money are occasionally glorified among socially accepted

values. Adding the inclination toward masculinity and violence to these exaltations, the researchers asserted that the subculture accepts some components of these values, therefore it cannot be evaluated in total isolation from or in opposition to the societal context. A member of a subcultural group who has committed a crime should not feel shame or remorse if there were an obvious distinction between dominant culture and subculture (Sykes & Matza, 1957). However, the researchers, who stated that feeling guilty and anger over their actions are quite common emotional situations for those who commit crimes, also expressed that youngsters who have joined subcultural groups show a good attitude, respect, and emulation for the heroes or influential persons on the social hierarchy. These findings can be interpreted to imply that a subculture group cannot be evaluated without the cultural denominator it belongs to, as well as that there cannot be a subculture that is completely disconnected from the dominant culture and that has values that are fundamentally opposed to traditional ones.

In their 1957 article titled *Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency*, the authors noted that adolescents are members of multiple groups at the same time and play multiple roles within the home, religion, school, and/or subcultural group (Sykes & Matza, 1957). In addition, Sykes and Matza, who stated that criminals frequently exhibit behaviours such as avoiding responsibility in their defence, claiming that no one was harmed as a result of the action, and sometimes admitting guilt, presented these defensive behaviours as evidence that delinquent individuals do recognise and accept the authority against their criminal actions. Therefore, the attitudes acquired as a defence strategy following the commission of a crime may imply the acceptance of some cultural aspects, if not a total submission to the dominant culture. Furthermore, in today's societies or in social organisations quite similar to today's societies, the dynamic inclusion of an individual in different groups and performing certain roles may falsify the image of an individual as acting only with the values and norms of a subcultural group.

In addition to the objections of the subculture theory, it is necessary to note that, according to Nwalozie (2015), there are relatively few studies on women's engagement in delinquent groups and their potential to be members of subculture. In addition, she also claimed that the subculture approach is centred on American society, with disparities based on class inquiry and ethnic distinctions. Therefore, subcultural theories fail to adequately explain deviant or delinquent behaviour in other countries or culturally homogeneous settings.

2.2.5. Conflict theory

Conflict theory is derived from Marxist theory and theories that have adopted the Marxist thought tradition, and radical criminology is the approach that applied Marxism to criminology (DeKeserdy, 2011, p.1-21). Therefore, in order to comprehend the criminological conflict theory, it is essential to examine briefly how the theoretical concepts and discoveries within the spectrum of Marxist theory define social control and assess institutionalised law, security, and similar institutions against crime at the social level. Under this viewpoint, in this section, the primary arguments of Marxism and the inferences of the Marxist school of thought on social control will be explored first, followed by brief a discussion of the radical, pluralist, and left-realist approaches within the spectrum of Conflict Theory.

Conflict criminology takes its foundation from Karl Marx's theoretical works and, later, those of Lewis Coser and R. Dahrendorf, who contributed to the conflict approach. For this reason, to understand how different theorists consider crime in the context of class, power, and authority, it will be beneficial to first discuss how Marx described the relationship between classes in his studies of capitalist societies and then briefly describe Lewis Coser and Ralf Dahrendorf's contributions to the approach.

In his work, Karl Marx did not conduct a criminological investigation by concentrating on the phenomenon of crime. However, his theory focuses on the emergence of the social order, its power structures, and the link between capital and power (Farganis, 2014, 29-31). Marx, therefore, laid the groundwork for future interpretations and investigations of what constitutes normal, aberrant, or criminal behaviour on a legal or social level. Taking his conceptual origins from Hegel and nourished by his dialectical philosophy, Marx used a materialist approach instead of Hegel's idealist dialectic. In short, Marx argued that mind is formed in a social environment through actions and activities, in opposition to the Hegelian idea that the mind exists naturally. In this regard, he noted that poverty and oppression are two major obstacles for individuals to reach their potential (Jessop, 2008). Regarding these obstacles, it can be stated that poverty and oppression are always present in both capitalist and pre-capitalist cultures. Although the existence of a wealthy and powerful minority and an impoverished, voiceless majority is historically ancient, what is important for this thesis is the impact of class relations within capitalist and modern societies on social control.

According to Ritzer (2011, p.43-75), Marx, who described human as connected with social relations and maintained that labour is closely related to human potential, asserted that within capitalist production systems, individuals are alienated from their labour and themselves. He stated that this alienation process can begin when labour is reduced to a commodity and sold as it moves away from its real purpose. He also noted that the proletarian class, which consists of wage slaves who do not produce for themselves and do not have the right to use their labour, is relentlessly exploited by the bourgeoisie class, that seeks to create more capital for themselves. According to him, exploitation is necessary in the relationship between these two classes since the wealthy class desires to increase capital by paying low wages to proletariat labour, and this is the only method to develop surplus value in the product-labour relationship. Marx, having performed a materialist study of the social system based on the production of commodities, also identified the class that owns the means of production within the relations of production as the dominant political and ideological group (Farganis, 2014, p.29-31). Therefore, according to his theory, the answer to the questions of how social reality is formed, what values and norms are possessed, and by whom the law is formulated is the bourgeoisie, which possesses power and wealth.

Marx and Engels, who mentioned that the public institutions that provide social control and the political leaders who have power over these institutions have a close relationship with the bourgeois class, in their work *The Communist Manifesto*, asserted that the state and its parts are used as tools to normalise and maintain the capitalist social structure by the wealthy class (Jessop, 2008). In this sense, it can be said that Marx and Engels considered capitalists repressive and anti-reform-revolution. In *The Communist Manifesto*, however, they also discussed the revolutionary side of capitalism. The bourgeoisie was dealt with within the context of a revolutionary transformation that destroyed the institutionalised structures of traditional society, and it was only after this revolutionary process that it was stated that two distinct class structures, the proletarian and the bourgeoisie, had been formed (Marx & Engels, 2008). According to them, the bourgeoisie, which owned and monopolised the means of production, inevitably possessed political power. The answer to the issue of how this political power was established is as follows: During the 19th and 20th centuries, capitalists with a monopoly on industry on the social plane not only had a say in the national production system, but also wielded complete control over the economic structure via private banks and

corporations (Heller, 2019). As a result of this, it can be claimed that they wield influence over state authorities and use governmental organs for their own benefit. Therefore, it can be construed that the right to have a say in the formulation of the rules in the social system and how these rules will be applied rests in the hands of a minority who solely considers increasing their capital and, thus, their own interests.

As has been said, Marx did not deeply investigate social control and crime. However, Gramsci and Althusser, who followed the Marxist tradition of thought, created significantly more detailed ideas regarding the operation of social control in capitalist societies with the concepts of hegemony and ideological state apparatuses. According to Gramsci (2010, p.229-270), the capitalist system survived the First World War, whereas the socialist revolution in the Western world failed. He concentrated on the concepts of ideology and hegemony, claiming that Marx did not fully examine the superstructure, or the political, legal, and cultural plane. Expressing that ideology is basically an illusion and a tool to deceive the public, Gramsci mentioned that ideology is a requirement for authority to be seen as legitimate. At the point of establishing this legitimacy, he expressed with the concept of hegemony the function of one class to impose its power, or rather its lawful authority, on the other class (Slattery, 2014, p.240-248). Gramsci, who stated that the state structure came into effect when oppressed groups demanded equal rights with rulers and the ruling class, pointed out the existence of a group of rulers that permeated the intellectual and moral planes of society in addition to the economic and political with the concept of hegemony. In this sense, the state acts as an organ for this dominant group (Gramsci, 2010, p.229-270). Gramsci's fundamental expression of ideology and hegemony is, thus, a power gathered in one hand for the purpose of defining the boundaries of social reality and, consequently, of behaviour, and an army of workers and unemployed who have legitimised adherence to these boundaries. In this sense, although the capitalist system uses brute force to maintain the dominant class's potency, it can be said that it prefers normality and legitimate authority to represent its interests.

The works of Althusser, who was preoccupied with the concept of ideology, provide a more in-depth analysis of governmental organs, general boundaries, and the functions that different institutions perform for capitalism. Ideology, according to Althusser (2015, p.11-12), is a result of class struggle and was developed to seek consensus in the conflict between the bourgeoisie and the aristocracy, the proletariat, and its own elements. He defined the head of state as an authority that serves the interests of

a class ruling group and is responsible for providing them with resources and stated that the state has oppressive ideological apparatuses. According to him, the government, administration, army, police, courts, and prisons are oppressive state apparatuses, which rely more on physical force than ideology. Another category includes religion, school, family and legal institutions, which instil certain values in individuals by playing a major role in creating a social, legitimate reality through the process of socialization and interaction using ideology (Althusser, 2015, p.16-64).

The major argument that can be made from Marx, Gramsci, and Althusser's theoretical models is that state authority, which has the power to regulate and limit the values and behaviours of lower-class individuals, is not neutral but controlled by capital owners. According to them, even in contemporary social organisations that are judged as democratic administrations, the bourgeoisie possesses more potency and authority than the lower class due to its resources. In this regard, the fact that criminal behaviour is viewed as a characteristic of the lower classes and that certain reformist and revolutionary behaviours and organisations seeking rights within the system are viewed as criminal aspects by the penal systems are vital consequences. In a similar perspective to these readings, Lewis Coser explored the destructive and functional components of conflict in the process of social transformation and in general by combining functionalism and conflict approach. According to Coser (1957), new technologies and institutionalised structures emerge as a result of conflicts in human relationships, and the effort of groups to enhance their share in social organisation should be viewed as a fundamental source of conflict. In accordance with the Marxist tradition, Coser asserted that the dominant group in the existing order would adopt a conservative stance in response to such a request or conflict, and that the conflict would be viewed as an assault on the system itself. This argument may also lead to the conclusion that the rights-seeking behaviours of the lower classes can be criminalised. Expressing that the lower classes experiencing frustration may not question the legitimate order only because of the strain over them, Coser emphasised in his article that the degree of questioning against the legitimate order might vary according to the level of frustration, desire for established goals, and institutionalisation, and hence cannot be the same for all social classes. It can be said that Lewis Coser also affected by Robert K. Merton's Strain Theory, considering the notions in this inference and his view of the deviant behaviour of the lower classes in response to their status frustration and lack of resources. Regarding the occurrence of the crime, he

also remarked that there is not always a confrontation between the groups as a result of individuals' frustration, and that occasionally individuals turn to stress-relieving measures, leading to dysfunctional deviant conduct.

In terms of the functionality of social conflict, he stated that the conflict can acquire functionality that can lead to progress if the social organisation has the flexibility and tolerance to manage social change and conflict processes. However, he also underlined that in cultures with contrasting characteristics, the catastrophic consequences of accumulated discomfort and suppressed conflict may be inevitable (Coser, 1957).

Another theorist who supplies the theoretical foundation for the criminological conflict paradigm is Ralf Dahrendorf, who focused on the conflict between those who recognise legitimate authority and those who are subject to it. He highlighted that the position of authority provides power and that those who hold these positions strive to preserve their positions, and he also stated that those who are subject to these positions are in conflict with those who possess authority by attempting to seize it (Slattery, 2014, p.181-187). Dahrendorf partially embraces and opposes Marxist philosophy simultaneously. According to him, Marx could not foresee the dispersion of capital within the system, nor could he predict that the proletariat would cease to be a homogenous entity, and he also did not study the emergence of a white-collar working class. While the dispersion of capital through large corporations constitutes an obstacle to the determination of who the bourgeoisie is, the existence of specialised white-collar workers who are managers but do not own property within such large economic or productive organisations is another major weakness of traditional theories (Poloma, 2010, p.115-121). In evaluating socioeconomic classes, Dahrendorf does not emphasise the conflict between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, but instead adopts a pluralist stance by recognising the presence of multiple classes. In addition, Dahrendorf, who argued that authority and power are among the variables that determine conflicts in every field, underlined that power is dependent on position and that a person with a position may not have the same power in multiple social planes simultaneously (Ritzer, 2011, p.266-268). Therefore, it is possible to discuss positions that have an effect on authority holders and a social plane in which various groups have various conflicting interests.

Although the criminological conflict theory was developed nearly simultaneously with the labelling theory, it did not attract as much attention. Conflict theory, which is also very closely related to labelling theory, finds the explanations of labelling theory

regarding why a crime or deviant behaviour is defined as a crime or deviant to be insufficient, and even though heterogeneous society and interactions of different cultural structures can be mentioned under the spectrum of labelling theory, according to the conflict approach, the point that has not been examined is whether the law was created by the powerful at socio-economic and political planes just to protect their own interests (McLaughlin, 2010). In this regard, conflict theory researchers who have written highly political studies and articles on the development of social control have had a tough time reaching large audiences. According to DeKeserdy (2011, p.1-21), a follower of the conflict theory, the reason for this is the oppressive and censoring stance of liberally structured governmental institutions and universities particularly against the radical criminological approach.

The primary focus of conflict theory is a social organisation that has little consensus on the common in social dynamics based on conflicts of interest rather than a social consensus, and the struggle to maintain the continuous strong position of the authority by siding with the dominant bourgeoisie (Beirne & Messerschmidt, 2011, p.163; Williams & McShane, 2018, p.107-115). This effort to protect can shape how the crime is defined and what methods will be used to combat it. DeKeserdy (2011), for instance, noted in his work that some groups that are already wealthy within the current economic system can also benefit from high crime rates. In addition to the establishment of privately-run prisons in the United States and the adoption of very liberal economic-based measures in the fight against crime, according to him, attempts to reduce crime rates with autonomous approaches that portray crime as a problem of the individual and as pathological demonstrate that social factors are ignored and that certain groups benefit from high crime rates. In their book *Law, Order and Power*, Chambliss and Siedman took a similar approach, arguing that the law on paper and the law in practise are not the same, and that legal restrictions are a deception. In addition, they claimed that through lobbying and other efforts, the bourgeoisie continuously determines which topics the government and legal institutions will address and how they will judge them (Beirne & Messerschmidt, 2011, p.163-185). Consequently, the bourgeoisie with a high socioeconomic standing can establish a social reality and a set of laws for the administration of this reality by controlling governments that are viewed as legitimate by the public in order to advance their own interests.

As can be seen, the conflict criminological theory studies crime in a manner fairly close to the Marxist tradition. This theory, in which crime is addressed on a socioeconomic and political level, is not homogeneous; rather, it serves as a roof for a variety of perspectives (Burke, 2009, p.180-190). Accordingly, radical criminology has adapted the Marxist tradition of thought to crime theories, and along with radical criminology, there is a pluralist approach that defines society with the conflicting interests of different groups, as opposed to orthodox views that evaluate society along the axis of two classes, and a left realism approach that is concerned with the creation of practical political procedures (DeKeserdy, 2011, p.1-21; Williams & McShane, 2018, p.107-115). Therefore, in the following pages, the primary arguments of each approach will be briefly discussed, along with criticisms of the conflict theory.

2.2.5.1. Pluralist approach

According to Williams and McShane (2018, p.107-115), the pluralist approach is concerned with potency and its application, and the most distinguishing characteristic of this approach is that it evaluates society not only along the axis of class conflict between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie but also with the mutual conflicts of numerous different groups. George Vold, Hubert Blalock, Austin Turk, and Richard Quinney are the leading representatives of the approach.

By adopting a pluralistic approach rather than considering society in a dualist way, George Vold, who was influenced by the fundamental work of theorists such as Georg Simmel, Karl Marx and Lewis Coser, and was one of the first to contribute to the Conflict Theory, claimed that each group attempts to protect its own values and interests (Burke, 2009, s.180-190). Adopting the interactionism and collective behaviour views, Vold asserted that every person is a member of multiple groups simultaneously and that groups are the consequence of shared interests and the foundation of society (Brown et al., 2013, p.384-385). Concerning the participation of individuals in groups and the internal dynamics of conflicting groups, he stated that individuals join groups due to their shared needs, and that conflict has a cohesion-enhancing influence on a group's internal dynamics (Brown et al., 2013, p.384-385; Kubrin et al., 2009, p.221-222). George Vold's assertion is also consistent with Lewis Coser's (1957) notion that conflict has a positive effect on in-group cohesion and the renowned Robbers Cave experiment by Sherif and others (1998). He examined crime, criminal law, and police activities in the context of

intergroup conflict, and he concluded that the emergence of institutions such as law and police force, as well as the effort to control them, are the results of conflicts between numerous groups for social control (Kubrin et al., 2009, p.221-222).

As can be seen, Vold, who had a pluralist perspective, did not limit his definition of society to the conflict between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Despite adopting a pluralist perspective, he was also interested in the manifestation of social control on a macro scale. According to him, the group in charge of determining societal norms and values is also in control of these institutions. In this sense, although Vold's theory gives a criminological explanation for the conduct of social organisations, including political crimes, it is insufficient to explain rape, murder, and interpersonal violence (Brown et al., 2013, p.384-385). Hubert Blalock is another pluralist like George Vold and an early scholar who contributed to conflict theory. Blalock (1956) conducted a research on prejudice in society and highlighted the conflict's national and racial dimensions. According to Williams and McShane (2018, p.111), in addition to the numerical ratio of ethnic minorities to the dominant groups in a region, Blalock also stated that there is another variable in the discrimination process, and according to this, if an ethnic minority starts to affect the balance of power and control in a social system, it is more likely to observe an attempt of political intervention, violence, and discrimination from the dominant group toward that minority. However, in the studies conducted by Blalock in 1956 and 1957, it was said that the number of minorities was not directly associated to racism and discrimination, and it was underlined that, despite the existence of correlations, these correlations were weakly positive (Blalock, 1956, 1957). It is possible to argue that Blalock is a pluralist, given he focuses on the conflict between groups such as Vold as opposed to the economic-based class conflict. Furthermore, Blalock holds a unique position in Conflict theory, as he has identified cultural differences as the source of conflict.

Another academician who can be said to have adopted the pluralist approach is Austin Turk. According to him, the judgement of an act as criminal should not imply that the act itself is inherently criminal (Brown et al., 2013, p.385-387). In the eyes of their audience, actions acquire meaning, and Turk (1964) concurs with Sutherland that criminal behaviour is a behaviour like any other. According to him, criminal action is not a subclass of behaviour, but rather a sort of action defined and classified by the law. In this regard, it is possible to assert that Turk was significantly impacted by the Labelling

Theory. In addition, Turk, who noted that being perceived as a criminal creates a social status and necessitates stigmatisation by the authority, stated that since criminal law and police force tend to concentrate on the lower classes and minorities, there is a perception that the powerless are viewed as potential criminals within the statistical framework (Kubrin et al., 2009; Turk, 1964). The impact of conflict theory in his ideas can be found in his analysis of the creation of laws that stigmatise the behaviour and identities of lower classes and minorities. Accordingly, Turk (1966), who defined the legal norm as the cultural norm established by the authority, noted that legal norms could be the product of a conflict between multiple groups or a post-conflict consensus. In addition, it may be said that Turk, who was interested in both the economic and cultural dimensions of the conflict, held a pluralist viewpoint and did research outside of economic determinism. Stating that examining the law or not questioning the rules in many studies creates incomplete research, Turk underlines in his article that the rules of law can be used not as a conflict solver but also as a trigger by the powerful group or groups that create and impose them (Turk, 1976). Consequently, in a confrontation between groups, the fact that one party has a say in the creation and execution of the legislation also signifies that this group has the ability to employ state-sponsored violence. Within the framework of this analysis, it can be said that the law can be used by powerful groups as a tool to ensure resource mobility and maintain social control. Even while such a powerful and respectable position might be developed by the upper classes or powerful groups, Turk argues that no ideology can preserve the position of the strong forever (Turk, 2002). Because the social reality imposed cannot operate perfectly. Regarding criminalization, it may be claimed that the punishment of the criminal or the stigmatisation of the lower classes is an indication that the norms of law can be utilised as a safety valve against systemic movements, as well as a duty to maintain society functioning in general. Due to the humiliation and marginalisation that stigma towards the opposing group's acts carries, the opposing group's actions may lose their validity as a result. Within the context of these perspectives, it is possible to assert that Turk has both a pluralist confrontational and interactionist side, based on the fact that he describes many different groups as being in conflict, focuses on cultural conflicts outside of the economic dimension, and assumes that ideology and law serve the powerful.

Richard Quinney is a scholar who is credited with conducting some of the most influential theoretical studies and analyses in the pluralist approach. According to

Quinney, the relationship between social norms and penal laws has been misunderstood by numerous sociologists, and laws do not necessarily reflect social norms. In his article, he argued that social norms and regulations in old homogenous civilizations might be the same, however modern heterogeneous society have various social values and norms due to the presence of diverse cultural groups (Quinney, 1965). He also stressed that, as a result of different groups and their conflict, certain dominant parties are able to effectively create legal laws and impose them on society. And therefore, legal codes cannot represent the social norms of a heterogenous society. In this sense, it can be said that Richard Quinney held a pluralist and critical viewpoint.

In his paper on the formulation and application of laws, Quinney (1973) critiqued the American ideology and the cultural aspects it imposed, and he discussed the false sense of legitimacy and fairness that the ideology fostered. According to him, individuals who make the laws and manage the authorities not only breach the law but also create legal structures to further their own goals. Therefore, it can be stated that it is vital to analyse thoroughly social controls designed to perpetuate the existing system. This analysis concurs with the idea that justice is a product of social reality and, consequently, conflict, as opposed to being idealistically produced (Quinney, 1977, p.1-6). Thus, according to Quinney, the legitimacy and social reality that are imposed and maintained are essentially nothing more than the methodical strategy of property owners or those in positions of authority to safeguard themselves.

In his book *Class, State, and Crime*, in which he examined the effect of class conflict on criminalising behaviour and the phenomenon of crime in greater depth, Quinney (1977, p.6-43) asserted that in the United States, substantial resources and political practises are devoted to the fight against crime, but each policy is based on the assumption that crime is the result of rational choice. According to him, while the liberal world reduces crime to an individual dimension through tougher penalties, clinical applications, and pathological studies, it has ignored the social inequalities, oppression of the dominant class, and exploitation of the lower classes that contribute to the crime phenomenon (Quinney, 1977, p.13-43). He also stressed that the law, which has become a weapon for maintaining the capitalist order, have been repeatedly broken by the capitalists, yet those violations are not considered crime. Because, in his estimation, capitalism cannot exist without violating human rights (Quinney, 1977, p.51-52).

2.2.5.2. Radical approach

In his analysis, Chambliss, who employs a radical conflict method, examines the relationship between the administration, establishment, and maintenance of social order and the judicial system. In his paper on the vagrancy law, Chambliss (1964) analysed the rules of law that emerged in the past. He argued that the rules against vagrancy were created to facilitate the finding of workers for landowners who were already in a powerful position and to assure the continuation of the existing order. Regarding modern societies, Chambliss (1975), who described the social order in terms of a two-class conflict instead of a pluralist approach, stated that the laws passed by the upper class to ensure social control criminalised the lower class, and he predicted that this would lead to an increasingly polarised society. Furthermore, he explored the impact of crime in the context of class struggle, concluding that interest and perception were attracted from class conflict to criminal conduct when members of the same class committed crimes against one another (Chambliss, 1975). Therefore, it can be said that criminal activities themselves can be a means of creating a false social reality in order to ensure the continuity of the interests of the upper class.

In the book *On Law and Order* that he co-authored with Siedman, they examined the American legal system. They debunked the idea that justice means equality and freedom for all by asserting that the law exclusively defends the interests of a specific group, not the interests of everyone (Brown et al., 2013, p.390-391).

2.2.5.3. Left realism

In conflict theory, in addition to radical and pluralist perspectives, there is also a left realism perspective, as noted above. One of the most influential proponents of left realism, Jock Young, was influenced by the Labelling Theory like Austin Turk. Young, expressing that modernity has standardising and controlling characteristics, stated that those whose behaviour deviates from the norm are constantly marginalised and alienated from the social scale (Young, 1999, p.1-13). Stating that radical criminology has provided a new explanation with a political and class approach to the crime phenomenon, which liberalist and positivist perspectives view on a small scale and as a visible phenomenon, Young argued that this political and unrestricted approach can focus on the structural problems within the justice system (Young, 1988). However, as is well-known, left realism addresses the shortcomings of Marxist and Radical explanations of crime

prevention and seeks to execute a pragmatic policy (F. P. Williams & McShane, 2018, p.107-115). Although Jock Young can be viewed as a follower of Left Realism, according to him, the value of radical criminology is that it focuses on structural problems and does political research regarding crime prevention (Young, 1988).

Young emphasised in his book *The Exclusive Society* that police actions are focused at specific socioeconomic segments that are viewed as potential criminals rather than actual criminals, and he argued that groups that lack the resources are criminalised (Young, 1999, p.30-44). Regarding the new administrative criminology, Young (1999, p.45-46) noted that this approach pays attention to the events that generate the crime, rather than individual motivations and post-criminal punishment, and he stressed the significance of a criminology that focuses on the genesis of crime. Regarding the emergence of crime, Young rejected the main argument of the Strain Theory that the lack of resources and tools to achieve culturally accepted goals is the primary cause of crime and emphasised that resource deprivation is only noticeable and can be a triggering effect when a person compares his or her possessions to those of others (Young, 1999, p.52). Therefore, it can be said that relative deprivation can be viewed as the primary factor. It can produce discontent and conflict and without an intervention, can create criminal behaviour (Brown et al., 2013, p.392).

Another follower of Left Realism Approach, Tony Platt, severely disputed Richard Quinney's views concerning pluralism and the emergence of crime in a socialist society and argued that crime will remain as a universal phenomenon (Platt, 1982, 1984). This means that, according to him, even without class struggles that can be observed in capitalist societies, criminal actions will continue to exist.

Platt stated that racist and oppressive policies were implemented under the guise of crime control, and that the left wing remained silent in the face of street crime and the new practises of the right wing. He also stated that even the bail practise in the American justice system is nothing but social inequality and that prisons are only populated by a specific group of poor people (Platt, 1982). Platt has attempted to provide an alternative to the growing right's answer of jail expansion and severe penalties for criminals, and he has evaluated the theoretical approaches of the left as being too theoretical and utopian (Platt, 1984). By demonstrating the necessity of a reformist approach, Platt presented practical applications such as a justice system unaffected by economic insufficiencies, the abolition of some mandatory penalties, a policy to reduce crime rates by increasing

employment, a non-racist judiciary, and respect for the human rights of incarcerated individuals (Platt, 1982). In this context, it can be said that Platt claims that pluralist and radical criminology remains on paper, and that the phenomenon of crime will continue in a socialist society. Therefore, his assertion that the practical political solutions that affect the laws will be more effective and problem-solving than theoretical justice system solutions is the main argument of his approach.

Apart from the criticisms of Tony Platt's radical and pluralist approaches, DeKeseredy (2011, p.37-42) stated that left realism received many different criticisms from both the right and the left, and according to him, the reason for harsh criticism is that Left Realism does not present a new theoretical perspective. By emphasising on the relationship between social class and crime in his publication with Schwartz, DeKeseredy (2013) intended to develop a new left realism agenda. According to them (2010), the poverty caused by industrialization and the laissez-faire philosophy has worsened with the relocation of industry to other regions throughout neoliberal periods, and the unemployment of working men is a blow to the perceptions of masculinity. Accordingly, they asserted that violent groups and acts arose when a big number of poorer and unemployed individuals began to withdraw from society. In this context, DeKeseredy and Schwartz (2013) asserted that the concept of subculture can be used in criminological studies, particularly in rural regions, and they emphasised the need for a shift in university attitudes toward the Marxist approach to advance Conflict Theory. In addition, they indicated that it would be advantageous to enhance qualitative studies rather than only quantitative ones.

In conclusion, Conflict Theory is not monolithic; it encompasses different perspectives like a roof. However, the primary emphasis is that the socially dominant group or groups build a social reality and legitimacy through constructing the legal system and ideology using the resources they control. This established structure can cause the lower classes to be perceived as potential criminals and so reduce class conflicts.

2.2.6. Feminist criminology

Throughout history and academic research, due to their status in society, women have been disregarded and ignored by numerous theories dominated by a male perspective. This was also true of the discipline of criminology before the emergence of feminist criminology (Renzetti, 2013, p.1-14). In this sense, the primary objective of

feminist criminology is to re-examine previously defined theories in response to the dominant male perspective in criminology and the inability of women to find a place for themselves in the literature and to focus on women's experiences as criminals and victims in crime and punishment systems from a gender-centred perspective (Burgess-Proctor, 2014; Renzetti, 2013, p.1-14). In this perspective, the objective of the section on feminist criminology is to discuss briefly the various feminist criminology approaches. In order to comprehend these distinctions, it is necessary to provide some fundamental knowledge regarding feminism. However, feminism will not be examined in length in this section because it encompasses multiple detailed perspectives. For this reason, the basic sociological argument of basic feminism will be briefly discussed in order to illustrate the significance of the feminist viewpoint. Following this, feminist criminology will be discussed briefly.

Similar to the critical approach, feminist theory lacks theoretical coherence but focuses primarily on the subordinate status of women in social organisations while attempting to build a link between theory and practise (Van Gundy, 2014, p.1-8). In this sense, theorists have developed the concept of gender, which emphasises socially learned gender-specific roles beyond the presence of physiologically distinct sexes, in order to examine the position of women in society (Ritzer & Stepnisky, 2014, p.440-443). The significance of the concept of gender emphasis is that the values and behaviour patterns of women and men are not the result of biological immanence, but rather a social construction; consequently, the subordinate position of women on the social plane can be interpreted in a way that can be modified. According to Wharton (2005, p.4-9), who states that the emergence of the concept of gender and its adaptation from academic life to social life coincides with the second feminist wave, there is also the viewpoint that, despite the fact that gender roles do not have a biological immanence, the biological and social cannot be viewed as completely distinct from one another. At the same time, according to him, how individuals see the world is shaped by gender roles and therefore, identities, values and behavioural patterns can vary. In this regard, it can be said that, along with the different gender roles, it may be possible to perceive and interpret social situations differently. Consequently, the feminist approach in the social context, which is built and viewed from a male-dominated perspective, has a critical perspective and can be seen as a voice for some groups whose voices cannot be heard.

The emergence, development and first practical steps of feminist theory are often associated with the white middle-class women in the Western countries (Van Gundy, 2014, p.1-8). However, although it had such a beginning, due to the evolutionary process of the approach, today it focuses not only on women but also on different social groups, people of different colours, essentially every person and individual living in a hierarchical and patriarchal society (Ferguson, 2017; Ritzer & Stepnisky, 2014, p.440-443).

As previously stated, feminist theory is not a single, separate entity; rather, it can be seen as a framework for multiple theoretical perspectives. Therefore, it is not possible to address every aspect of feminist theory in this thesis. On the other hand, basic information can be offered on the broad development of feminist theory, specifically the three distinct feminist waves that emerged throughout history.

First-wave feminism began in France, and although its exact date is unknown, the feminist movement gathered momentum and took on a more organised shape throughout the middle of the 19th century (Boxer, 1982). The first wave feminism asserted that women should have the right to vote and emphasised equal economic and educational participation. Mary Wollstonecraft, the author of *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, was most notable figure (Boxer, 1982; Sanders, 2001). Wollstonecraft (2013) argued that in a world ruled by men, women are not viewed as rational and hence do not qualify as equals. According to her, women acquire these roles associated with their gender through their families and mothers throughout the socialisation process they enter at birth; thus, from her perspective, women do not possess an inherent irrationality, and they have the potential to be in the same position as men. According to Sanders (2001), although Wollstonecraft promoted equal rights and an active woman profile in the public realm, she also accepted some patriarchal gender roles for women and, thus, cannot be considered a follower of the radical feminist approach. Another criticism of Sanders for Wollstonecraft's work is that she exclusively concentrated on white women, which is also true of the entire first-wave feminist movement. Another central thought within the first wave of feminism was John Stuart Mill's description of patriarchal society that enslaved and imprisoned women via traditional customs. With the assertion that women are intelligent beings, he argued that male dominance is founded on physical power and that it is therefore ludicrous for one species to be dominant over another (Sanders, 2001). Noting that women have almost no say in the process of marriage and in their relationships with their partners and comparing this situation to the slave-owner

relationship of ancient times, Mill (2013) argued that this system, which is the result of marriage, contradicts all the libertarian and egalitarian characteristics of the contemporary world. Additionally, he emphasised that it is unacceptable for a person to be subject to another's dominance. In addition to this theoretical information, it should be noted that the first wave feminist movement is highly activist and political.

According to the feminists in the second wave, feminism was almost dead in the second half of the 20th century, and unlike the legal claims of the first wave, this wave focused on the cultural positions of women (Thornham, 2001). Regarding the cultural denominator of being a woman, Simone De Beauvoir might be considered one of the movement's early pioneers. "One is not born a woman, but rather becomes a woman," Beauvoir (2011, p.283) wrote in *The Second Sex* to underline the presence of socially imposed gender norms. She also noted that male and female children exhibit the same behaviours throughout childhood and that children's behaviour patterns resemble severe sexual attitudes toward their moms (Beauvoir, 2011, p.283-284). In this sense, it can be said that the roles of men and women appear to have a clear effect on individuals in the latter phases of socialisation, and that Simone de Beauvoir was influenced by the Freudian perspective. Beauvoir stated that women, in the pacified roles assigned to them at a young age and in their secondary situations, frequently get caught up in the escapism movement and plunge their eyes into fictional, unreal worlds. She also noted that female children are envious of their mothers' affection for their fathers (Beauvoir, 2013). Therefore, it may be claimed that women accept their subordinate positions on the social plane due to the internalisation and acceptance of gender roles by society.

In the 1960s, the second-wave feminist movement also emerged in the United States. In this period, in addition to organisations such as the National Organization for Women, which advocated for equal rights, the Women's Liberation organisation, which can be described as more radical and inexperienced, argued that the problems that appear to be personal for women in the United States are structural and social in nature (Baxandall & Gordon, 2005). Betty Friedan, one of the most prominent advocates of this movement in the United States and the founder of the National Organization for Women, denounced women's imitation of men and argued that they should engage in a process of feminine self-realization (Thornham, 2001). Friedan (2013) referred to the declining marriage age and women who prefer to have children instead of pursuing a profession while discussing the idealisation of the position of a woman who is feminine, subordinate

to her man, and a mother through socialisation and the media. In this way, she argued that women's belonging to their own homes is imposed through education, magazines, news, and advertisements within an ideological framework. Therefore, it might be claimed that she referred to the state's implementation of the ideology of the male-dominated social order. Furthermore, she added that American women who have greater advantages than in the past and who have an abundance of technical devices for household duties are not content and many of them are depressed. Even though psychiatrists have not yet addressed this condition, the Friedan asserted that there are similar complaints from all around the country and maintained the notion that there is a problem that has no name (Friedan, 2013). In this respect, from her perspective, media and politics implant in the minds of women the notion that feminist aims have already been achieved and political demand is no longer essential. Therefore, it might be argued that ideology shapes women's perspectives. The element that can be derived from the perspectives of both theorists and that can reflect the fundamental notion of the second wave feminism is that improvements in legal rights on paper are not completely mirrored in the social and practical world.

Regarding third-wave feminism, Mann and Huffman (2005) are closer to the notion that third-wave feminism is established as a result of the second wave's deficiencies, and they evaluated the third wave against the theoretical position of the second wave. Mann and Huffman, who noted that the third wave of feminism, like the second wave, lacked cohesion and was comprised of different approaches, stated that the third wave was initiated by women of colour, whereas the first two waves primarily focused on white women and ignored racial and ethnic identities. Snyder (2008) remarked that it would not be accurate to emphasise that Third Wave feminism is the exact opposite of Second Wave feminism. According to her, the third wave, which prioritises activism over academic validation and employs a multimodal approach rather than a synthesist method based on fundamental theoretical limits, also embraced inclusivity between the genders.

As previously stated, the third wave feminist movement is characterised by its multimodal approach, which embraces postmodern and poststructuralist perspectives. As a result, instead of a binary or dualistic understanding of the universe, it has a perspective in which there is no objective reality and identity is constructed via language and discourse (Mann & Huffman, 2005). With this approach, the shared experience of womanhood portrayed by the first and second waves was rejected due to the existence of

multiple truths and the fact that not every individual would have the same experience across all geographies and cultures (Snyder, 2008).

Similar to the feminist approach, feminist criminology includes a variety of approaches. However, they all share a critical perspective of mainstream criminology, which is dominated by men. Feminist criminology has focused on the subject of why conventional currents are not explanatory for women and why women are less likely to commit crimes (Walsh, 2011, p.10-11). It should also be highlighted that until feminist theory, criminology overlooked women, but the feminist approach, which focuses on women and incorporates their experiences, does not fully exclude men (Renzetti, 2013, p.1-14). Although there is no consensus on its origin, the 1960s and 1970s can be considered the beginning of feminist criminology. The primary reason for the significance of this approach is not only the exclusion of women from traditional criminology, but also the evidence that violence-prone women have been victimised in the past (Whiteley, 2014). Therefore, examining women's criminal behaviour provides insight and information regarding their likely victimisation in the past and their continuing social exploitation.

The major distinction between the feminist criminological approach and others is its gender-based orientation. Feminist criminology recognises gender as a social construction, as demonstrated by feminism, and asserts that the current system is male-dominated and excludes or disregards women's experiences owing to the gender-based role differential between men and women within this social construction (Van Gundy, 2014, p.8-17). Although gender is a crucial element, feminist criminology also takes fundamental variables such as class and race, and simultaneously studies the effects of gender on each other and on criminal conduct (Burgess-Proctor, 2006).

As previously stated, the feminist criminological approach incorporates a variety of theoretical perspectives, including liberal, radical, Marxist, socialist, and postmodern criminological perspectives.

2.2.6.1. Liberalist feminist criminology

The liberal feminist approach, one of the earliest in feminist criminology, was concerned with socially ongoing inequality along the gender axis. Consequently, this approach has attempted to reform some sexist legislation and to ensure that women and men play an active role in the public discourse, along with the demand for gender equality

in the legal system (F. P. Williams & McShane, 2018, p.129). In addition, the liberal perspective has attempted to explain the increase in the rate of crimes committed by women during the 20th century (Renzetti, 2013, p.15-33). According to Adler, the access to equal rights and opportunities made possible by the feminist movement facilitated criminal activity. In this sense, women, like men, have had the chance to engage in criminal behaviour due to their public status. However, this argument did not account for the property offenses perpetrated by black women arrested for economic motives. In this way, Renzetti at one point referred to the irony of liberal feminist theory, namely that the liberalist approach theorised that female criminality would rise as a result of more equality (Renzetti, 2013, p.15-33). Power Control Theory, which explores the relationship between gender, class, and criminality within the context of liberalist theory, is another theory that should be highlighted.

Power control theory focuses primarily on the impacts of class, race, and gender on criminal conduct, and it is a generally recognised way to identify the family as a social control instrument under the Power Control Theory (Walsh, 2011, p.33-35). Although class and gender are regularly employed in delinquency studies, Hagan and other (1985), the inventors of the theory, said that these two variables were not evaluated jointly. In their theory, the authors stated that the power variable is about the ownership of the means and ways of production, and the control, on the other hand, is about family on micro level. They also asserted that the mother's role is used as a control tool more than the father's and that girls, not boys, are the main object of control. In addition, the authors said that the threat of punishment in dominant relationships established inside the family had a detrimental effect on delinquent behaviour and that the origins of oppressive effects were developed within the family (Hagan et al., 1985). In this regard, the deterrent effect is utilised more effectively with girls than with boys. Consequently, it may be claimed that this hypothesis also provides an explanation for why women commit fewer crimes than men.

While Hagan et al. (1985) asserted that men in their own class are more liberated than women, they also conducted empirical research to test these hypotheses. Accordingly, researchers who administered questionnaires to children from different classes and their families were unable to identify a substantial association between class and delinquent behaviour, but they did find that children from lower classes were more likely to engage in delinquent behaviour. In this regard, even though there is a small

correlation between class and delinquent behaviour, the traditional criminological hypotheses regarding lower class delinquency have not been proven. In addition, although Hagan et al. (1985) stated that gender is a much stronger variable than socioeconomic class, they said that the effect of gender decreased when they were analysed together with the class variable. In addition, they reported that parental control had a negative influence on delinquent conduct and that girls were more controlled than boys.

In another extensive study of their early work, Hagan et al. (1987) discussed the position of women as being weaker than men and the position of girls as having less freedom than boys in patriarchal families, and they have proposed that this difference decreases as one move toward more egalitarian families. The authors, who argued that a woman's position of powerlessness has shifted as she enters the workforce and acquires resources, examined the impact of this shifting structure on family control and delinquent behaviour. Confirming that mothers exert greater control over their daughters than over their sons, the researchers asserted that due to the rising socioeconomic status of women and workplace authority, working mothers do not merely serve as a means of control, and both mother and daughter gain greater independence. In addition, as a part of this situation, it was stated that the desire of girls to take risks increased in more egalitarian families (Hagan et al., 1987). In this way, by making a statement that is similar to liberalist theory, Power Control Theory establishes the notion that women are more prone to take risks and engage in delinquent behaviour in an egalitarian society.

2.2.6.2. Radical feminist criminology

The fundamental focus of radical feminist criminology is on the social constructions that place the male perspective in the dominant position, and on how the phenomenon of crime benefits capitalist society (Williams & McShane, 2018, p.129). In this perspective, which focuses on gender-based social inequality, it is asserted that men-controlled women's sexuality and maintained their privileges even before capitalism. Furthermore, they were more concerned with crimes committed by men against women than with crimes committed by women, and they emphasised that every element of the social system that has been institutionalised is patriarchal, highlighting that the legal gains of liberalist feminism cannot be considered a final achievement on their own (Renzetti, 2013, p.39-42). Concerning academic research, there is a notion of the need for qualitative approaches in which the researcher is more involved and the emphasis on enabling the

acknowledgement of crimes and victimisation of women who are not heard (Chesney-Lind & Morash, 2013).

Regarding the underrepresentation of women in criminology, Carol Smart (1995, p.14-25), a radical criminologist, asserted that the statistically lower rate of criminal conduct among women in comparison to men is one of the reasons why criminologists are not interested in women's criminal conduct. In addition, Smart said that ideological perspectives have a significant impact on criminology research and that ideology separates women and men, in a sexist manner. This sexist approach includes attitudes and behaviours that are asserted to be intrinsic to women from a biologically deterministic perspective, and as a result, it treats women who commit crimes as pathological regardless of their age, social class or educational backgrounds. Smart (1979) also criticised the liberal feminist criminology's view that increased liberation and equal chances have led to an increase in the criminal behaviour of women. Using official statistics, she asserted that it appears frightening at first look to declare that crimes against women have increased by more than 100 percent. Nevertheless, because the numbers are small, the opinion that the increases are insignificant is also crucial. Smart (1979) stated that the increase in women's crime was greater than 100 percent at the beginning of the 20th century, even before there were legal gains. and noting that statistics do not fully reflect social reality, she also opposed the notion that women are becoming more masculine and that they are more likely to commit crimes because they have employment opportunities. Therefore, radical criminology asserts that the opportunities that come with the achievement of legal equality are not a significant variable in gaining access to and growing criminal activity. It is also possible to argue that the notion that having equal rights on paper will result in the same social practises is a rather reductionist conclusion.

2.2.6.3. Marxist feminist criminology

Adopting Marxist theory and theories advanced under the Marxist tradition, Marxist feminist criminology has argued that an analysis of society and crime can be conducted using class relations. However, the gender variable is missing from these traditional Marxist studies, according to this perspective (Renzetti, 2013, p.36-39). In this sense, the Marxist feminist criminological approach focuses on issues such as inequality, women's victimisation, and their exclusion from the social order. Accordingly, the gendered division of work in capitalist societies, private property ownership, and men's internalised

use of this system are the primary drivers of women's inequality and exploitation (Daly & Chesney-Lind, 1988).

According to Radosh (1990), who has studied the crimes committed by women, the class relations between criminal women and other women, and the capitalist, patriarchal system viewed as legitimate, Marxist criminological theories lacked an analysis of women's criminal behaviour and primarily treated women as victims. Expressing the fact that women are imprisoned in the private sphere, Marxist feminist criminology stated that women tend to commit more crimes in modern societies, but the vast majority of these crimes are property crimes. Citing the emergence and proliferation of women's criminal activities as a symptom of the exclusion of women from the economic realm. This theory also underlined that rape and violence against women increased in modern capitalist society due to internalised male dominance and female exploitation (Renzetti, 2013, p.36-39). Similarly, according to Radosh (1990), the most important question to examine is whether the gendered division of labour, which appears fairly normal in capitalist countries, influences the increase or decline of criminality. Radosh, who stated that capitalism profits from this sexist attitude, that women's labour is unpaid, and that women are responsible for raising the next generation of capitalists or labourers, stated that for a woman, it is enough to go beyond the values established by the capitalist ideology to be labelled as a criminal. According to her, because of the discourse of the capitalist society, the family is destroyed without the role of a mother, women have no independence, and the smallest normative deviation stigmatises women as deviants (Radosh, 1990). Since the ideology defends the upper class and men and the court system is built accordingly, it is therefore simpler to view women as criminals or vulnerable victims. This circumstance can exert ongoing physical and mental pressure on females. Consequently, it can be said that this argument also explains why women are less likely to commit crimes than men.

2.2.6.4. Socialist feminist criminology

The Socialist Theory, which blends radical and Marxist feminist criminological theories, identifies the patriarchal capitalist system as the primary source of women's subjugation. And although influenced by Critical Criminology and focusing on class, this approach also examines gender and class as simultaneous variables. (Tierney, 2009, p.81; Williams & McShane, 2018, p.130).

James Messerschmidt, one of the socialist feminist theorists, asserted that on the patriarchal capitalist social plane, there are two groups: the most powerful and predominantly male, and the weakest and predominantly female, with the former doing the greatest crime and harm. Because the stronger group is the one that has the most opportunities and is least likely to be punished in the end. In this respect, he drew a relationship between the ownership of opportunities and the manifestation of criminal behaviour, stating that women, or rather working women, have the fewest opportunities, both legal and illegal, and are in the most exploited positions (Beirne & Messerschmidt, 2011, p.190-191). Messerschmidt (2008) also argued that there was no equality between men and women before to the emergence of capitalism, but that women's labour force participation declined with the birth of capitalism. In this sense, Messerschmidt, who emphasised that a social perception has emerged regarding the need for women to spend more time in their private sphere as a result of the prohibition of child labour and the prominence of childcare, stated that the exploitation of women has become normal due to the presence of men who are active in the public sphere and who have already taken control of the institutions (Messerschmidt, 2008).

In both Marxist and Socialist Feminist Criminology, the influence of the ideology and social control instruments mentioned in this thesis under the title Marxist Criminology is apparent. In contrast to traditional studies, however, the Marxist and Socialist Feminist Approaches asserted that the gender variable is a significant factor in the victimisation and delinquency of women; thus, these variables were considered intersectional.

2.2.6.5. Postmodern feminist criminology

Postmodernism, which is sceptical of the notion that the genuine truth can be discovered by the scientific method and rational intellect, asserts that social production and, consequently, the attempt to comprehend it, are likewise constructed through discourse. Therefore, the postmodern approach does not assert that the positivist method's methods and these methods provide an objective analysis (Henry & Milovanovic, 2005). In this way, postmodern feminist theory criticises classic feminist ideas and resists the notion that reality is singular because the scientific method was developed with a modernist perspective (Tierney, 2009, p.82). Therefore, this approach can also question the concepts such as gender and crime, which can be expressed as given categories. The

fundamental question of postmodern feminist criminology concerns first gender and then crime. In addition, the theory asserted that gender and the meanings and values attributed to it are vary in time, geography, and culture; hence, conceptual approaches such as women's dominance are not a universal fact (Williams & McShane, 2018, p.130). Therefore, postmodern feminism differs significantly from earlier conceptions and is frequently understood as a very abstract body of research.



CHAPTER 3: THE MEASUREMENT OF FEAR OF CRIME AND ITS THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

3.1. Vulnerability Hypothesis

In order to ensure comprehension of the relationship between the vulnerability hypothesis and fear of crime, empirical findings, and the various results revealed by different studies, it will be very beneficial to begin with the most general definition of the vulnerability hypothesis. The vulnerability hypothesis is an approach that posits a relationship between socio-demographic characteristics of groups and fear of crime, and in this context, explains the cause of fear of crime (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.29-30). In this case, it should be clear what is intended by the terms possessed characteristics. Skogan and Maxfield (1981, p.69-79) demonstrated two distinct forms of vulnerability. These are physical factors, such as susceptibility to assault, inability to resist, and proximity to crime-ridden areas due to low income and ethnicity. Therefore, in a broad sense, it can be concluded that this hypothesis identifies women, the elderly, those with ethnic backgrounds, and individuals from lower socioeconomic classes as the most vulnerable groups due to their lack of resources to deal with crime victimisation and mitigate its negative effects (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.29-30; Sacco & Glackman, 1987; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, p.69-79; Taylor & Hale, 1986). Although the hypothesis can be viewed as providing a very logical explanation given the conditions of the individuals, it is necessary to discuss the results of numerous studies on the hypothesis in order to examine the explanations of the hypothesis critically. In the examination of the empirical findings of the conducted studies, to comprehend how the studies differ and how they change over time, it may be beneficial to the comprehension of the vulnerability hypothesis to describe how the effects of age, gender, and economic low-income ownership on fear of crime are detected within the scope of each study. When young and old people's experiences of fear of crime are compared, it can be claimed that there is positive correlation between age and fear of crime, meaning that older people are more fearful than younger people (Braungart et al, 1980; Cossman & Rader, 2011; Pantazis, 2000; Toseland, 1982). However, the extent and nature of these findings differ from study to study. For instance, Braungart and others (1980) discovered a small but positive correlation between age and fear of crime. Toseland (1982) asserted that living alone has a positive impact on fear of crime and that this circumstance has an impact on the social lives of the elderly. Another finding regarding the relationship between age and fear of

crime is that older individuals with a low income are more fearful than younger individuals, meaning that the gap between the two groups can be reduced by introducing a high socioeconomic status (Cossman & Rader, 2011; Pantazis, 2000). Before diving deeper into the findings, to critically evaluate the results of these studies, it is necessary to understand what it means to investigate fear of crime using global measurement techniques. Formless fear, that is, the measurement types created without mentioning any crime name or definition in the questions, can also be viewed as global measures of fear of crime (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987; Rountree & Land, 1996). According to different studies, it is possible to find elderly more fearful than young people when such measurements are employed (Ferraro, 1995; Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987). In studies involving different types of crimes and therefore differ from the global measurements, it was not always possible to find a significant positive correlation between age and fear of crime (Katz et al., 2003; Rountree & Land, 1996; Warr, 1984). Regardless of the measurement type, the most common finding is the difference in fear of crime rates between women and men. Consequently, it can be asserted that women fear crime more than males across all measurement types (Braungart et al., 1980; Cossman & Rader, 2011; Pantazis, 2000; Rader et al., 2012; Sacco & Glackman, 1987; Toseland, 1982). Important to discuss in relation to this finding is whether women's greater fear of crime is primarily due to their greater vulnerability. According to Pantazis (2000), women are raised by the belief that they cannot safeguard themselves, and this socialisation process renders women more vulnerable than men. Another important approach, tested by different studies, proposes an explanation for the reason why women have a greater fear of crime than men do. According to this hypothesis, the reason why women show a greater fear of crime is the possibility of a sexual assault that is usually overshadowed by another crime (Ferraro, 1996; Warr, 1984). In this sense, in addition to the insufficient resources proposed by the vulnerability hypothesis, this approach, known as the shadow hypothesis, demonstrates the simultaneous efficacy of multiple crimes on fear of crime. Therefore, while extortion can only be viewed as extortion from a male perspective, from a female perspective, a crime may have the potential to encompass more serious crimes. In this sense, the Shadow hypothesis will be evaluated briefly and concisely.

When the relationship between income level and fear of crime is examined, it can be seen that numerous studies asserted a negative relationship between income level and fear of crime (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.29-30; Pantazis, 2000; Sacco & Glackman,

1987; Toseland, 1982). Cossman and Rader (2011), on the other hand, claimed that low income may have a negative effect on fear of crime with a mediating factor due to the negative relationship between low income and access to health services. On the other hand, in their study of fear of gang crime, Katz et al. (2003) did not find a significant correlation between low income or education level and fear of crime. However, despite the fact that there is no consensus among the findings, it can be asserted that insufficient resources may result in a relatively higher level of fear due to the inability to compensate for losses caused by criminal activity.

Consequently, according to the vulnerability hypothesis, the reactive behaviours of each group that makes up a society are distinct, and resource differences in coping with crime result in varying degrees of fear of crime. In this respect, social groups that have relatively less opportunity and resources to cope with the crime phenomenon can be considered more vulnerable than the others. However, it is evident that the outputs anticipated from the hypothesis are highly influenced by the methodology employed and the research universe selected. Therefore, it is possible that the hypothesis alone is insufficient to explain the factors that influence fear of crime.

3.1.1. Shadow hypothesis

As discussed during the clarification of the vulnerability hypothesis, it was stated that groups with certain socio-demographic characteristics may experience relatively more fear of crime than others, and in general, women were included in this disadvantaged group due to their lack of physical and social resources (Doran & Burgess, 2012; Lane & Fisher, 2009; Sacco & Glackman, 1987; Taylor & Hale, 1986). This view may provide an explanation, within the context of the vulnerability hypothesis, for why women experience a greater fear of crime, but there are additional explanations for this phenomenon. Warr (1984) began by posing the question about why women experience more fear of crime and stated that, unlike men, women occasionally confront the threat of sexual assault. Consequently, within this framework, women's greater fear of crime compared to men may not be due to vulnerability, but rather to gender differences. The development of this opinion and its classification are founded on Ferraro's research. Accordingly, Ferraro (1996) emphasised that women already exhibit more fear than men in situations such as sexual assault or harassment, and that the same is true for other face-to-face crimes that are not sexual in nature. In his study, he measured fear by including

specific categories of crime and proposed the shadow hypothesis, which states that face-to-face non-sexual crimes cause women to have a high level of fear due to the possibility of sexual assault (Ferraro, 1996). This view, which has gained a great deal of attention in the academic community and provides a novel and distinct explanation, has been examined by numerous studies. Fisher and Sloan (2003), who tested the shadow hypothesis on university students, included various types of crimes in their fear of crime measurements and concluded that women perceive greater danger when both non-sexual and sexual crimes are taken into account. Similarly, when evaluating fear of crime, it was determined that women were more fearful than males, and the research findings supported the shadow hypothesis. In a separate study involving 375 undergraduates, Hilinski (2009) emphasised that men and women did not differ significantly in their fear of non-sexual crimes. However, she also highlighted that there is a correlation between the fear of sexual assault and the fear of non-sexual crimes. In addition to studies carried in the United States, studies conducted with university students in Sweden and Türkiye have produced empirical evidence supporting the shadow hypothesis (Mellgren & Ivert, 2019; Özascilar, 2013; Özascilar & Ziyalar, 2017). In the study by Hilinski and others (2011), which offers additional details about daily life, a questionnaire was administered to 375 students, and the female participants were asked open-ended questions about their fear of crime. The data collected from women revealed that the fear of sexual crimes has a positive influence on the fear of other crimes. However, in the study, some of the women evaluated other crimes and sexual crimes separately and stated that their fear of sexual crimes had no effect on others. In addition, there was some support for the vulnerability hypothesis, and while some women highlighted their physical weakness, others claimed they could protect themselves (Hilinski et al., 2011). Therefore, it can be stated that, in light of the roles ascribed to women and men during the socialisation process, the severity of some crimes and the approaches to the possibility of these crimes may vary, even when there is no information regarding the threat's presence or absence. In this context, the fear of sexual crimes can alter women's fear of other non-sexual and face-to-face crimes. However, before drawing such a broad conclusion within the framework of gender, it is important to remember that groups are not always homogeneous in social reality.

3.2. Victimization Hypothesis

The victimisation hypothesis investigates the relationship between an individual's crime victimisation and their fear of crime. One could say that being a victim of a crime has an effect on an individual's life. Accordingly, shock, depression, anxiety, and insecurity can be observed in the lives of individuals when victimisations are evaluated in terms of the effects they have (Clark, 2003). Therefore, being a victim of any crime can heighten a person's sensitivity to particular risks. In this context, the central argument of the victimisation theory is that being a victim of any crime increases a person's fear of crime (Doran & Burgess, 2012). Similarly, Gray and others (2011) stated, regarding the relationship between victimisation and an individual's quality of life, that criminal victimisation can have a positive effect on a dysfunctional anxiety and reduce an individual's quality of life. Regarding this hypothesis, numerous field studies have been conducted, resulting in a variety of findings.

Numerous studies examining the relationship between being a victim of a crime and fear of crime have discovered a positive correlation between the two (Akers et al., 1987; Box et al., 1988; Ditton et al., 1999; Katz et al., 2003; Mesch, 2000; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, p.59-69). In other words, the hypothesis that individuals who are victims of a crime will have a higher fear of crime has been confirmed by these studies. In contrast to these studies, other studies have demonstrated that there is no significant positive correlation between fear of crime and victimisation experienced by individuals (Borooah & Carcach, 1997; Ferraro, 1996; Lalli & Savitz, 1976). As can be seen, the results of the studies may produce contradictory findings. Yin (1980) stated that there is still ambiguity in the literature regarding whether past victimisations impact a person's fear of crime, he also that if there is no significant damage following the victimisation, the victimisation can even serve as a fear reducer if individuals take adaptive behaviours. In addition, according to him, it may be crucial to focus victimisation research on a single time period. The point to be made here is that not all victimisations have identical or comparable impacts on individuals. Skogan (1987) claimed that the effects of victimisation experiences can fade within months, but this does not imply that sexual assault and petty theft are equivalent. Accordingly, Yin (1980) stated that in the process of collecting data on victimizations, specific crime types should be included, in addition to setting a certain time limit to the questions. Consistent with the notion that the effects of victimisation will diminish with time, Agnew (1985) stated that crime victims can neutralise their

victimisation experiences, just as criminals neutralise their criminal activities. Moreover, according to Agnew, individuals can assert that victimisation does not cause significant damage, that they have learned valuable lessons from victimisation, or that they can act with confidence that criminals will be punished in a just world. Therefore, they can enhance the perception that they have control over their own lives. Consequently, the design of questions can influence the degree to which social actuality is captured. At this point, putting a time limit on victimization questions can be viewed as an essential step. According to Schneider (1981), even when time limits are included in the questions, participants deviate from the timeframe by 25 percent when questioned about the last 6 months and by 11 percent when asked about the last 12. Therefore, this can be considered as a limitation. According to Killias (1990), the setting of a time limit may reveal the notion that researchers are insensitive to victimisations experienced at various times and that these experiences are unimportant. Therefore, Killias stated that by adding when and where questions to the victimisation questions administered without a time limit, this issue can be avoided (Killias, 1990). Russo and Roccato (2010), who tested how long a victimization would have a positive impact on a person's fear of crime, determined that victimizations that occurred prior to 12 months have no effect on a person's fear of crime. However, it has been suggested that direct and indirect victimizations experienced within a 12-month period have an increasing impact on individuals' fear of crime. Similarly, Norris and Kaniasty (1994) examined the effects of violent and property-related crimes and discovered that victims recover within one to one and a half years, with the greatest likelihood of recovery occurring between three and nine months. Individuals are more emotionally traumatized by violent crimes than property offences. Therefore, time can be regarded a factor that requires consideration when analysing the results of victimisation studies. Adaptive behaviours acquired in response to fear can be argued to be another effective variable in obscuring the positive relationship between victimisation and fear of crime (Özascilar, 2013; Yin, 1980). Individuals can play effective roles in reducing risk and fear by acquiring new behaviours.

In evaluating the impact of victimisation on individuals, the various experiences and adaptive behaviours of men and women can also be viewed as crucial factors. Hille (1999) asserted that fear can lead women to adopt avoidance or protective behaviours in their daily lives. According to her, these adaptive behaviours and trauma-induced psychological conditions, which arise as a result of victimisation and attempted crime,

can result in the abandonment of the public sphere by women. In this sense, it can be claimed that women's gains in the public sphere after the feminist struggle can be negatively affected by the factors of crime and fear of crime.

Consequently, the victimisation hypothesis is not an approach that can explain fear of crime on its own, like the vulnerability and shadow hypotheses. Different coping strategies, the passage of time, and the formulation of research questions can influence the research findings. Moreover, considering the chapter of this thesis that explains crime theories, a crime phenomenon should not be evaluated as merely the relationship between the victim and the criminal. Crime can have varying degrees and types of impacts on the community and, consequently, on other individuals living in the region.

3.2.1. Indirect victimization hypothesis

As mentioned, the phenomenon of crime can have an indirect effect on other people as well as on the victim. For this reason, the relationship between indirect victimization hypothesis and fear of crime can be considered very important. Clark (2003) states that it is possible to observe disappointment, shock, and depression in victimised individuals. However, according to her, this circumstance is not limited to those who directly experience victimisation; their friends, families, social connections, and others who receive the news through the media can also experience fear and anxiety through empathy. In their study, Skogan and Maxfield (1981, p.14-175) stated that individuals can acquire a vast network of information about their surroundings through interaction and cohesion with the region, and as a result, they are continuously aware of crime events in the region in which they reside. In addition, they discovered that indirect victimisations were four times more prevalent than direct victimisations in their study. In this sense, if the general thesis of indirect victimization hypothesis is included; It is suggested that the fear of crime can also be explained by focusing on the victimizations heard and seen instead of solely focusing on the crime victimization that individuals experience directly (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.26; Hale, 1996). Consequently, interactions between individuals and the media can play a significant role in spreading victimization experiences. In this context, the relationship between the media and fear of crime is discussed in the following pages of the thesis under a discrete heading.

Skogan and Maxfield (1981, p.162-175) found a positive correlation between indirect victimisation and fear of crime when the relationship between indirect

victimisation and fear of crime is examined. According to them, the strength of this relationship is also dependent on the severity of the crimes and the proximity of the individuals who experience indirect victimisation to criminal activities. Taylor and Hale (1986) also asserted that learned crime victimisations was effective in raising a concern against crime. In their study of British travellers, Mawby and others (2000) found that groups with a fear of crime also experienced victimisation or heard of victimisation experienced by others. Roccato and others (2011) stated, in a similar but also distinct way, that there is no direct effect of direct or indirect victimisation on fear of crime, but that the effects of these variables are apparent through the mediating variables such as perceived social disorder. In this sense, according to them, being a victim of a crime or receiving information from people who have been victims of crime can increase fear of crime by altering perspectives on the environment. Not only does indirect victimisation induce anxiety, but it can also result in adaptive behaviour. According to Xie and McDowall (2008), who studied the effect of direct and indirect victimisation on the relocation of individuals, indirect victimisation can also be viewed as one of the push factors influencing moving alongside direct victimisation. Nonetheless, the conclusion that witnessing violent offences cannot be regarded as a push factor is an intriguing finding from their research. So, it can be argued that, as a result of the separation of society into those with economic resources and those without, interactions between certain social groups will decrease as a result of the departure from crime-ridden areas.

As a result, it is possible that indirect victimisation is a phenomenon that can influence a person's fear of crime and contribute to the development of adaptive behaviours, just as direct crime victimisation can. However, the nature and severity of the crimes should also be considered, and women's and men's experiences should be addressed along the gender axis.

3.3. Social Disorganisation Theory

The central argument of social disorganisation theory can be stated briefly as the disintegration of the organisational schema in the living area, the loss of control over the society's individuals, and the inability to instil common objectives and values (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.32-33). It can be argued that this theory is subdivided, despite the fact that different classifications have been used in various studies. Therefore, within the scope of this thesis, social disorganization theory will be examined under the headings of

subculture diversity approach, social cohesion hypothesis and social and physical incivilities, respectively.

3.3.1. Subcultural diversity approach

The subcultural diversity theory, like many other theories that explain fear of crime, is founded on a factor that influences fear of crime. In this sense, if the main thesis of the theory is included, the subcultural diversity theory asserts that fear of crime may arise when people live in close proximity with people whose cultural structuring differs from their own, and the key point in this process is the assumption that individuals with different cultural structuring will not understand each other's behaviours (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.35). Similarly, according to Bauman (2018, p.14), foreignness can induce fear and panic. Because, according to him, when locals and outsiders interact, the ability to predict may be lost and obscurity may reign. If the empirical findings of the theory are examined, it is not possible to see an ongoing consensus throughout the studies. However, it would be beneficial to provide a theoretical background on the conflict that arises from the coexistence of different cultures before addressing these findings and the methodological differences observed in their acquisition.

Despite the fact that the notion that race represents a distinct scientific hierarchy has been falsified and is no longer accepted, race is still accepted as a discursive social construction in contemporary societies and continues to influence the behaviour of individuals and societies (Best, 2005, p.149-150). Consequently, it can be claimed that alliances and conflicts based on factors such as ethnicity and race can continue to exist in communities where various cultures coexist. When today's world is considered, it can be mentioned that there is a constant interaction with the globalisation process, and depending on this interaction, various groups can coexist. According to Appadurai (2006, p.7), because this situation blurs the distinction between us and them, it conveys with it a desire for ethnic-cultural classification, that is, a desire for regulation that arises in the face of uncertainty and chaos, which can lead to violent acts. Bauman (2018, p.9-11), like Appadurai, drew inferences about being outsiders; according to him, the immigrant community in particular is typically categorised as useless in the destination country and is therefore deemed unnecessary. In this sense, it is possible that this functionalist evaluation of a human group may result in a disregard for human values. Concerning the regions where locals and foreigners coexist, which is the focus of the subcultural diversity

theory, Wacquant (2015, p.12-43) stated that there may be ghettoization in the context of race and class in certain regions and that people in the same social position may congregate in these regions with distinct borders and centres. According to him, the fundamental assumptions of the dominant paradigm regarding these regions are that they are barbaric, untamed, and unruly. Consequently, these regions can be characterised as communities characterised by crime and deviant behaviour.

When examining the studies that test the subcultural diversity theory, it is possible to conclude that the results obtained from diverse research populations differ. In accordance with the central tenet of the subcultural diversity approach, a number of studies have discovered a positive correlation between diversity and fear of crime in regions with diverse ethnic compositions (Akyuz et al., 2021; Chiricos et al., 1997; Kennedy & Silverman, 1985; Lane & Meeker, 2000; Semyonov et al., 2012). When these findings are analysed in greater depth, even though Kennedy and Silverman (1985) discovered a positive relationship, this relationship between cultural diversity and fear of crime is weak. According to Chiricos and others (1997), the perceived form, not the actual ethnic composition of the region, is a significant variable in predicting fear of crime. However, they also emphasised that this perception is effective with whites but not with blacks. Additionally, blacks exhibited increased fear in white-dominated neighbourhoods. In this sense, the relationship between otherness and fear of crime can be related to being a minority or majority in the region. In the study conducted by Semyonov et al. (2012), who noted that the data acquired may vary between nations, the subcultural diversity approach was supported and it was discovered that the perception of security is greater in regions where Europeans are homogeneous than in other regions. In a similar vein, Akyuz et al. (2021), reported that encounters between Syrians and the people of the region increase the element of insecurity and threat, which in turn increases the fear of crime. In contrast with these findings, Bennet and Lavin, who tested the hypothesis that individuals in cultures that support and protect each other will exhibit less fear, discovered that the group with higher crime rates, as well as poorer and culturally diverse, exhibited less fear of crime than the other groups. In a different study, it was hypothesised that interactions between people of diverse ethnic backgrounds would reduce uncertainty and that mutual acquaintance would reduce fear of crime. However, according to the findings of the study, interactions between people of diverse ethnicities were not very effective in reducing fear of crime (Mears & Stewart, 2010).

Regarding the studies that are examined in this section, except for the work of Akyuz and others (2021), the global measurement of fear of crime, that is, the measurement of fear of crime without including various types of crime, has been employed by the researchers. This circumstance can be viewed as a barrier to accurately documenting social actuality. Discussions on global measurement are given later in this thesis. However, if a general recommendation is made; when attempting to correlate reactive situations resulting from encounters between groups of different ethnic origins with fear of crime, Ditton and others (1999) suggested using questionnaires containing different types of crimes, which can produce results that focus on the fear of crime instead of using global measurements. In this sense, a generalisation can be made to the effect that cultural diversity's uncertainty can cause anxiety and fear. Nonetheless, this does not imply that the same outcomes will occur when diverse categories of crime are considered.

3.3.2. Social cohesion/integration hypothesis

The social cohesion or social integration is another hypothesis discussed under the heading of social disorganisation theory. If this hypothesis is briefly explained, its main argument is that fear of crime is associated with individuals' integration with their own neighbourhoods (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.36). According to Skogan and Maxfield (1981, p.99-106), strong social ties to the neighbourhood or the environment can generate a sensitivity to the problems of that region, and individuals with a high level of cohesion can participate in collective actions for their environment. As a result, the sense of unity can be evaluated as a means of fostering a climate of trust by reducing vulnerability and isolation, and consequently lowering the fear of crime (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.36; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, p.99-106). Numerous studies investigating the relationship between fear of crime and neighbourhood cohesion support the hypothesis that there is a negative correlation between cohesion and fear of crime (Box et al., 1988; Karakus et al., 2010; Lindström, Merlo, & Östergren, 2003; Markowitz, Bellair, Liska, & Liu, 2001; Rountree & Land, 1996; Scarborough et al., 2010). In conclusion, it can be stated that unity and the resulting sense of belonging foster an atmosphere of trust. In addition to having a negative effect on fear of crime, social integration is also negatively associated with crime, according to Bellair's study (Bellair, 1997). However, Bellair, who also examined the frequency of interactions in this context, stated that, despite the perception that daily conversations between individuals and their neighbours are logically more

effective for a high level of integration, inconsistent conversations are also quite effective in establishing ties between them. Therefore, the absence of consistent interactions may not always indicate a low level of integration.

If the factors that affect neighbourhood cohesion are taken into account, it can be said that as the cultural heterogeneity of the residing area increases, social cohesion decreases (Markowitz et al., 2001; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, 99-106). Markowitz and others, who examined social cohesion in terms of its effect on fear of crime, discovered that the relationship between perceived social disorder and cohesion was negative after analysing the British Crime Survey data. In addition, it has been found that people living in city centres show low neighbourhood integration. Consequently, high social mobility can also be viewed as a factor that hinders neighbourhood cohesion. In a different study that used different types of questions than those used to measure neighbourhood cohesion in the literature, although friendship, trust, and belonging were found to be associated with fear of crime, there was no significant relationship between sense of community and fear of crime when other factors were controlled for (McCrea et al., 2005). However, due to the use of different questions, the comparability of this study with other studies should be questioned.

Consequently, neighbourhood cohesion can be defined as the collective unity and interactions of individuals with their own communities, as well as the resulting sense of belonging and trust. Therefore, it is possible to state that this sense of unity might have a negative influence on fear of crime.

3.3.3. Social change hypothesis

According to Furstenberg (2000), it is unknown precisely when the phenomenon of crime was perceived as a major public issue, but it is possible that fear of crime arose as a result of ongoing major social changes, economic and ethnic conflicts. In addition, he asserted in his paper that, according to the relevant literature, in the change processes of the prevalent norms, those who experience the most distress due to change are also those who fear crime the most. However, at this point, it may be crucial to discuss whether social change directly influences fear of crime. In other words, the question of whether or not social change influences fear of crime via mediating variables is important. In accordance with the neighbourhood cohesion hypothesis, a study conducted in Texas found that social integration is negatively associated with fear of crime. Additionally, it

was discovered that anxiety about future economic changes is a factor that increases senior individuals' fear of crime (Eve & Eve Brown, 1984). Hunter and others (2009) wanted to determine if there was a correlation between rapid social change and fear of becoming a victim of crime, so they examined four towns that experienced rapid change. In the findings, although the former residents of the regions can be seen as those who experienced the changes the most, the immigrants who came during the period of transition were the group with the highest fear of crime. In explaining this situation, hunter et al. emphasized that being a former resident of the region indicates ongoing social ties, and newcomers are therefore the group most affected by the change. In parallel, Liu and others, in their study examining the relationship between the social change process and fear of crime in China, stated that in the regions with high social change, the elderly exhibit less fear of crime than the young, and this may be due to the differentiated social networks caused by the generation gap (Liu et al, 2009). This finding can be interpreted as the elderly are able to maintain their ongoing social ties and thus have greater neighbourhood cohesion. Similarly, Krannich and others (1989), who examined four rural areas in the United States, asserted that social change can influence the fear of crime by altering the integration of individuals and their perceptions of the surrounding order. Focusing more on the psychological perspectives of individuals and the relationship between social change and fear of crime, Jackson (2004) asked why some perceive incivilities more than others. According to him, if individuals have authoritarian attitudes and are comparatively more concerned about social changes in their communities, their perception of social disorder may increase, and they may be more worried about becoming a victim of crime. Therefore, when the relevant literature is examined, it is possible to conclude that social change processes and fear of crime have a significant relationship. Researchers should remember, however, that this relationship may not exist directly, but rather through mediator variables such as incivilities and neighbourhood cohesion.

3.3.4. Social and physical incivilities

The last hypothesis, examined under social disorganisation theory, focuses on the relationship between social and physical incivilities and fear of crime. The main argument presented within the context of this hypothesis is that environmental incivilities and stimuli conveying a lack of control and the possibility of peril can induce fear of crime

(Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.38). Individuals can experience fear, anxiety, isolation, and insecurity due to incivilities, according to Ross and Mirowsky (1999), and these incivilities can be physical, such as litter or graffiti, or social, such as noisy neighbours and unsupervised adolescents. Nonetheless, it is crucial to note that every action categorised by individuals as incivilities is not a crime, but instead falls under the category of cultural deviation. Therefore, it may be normal for individuals of various cultural perspectives to perceive the environment differently. Nevertheless, according to Ross and Mirowsky (1999), individuals should have comparable perceptions of incivility in the region. An exemplary study of this type of differentiation was conducted in Australia, and individuals identified nearly 300 incivilities in the findings obtained from the focus group discussions (Phillips & Smith, 2003). In the cited incivilities, in addition to the behaviours that can be considered offences, there are actions that can only be described as deviant behaviour or that some individuals may not even notice. Consequently, the issue of what comprises incivility may vary by culture.

Taking into account the empirical findings regarding the relationship between social and physical incivilities and fear of crime, it can be stated that many studies have found a positive correlation in accordance with the hypothesis, despite the inclusion of various measurement forms of fear of crime (Bennett & Flavin, 1994; Borooah & Carcach, 1997; Box et al., 1988; Brunton-Smith, 2011; Chadee et al., 2017; Gray et al., 2011; LaGrange et al., 1992; Lane & Meeker, 2003b; Scarborough et al., 2010). According to Taylor and Hale (1986), there is no evidence of a significant correlation between incivilities and fear of crime, in addition, their measurements did not reveal any correlation between physical incivilities and fear of crime. According to LaGrange and others (1992), the relationship between incivility and fear of crime is weak but positive. However, when the effect of incivilities on fear of crime is examined alongside risk perception, it has been suggested that risk perception acts as a mediator variable between incivilities and fear of crime. If we examine more closely what these incivilities are; for the purpose of measuring incivilities, participants were typically asked to rate the degree to which situations such as graffiti, unsupervised adolescents, drug users, garbage, vandalism, noise, and abandoned houses pose a problem in their neighbourhood (Ferraro, 1995; Gray et al., 2011; Taylor & Hale, 1986). Using this measurement technique, it is possible to briefly state that, although the relationship between incivilities and fear of crime has been found to varying degrees by various studies, the consensus is that social

and physical incivilities can influence fear of crime. Regarding this relationship, Brunton-Smith (2011) examined this hypothesis in reverse and hypothesised that fear of crime may lead to the perception of disorder. However, the findings acquired by the researcher who conducted a longitudinal study supported the incivilities hypothesis. Therefore, social and physical incivilities should be taken into account when a fear of crime study is to be conducted.

Robinson and others (2003), using a longitudinal research design to investigate the relationship between incivilities and fear of crime, reported an increase in crime rates during the research years. According to them, within the framework of the vulnerability hypothesis, the most vulnerable group is comprised of those who are dissatisfied with their neighbourhood and believe that the problems in their area are growing. In conclusion, it can be stated that the vulnerability of individuals is a variable that is likely to influence the perception of incivilities and, consequently, the perception of risks in the region.

Consequently, social and physical incivilities can be viewed as a significant factor influencing crime fear. In addition, the effect of risk perception should not be disregarded when analysing the relationship between incivilities and fear of crime. Lastly, paying attention to which social groups perceive incivilities most strongly may contribute to the development of the hypothesis.

3.4. Influence of Media on Fear of Crime

Among the approaches to explaining fear of crime, the last theoretical approach to be discussed in this thesis is the relationship between media consumption and fear of crime. To comprehend how this relationship is formed, however, it is necessary to first provide concise theoretical information regarding the media's relationship to socialisation processes. Regarding the role of the media in socialisation processes and its influence on individuals' perceptions of their lives, Gerbner et al (1986, p.18-28) stated that television, which entered our lives with the emergence of mass media, became an active participant in the process of shaping social constructions. Similarly, Sacco (1995) stated that media content is determined by the ideologies of the groups or individuals who own the media, and that the media can play an active role in the process of making meaning of and constructing life. The point that should not be forgotten here is that, despite the fact that the contents of mass media can be effective in the construction processes, the groups that

are the recipients of the interaction are not homogeneous, and as a result, the findings may change when different groups are considered, rather than making a one-dimensional inference.

Within the framework of the content of violence on television and its relationship with the viewer, Gerbner and Gross (1976) asserted that offenders and victims typically consist of certain demographics, arguing that the elderly, women, middle-aged, and young men can be stigmatised as potential criminals or victims. In support of this assertion, Jackson and Gouseti (2014) also stated that fear and harsh responses might rise towards those who are stigmatised as a result of the stigmatisation of certain groups as potential perpetrators and potential victims. Therefore, it is possible that the divide between some social groups that comprise the social structure will widen, that fear-based sanctions will be enacted against these groups, and that normal interactions between groups will diminish. The process of isolation and stigmatisation that results from this can evolve into a self-reinforcing dynamic that gives birth to practises that disregard human rights gains. According to Eschholz (1997), exaggerated violence events and dramatization may lead to a greater fear of crime and, consequently, calls for stricter control and punishment.

Individuals, according to Heath and Gilbert (1996), are encircled by the media due to mass communication, and it is therefore impossible to be completely protected from news and ideological representations disseminated through the news. If the news content in the media is examined, for instance, it is possible to observe the storyized and dramatized versions of violence news on television in the United States, despite the decline in individual acts of violence (Eschholz, 1997; Romer et al., 2003). When examining the relationship between media content consumption and fear of crime, however, it is not possible to state that there is a consensus among the studies' findings (Ditton et al., 2004; Romer et al., 2003). In the United States, Romer and others (2003) examined the media consumption of individuals and found that violence and narcotic crimes were the leading concerns. Additionally, they discovered a positive correlation between television viewing and fear of crime. In their California research, Lane and Meeker (2003a) found that previous victimisation and living near to the city centre have an influence on fear of crime, but they were unable to find a correlation between whites' television viewing practices and fear of crime. However, this situation changed among Latinos, and a positive correlation between television viewing and fear of crime emerged.

Weitzer and Kubrin (2004), who examined the relationship between media consumption and fear of crime in Washington D.C., found that viewing local television channels had a positive effect on fear of crime, but they were unable to detect a relationship between other media categories and fear of crime. Chadee and Ditton (2005), on the other hand, conducted face-to-face interviews with 705 Caribbean residents and found no correlation between media consumption and fear of crime. Kohm and others (2012) examined the relationship between media and fear of crime among university students in Canada and the United States, concluding that there was a positive correlation between local television consumption and fear of crime among American students. However, no such correlation was discovered for Canadian students. Referring to ongoing contradictory findings, Ditton and others (2004) asked the participants what media they followed and how frequently, using a mixed approach. Their quantitative data did not indicate any relationship between media consumption and fear of crime as a consequence of the data they collected. Qualitative data, on the other hand, demonstrated that individuals are not led to an unquestioning opinion as a result of their media consumption and that consumers interpret media content in light of the information they have gathered from their surroundings. In this sense, it can be said that media consumption and the sensational reporting of various crime news have no universally positive effect on the fear of crime among all individuals. Based on the findings of these studies, it can be concluded that media consumption can produce a social construction that can induce fear of crime in individuals, depending on the type and amount of media used. However, this construction process may vary as a result of individuals participating in interaction processes as active subjects and interpreting the content in various ways. Consequently, it can be stated, within the context of this perspective, that the research universe and various groups within this universe may have diverse responses.

3.5. Defining And Measuring the Fear of Crime

In terms of its consequences, fear of crime has significant effects on both individuals and society. According to Box et al. (1988), fear of crime can cause anxiety and stress, as well as emotions of insecurity, distant behaviour, mistrust of the justice system, and a desire for harsher sanctions. In this sense, understanding and assessing the fear of crime, as well as formulating possible policies based on research findings, can thus be viewed as crucial for sustaining social continuity and the humane treatment of

individuals. Despite being a significant phenomenon that has been the topic of numerous studies, there is no consensus in the literature regarding how to conceptualise and operationalize fear of crime. Croake and Hinkle (1976), who reviewed methodological issues in fear research, concluded that fear and anxiety questions are frequently misunderstood and that those who claim to measure fear in studies actually measure anxiety, while those who claim to measure anxiety actually measure fear. Moreover, according to the researchers, if fear is to be measured, it must be represented symbolically in the questions. And further major critique of traditional measures of fear of crime is that numerous studies claimed to assess fear of crime by incorporating questionnaires such as the British Crime Survey or the National Crime Survey, without distinguishing between perceived risk and fear of crime (Warr & Stafford, 1983). In this way, Warr and Stafford intended to build a system for assessing the fear of victimisation caused by specific crimes and the underlying causes of this dread. In this study, which assumed that fear of crime depended on both the severity and perceived danger of certain crimes, it was expected that when both severity and perceived risk are high, fear will be high, whereas fear will diminish when either severity or perceived risk is low. The researchers, who included specific crime categories in their inquiries, questioned the participants on how likely they were to become victims of various crimes, the severity of the crimes, and how fearful they were to become victims of these crimes, and their hypotheses were validated (Warr & Stafford, 1983). In addition to the Warr and Stafford's study, *The Measurement of Crime* by Ferraro and LaGrange (1987) is possibly the most constructive criticism and hence a significant addition to the conceptualization and operationalization of the fear of crime. According to them, fear of crime measurements proceeded without a conceptual definition and an agreed-upon operationalization, and research were conducted without distinguishing between cognitively perceived risk and fear as an emotional response. According to the researchers, who noted that cognitive perception evolves through perception and that the emotional response is a reaction against the symbols connected with crime or the crime itself, "fear of crime is a negative emotional response to crime or the symbols associated with crime." (Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987). In the years that followed, Ferraro (1995) revised the definition of fear of crime to "an emotional response of dread or anxiety to crime or symbols that a person associated with crime." However, in both studies there are a number of constructive criticisms that might be viewed as crucial to fear of crime measures. Consequently, among global assessments, such as the

British Crime Survey or the National Crime Survey, the notion that it is impossible to differentiate between perceived risk and fear based on the question formats utilised stands out and in addition, it was emphasised that the participant should not be left to interpret the meaning of the survey questions, as many forms of crimes may be encountered by individuals in their everyday lives, and not all crimes have the same significance (Ferraro, 1995, p.21-39; Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987). Therefore, in the light of this standpoint, it may be stated that researchers must include certain types of crimes in their survey questions. Similarly, Hale (1996) stated that in surveys such as the British Crime Survey, which he referred to as formless fear measurements in his study, question patterns such as “how safe do you feel being out alone in the dark?” may be insufficient to measure fear of crime and that the meaning of the question was left to the participant’s imagination because even the word “crime” was omitted. Briefly, it can be noted that the use of single indicator questions in measures of fear of crime was found to be inferior to surveys that cover several types of crime, that is, use multiple indicators. Rountree and Land (1996), highlighting the necessity of the distinction between cognitive and emotional measurement, stated that there is a correlation between perceived risk and fear, which is an emotional response. Moreover, they claimed that researches that include certain types of crimes and those that do not differ in their findings. In this context, the perspectives of Hale, Rountree and Land are parallel to those of Ferraro and LaGrange. Ferraro and LaGrange (1987) also argued that those with a risk perception may not always exhibit fear. Consequently, they hypothesised that the question pattern "how fearful are you of becoming the victim of (the offence) in your everyday life?" would be useful for assessing the fear of crime in everyday life using the survey questions, as it simulates daily life. In addition, Ferraro, who acknowledged in his later work that there was no ideal measurement system and that the surveys could capture imagined fear, emphasised that the sense of possible risk interacts with fear regarding the fear of crime definition he developed (Ferraro, 1995, p.7-39). Within these contexts, the researcher should differentiate between fear and risk since, as can be seen, risk and fear have been found to interact in earlier studies, but it has also been argued that studies without this distinction had validity issues. In addition, the comparability of research undertaken with different measurement types can be viewed as a question mark. Another important point is that by including diverse sorts of crime in the questions, it is possible to prevent participants from misinterpreting the questions, and it should be noted that different types of crime might

evoke different types of fear. Even if it is imperfect, the question patterns should have a structure that resembles everyday life. It can also be stated that it is vital to specify the offences in the questions in order to create a questionnaire that does not rely on the participants' comments and ideas. According to Doran and Burgess (2012, p.70-71), crime is defined by the law; yet, from a social perspective, crime can also refer to atypical types of behaviour. In order to generate findings closer to social reality, it may be essential to add detailed explanations of the particular offences listed in the questions.

Fear of crime and emotional measurement questions created by Ferraro and LaGrange were also criticised. According to Warr (2000), even the most effectively used definitions are lacking, and in Ferraro and LaGrange's (1987) definition of fear of crime as an emotional response, it is unclear whether the response is anger, anxiety or helplessness. In addition, Warr argued that fear is an instantaneous reaction and, from a psychological and linguistic standpoint, indicated that fear of crime might be an anxiety, despite the fact that this was not reflected in the research of fear of crime at the time. Therefore, he suggested that questions that assess worry rather than fear could be more useful for measuring fear of crime. (Warr, 2000). Gray et al., who argued that there was an inadequacy in the survey measurements created with the "how worried" question pattern and that the conceptual framework of anxiety was left to the participant's opinion, have also stated that not including how frequently fear or anxiety is felt in the measures may make the fear of crime phenomenon appear more or less significant than it is (Gray et al., 2008). In this regard, field research conducted by Gray et al. in London in 2011 revealed that worry or fear might manifest in action and motivate individuals to engage in adaptive behaviour (Gray et al., 2011). This situation expresses the view that some of the behaviours that result from fear or anxiety, such as avoiding risky areas or carrying pepper spray, can be effective in reducing fear or anxiety, and thus it can be asserted that fear of crime or anxiety has a reflexive relationship with the behaviours developed. Researchers (Gray et al., 2011) who asked participants whether they were worried about a particular type of crime, the frequency of their anxiety, and the behaviours that developed after anxiety, such as avoidance and protection, concluded that some participants felt safer after taking precautions against anxiety and fear. In this sense, fear and anxiety can have negative effects in the social setting, but individuals can minimise their fear and anxiety by their actions.

Evidently, it is essential to differentiate between cognitive and emotional measurements and to examine the effect of the results of the two measurements on each other and their relationship to the literature by employing both methods simultaneously. In addition to these two assessment kinds, a measurement of behaviour has also been established. The primary objective of behavioural measurement is to go beyond emotional and cognitive assessments in order to decrease continuing restrictions and examine the impact of various behaviours by focusing on avoidance and protection (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.76-79). As previously indicated, Gray and other's (2011) study revealed that individuals' behaviours prompted by fear or risk include a reflexive structure. Similarly, in early research in the literature, Yin (1980) noted that the actions acquired after being a victim of a crime might be adaptive, that is, they can reduce the fear of crime, but on the other hand, in his study, Ferraro (1996) revealed that behaviours such as avoidance and protection enhance fear. In contrast to Ferraro's findings, Özascilar (2013) found that avoidance behaviour was negatively associated with fear. In a later study that she and Ziyalar conducted on university students in Türkiye, they found that avoidance behaviour was negatively related and protective behaviours were positively related to fear of crime (Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017). As can be observed, there is no consensus in the literature regarding this issue. However, the reflexive relationship between behaviour and fear of crime has been the subject of several studies conducted across a variety of time periods; hence, behaviours can be regarded as essential variables in fear of crime studies. In general, behavioural questions include behaviours such as not venturing out alone, avoiding certain areas, limiting daily activities, installing additional alarms and locks, acquiring a weapon, carrying a defensive device, acquiring a guard dog, installing lighting outside the home, and requesting travel companions (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.76-79; Ferraro, 1995, p.135-136; Garofalo, 1981, Özascilar, 2013). In this context, it is crucial to integrate behavioural measurements with emotional and cognitive measurements in this thesis and to investigate the link between behaviour, fear, and risk.

3.5.1. Factors affecting fear of crime and empirical contradictions.

Even if it was mentioned when discussing the theoretical approaches that explain the fear of crime, it is necessary to review the empirical contradictions of the theories that explain the elements that contribute to the fear of crime in this chapter. Because the literature review indicates that the differences in measuring methods and, of course, the

samples taken from different universes are the primary cause of the contradicting results. Therefore, in this context, demonstrating briefly and clearly some of the conflicts and their origins can better explain how the questionnaire utilised in the field research phase of this thesis was developed.

In its simplest form, the victimisation hypothesis establishes a relationship between one or more criminal victimisations experienced by individuals and their fear of crime, and asserts that being a victim of crime has a positive effect on the level of fear of crime (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.26-27; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, p.59-69). In some research that evaluate the distinction between specific crimes and emotional cognitive assessments, a positive correlation between prior victimisation and fear of crime was not observed (Ferraro, 1996; Mesch, 2000). In contrast, Ditton et al. (1999), who included particular crimes and measured anger against crime in addition to emotional measures, found that those who had previously been victims were both more afraid and angrier. In addition, Skogan and Maxfield (1981, p.59-69) noted that specific types of crimes and a time limit were added in the past victimisation questions, and that past victimisation had a positive impact on fear. However, Lalli and Savitz (1976) included particular sorts of crime and evaluated anxiety but were unable to find victimization's effects. While Box et al. (1988), who use traditional measurement methods, adopted the view that previous victimisation is effective on fear, Borooah and Carcach (1997), who included particular crime types and analysed fear assessment in a traditional manner, observed that there was no significant correlation between persons' victimisation and their fear of crime.

As can be seen, there may be inconsistencies within the literature, even when using the same measuring formats. Regarding the effectiveness of victimisation on fear of crime, Yin (1980) stated that if there is no significant harm following victimisation, victimisations can even serve as a fear reducer due to the acquisition of adaptive behaviours. In addition, he suggested that it would be appropriate to ask about a period in the past, like the past 12 months, as well as the date of the victimisation that occurred during this time frame when conducting a study on victimisation. In addition, Skogan (Skogan, 1987) noted the uncertainty of the relationship between victimisation and fear in the research and stated that in survey studies, individuals who have not experienced victimisation may be more fearful. Noting that other studies have indicated that the effects of victimisation can diminish within months, Skogan stressed the need of determining whether or not each victimisation should be categorised in the same manner (Skogan,

1987). Schneider (1981) emphasised that the victimisations reported in the surveys must be compared with the police reports, and that participants can add their previous victimisations to the questions even if a time period is specified in the grievance questions in the surveys. He also noted that there is a 25 percent deviation in questions asking for 6-month periods and an 11 percent deviation in questions asking for 12-month periods. In this sense, it can be said that victimisations should be handled with specific crimes in terms of measurement accuracy, the concepts of crime should be explained, and a time period should be added to the questions for the validity of the measurement and the uncertainties that may be experienced.

Another of the ongoing uncertainties of the literature findings can be seen in the relationship between vulnerability and fear of crime. The core tenet of the vulnerability approach is that groups with distinct sociodemographic characteristics will exhibit varying levels of fear of crime (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.29-30). However, similar to the relationship between victimization and fear, it can be stated that there are empirical contradictions regarding this approach. Accordingly, within the framework of this approach, it is stated that women and the elderly are more fearful despite their low victimisation risk (Box et al., 1988; Taylor & Hale, 1986). On the other hand, according to LaGrange and Ferraro (1987), the reason for the elderly's high fear of crime in spite of their low victimisation risk is the measurement of fear of crime with formless fear questions. According to them, it is possible to detect that the elderly is fearful when the questionnaire is not divided into cognitive and emotional sections, does not cover crime types, and consists of standard single-indicator questions. Within this paradigm, the results of several studies indicate that the classical vulnerability approach cannot be confirmed in studies involving specific types of crime and cognitive and emotional measurement of fear of crime (Ferraro, 1995, p.67-83; LaGrange & Ferraro, 1987). Similarly, Rountree and Land (1996) stated that there is a contrast between the formless fear question patterns and the questionnaires that include specific crimes within the framework of the vulnerability approach in the fear of crime research, they also highlighted that when specific crime types are included in surveys, the opposite findings of the vulnerability approach can be found which is that young people and/or men may be more afraid in the face of certain crimes. Warr (1984) also emphasised that women and the elderly are portrayed as more scared despite low victimisation chances in research and asserted that the use of formless fear assessments is the primary reason for

these outcomes. Accordingly, in his study, Warr, who measured the emotional and cognitive types of fear of crime and the severity of sixteen different crimes, determined that the gender variable was a factor influencing fear, while the age variable did not have a positive effect for some types of crime, and in some cases, young people were more fearful. One of the most crucial aspect of Warr's (1984) study is the question of why women report higher fear than males. Accordingly, Warr underlined that situations such as being approached by a stranger elicit high levels of fear because they conceal the possibility of crimes such sexual assault and murder. In this sense, it can be said that he offered another reason for women's high fear, apart from the vulnerability approach. Building on these findings and dealing with the question of why women show more fear than men, Ferraro (1996) later developed the shadow hypothesis and stated that face-to-face crimes also carry a possible victimization of sexual assault. Thus, for example, it should be underlined that the crime of burglary is never perceived as limited to theft. In line with the shadow hypothesis, similar findings were reported in studies that conducted both in Sweden and Türkiye (Özascılar, 2013; Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017). Therefore, in some cases, the measurement method itself can also predict in what form the research results will come out. Regarding this thesis, since the research is divided into cognitive and emotional measurements, it is not reasonable to hypothesize that the elderly will be more afraid than the young. However, it can be hypothesized that women will show more fear than men.

In addition to vulnerability, criminal victimisation, and the shadow hypothesis, research indicate that individuals' views of their living environment can influence their fear and risk perception. In numerous research that do not differentiate between cognitive and emotional measures, but instead employ formless fear measures, the theory that cultural variety is a significant impact on fear of crime due to individuals' inability to interpret behaviours has been observed (Bennett & Flavin, 1994; Chiricos, Hogan, & Gertz, 1997; Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.35; Kennedy & Silverman, 1985; Mears & Stewart, 2010). Despite using similar measurements, Kennedy and Silverman (1985) discovered that cultural diversity was an effective but weak variable on fear, whereas Bennett and Flavin (1994) asserted that members of culturally diverse group experience low fear of crime. Chiricos et al. (1997), on the other hand, noted that in culturally diverse locations, heterogeneity affects whites but cultural composition does not affect blacks. However, an important note that can be made regarding their work is that fear can be

conveyed not by cultural variety but by being a minority and outsider in the region. Mears and Stewart (2010), who expected that alienation and fear would reduce owing to coexistence and interaction between diverse cultures, observed that interracial or inter-ethnic contact is not particularly helpful at reducing fear of crime. Akyuz et al. (2021), who researched the effect of Syrian refugees on fear of crime in Türkiye, included both the conventional measure of fear of crime and questions regarding attitudes toward Syrian migrants. Accordingly, they emphasised that local communities' fear of criminality is influenced by how immigrants are perceived.

Like cultural diversity factor, social and physical incivilities, which have the potential to create the feeling that one's own community is collapsing, have also been studied as one of the key determinants influencing the fear of crime (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.36). Regarding this variable, which has been covered under a distinct title in the preceding sections of this thesis, there are varying findings in the literature. Taylor and Hale (1986), for instance, concluded in their study that there is no clear correlation between incivilities and fear, and that physical incivilities (such as abandoned houses, automobiles, and graffiti) experienced by individuals had no effect on their level of fear. Using traditional measurement techniques, Box and others (1988) investigated the hypotheses of vulnerability, environmental-individual factors, and distrust of institutions, and found that women and the elderly are more afraid than men. Also, mentioning that fear increases in regions with high urbanization, the researchers emphasized that perceived incivilities are an effective variable on fear. Unlike other studies that are mentioned regarding this factor, LaGrange et al. (1992), who highlighted that social and physical incivilities were regarded a variable influencing fear of crime in various studies and tested this theory, applied both risk perception and emotional measurement of fear, in contrast to other studies. Consequently, they discovered that incivilities related to risk perception and fear. However, when the association between fear of crime and incivilities is the primary focus, risk perception appears as the mediating variable between the two variables. In addition to these research, a correlation between social and physical incivilities and fear of crime has been demonstrated by a large number of studies employing a variety of measurement techniques, including both formless fear and emotional and cognitive measures (Borooah & Carcach, 1997; Chadee et al., 2017; E. Gray et al., 2011; Lane & Meeker, 2003b; McCrea et al., 2005; Özascilar, 2013; Pantazis, 2000). Taylor and Covington (1993), who tested the hypothesis that social and physical

incivilities and the structural change of the living area affect the fear of crime, conducted their research using traditional measurement techniques. According to their findings, social changes affect fear through perceived incivilities; thus, perceived incivilities have assumed the role of an intermediate variable in this context. Reversing the association between incivility and fear of crime, Brunton-Smith (2011) questioned whether fear of crime is a significant variable in perceiving incivility. Accordingly, he tested the idea that fear of crime creates a perception of disorder but in accordance with the finding of relevant literature, incivilities' effect on fear of crime has been found (Brunton-Smith, 2011). As can be seen, numerous studies have demonstrated that social and physical incivilities influence the fear of crime. In light of this, it would be essential to test this approach on the sample within the scope of this thesis. Within the framework of the questions on social and physical incivilities, it was asked how big of a problem garbage, abandoned houses and vehicles, graffiti on the walls, vandalism, noisy-bad neighbours, stray youth groups, drunks, beggars, and drug users posed in the area (Gray et al., 2011; LaGrange et al., 1992; McCrea et al., 2005; Mesch, 2000; Pantazis, 2000).

Another variable usually reviewed as a factor influencing fear and risk perception in fear of crime research, and the other variable to be addressed within the scope of this thesis, is the individual's local cohesion, also known as integration. If we describe the concept of cohesion or integration in a single statement, it can be said that neighbourhood cohesion is the capacity of a community to exert control over its members (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.36). Numerous research undertaken within this framework have highlighted the negative association between community cohesion/integration and crime fear (Box et al., 1988; Karakus et al., 2010; Rountree & Land, 1996; Scarborough et al., 2010; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, p.80-124). However, these studies are typically based on data gathered from traditional crime fear measurement techniques. In this regard, result can be different because of the measurement method utilised in this thesis. This hypothesis frequently asks about trust in neighbours, requesting for assistance, maintaining regular touch with them, and an overall sense of belonging to the area (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.36; Ferraro, 1995, p.134-135). Regarding the findings of these studies, it can be said that the notion that individuals' interactions with their surroundings and their harmony with their neighbours can alter their fear and risk perception, and therefore one's cohesion with his/her neighbourhood can be seen as a significant and testable factor for this thesis.

3.6. Fear of Crime Studies in Türkiye

On the basis of worldwide literature and, in particular, studies conducted in Western countries, it is possible to assert that fear of crime studies in Türkiye are relatively recent and have a 15-year history.

Karakus and the others (2010) did a study on the fear of crime by analysing data obtained by the Turkish Statistical Institute and in the study, which is significant since it provides information on a nationwide scale, fear of crime was measured through the use of formless fear question patterns. The general findings of the study indicate that the theory that older individuals are more fearful than younger people, which is also supported by the vulnerability hypothesis (Box et al., 1988; Taylor & Hale, 1986), was rejected, and that a greater level of education and income were negatively associated with fear of crime. On the other hand, while it is proven that women have a greater fear of crime than men, the data supported the victimisation and social disorganisation theory, and a negative correlation was identified between neighbourhood cohesion and fear of crime (Karakus et al., 2010). In another study conducted in Malatya during the same period, it was desired to describe and explain the fear of crime experienced by the residents of the city and the factors affecting fear of crime (Uludağ, 2010). In the study, in which the majority of participants were young and high school graduates, forty percent of the participants did not feel safe, women generally displayed higher fear than males, and the effect of age on fear of crime could not be confirmed to be significant. In addition, no significant correlation was discovered between victimisation and security, and adequate street illumination was identified as one of the elements that positively influence the perception of safety (Uludağ, 2010). Another supportive finding regarding the relationship between street lighting and fear of crime was provided as a result of a study conducted by Aytaç and others (2015). Utilising various types of crime in their measurement of fear of crime, they demonstrated that the efficacy of lighting and fear of crime were negatively related. In addition, the researchers also claimed that the elderly showed a greater fear of crime than the younger ones. The fact that both studies (Karakus et al., 2010; Uludağ, 2010) used formless fear measurement makes it difficult to compare them to research that have adopted different measurement methods, as discussed in this thesis under the topic “Factors affecting fear of crime and empirical contradictions.” However, neither study considered age as a significant variable associated with fear, which may contradict other studies that have utilised formless fear measurement

techniques (Box et al., 1988; Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.29-30; Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987; Rountree & Land, 1996; Taylor & Hale, 1986).

Çardak, who conducted a qualitative study on the fear of crime experienced by urban women, unlike other studies, interviewed 30 female participants residing in Ankara and reported that, in general, women experience fear of crime, but it does not impact with their daily activities (Çardak, 2012). In addition, Çardak asserted that women have a heightened fear of sexual crimes within the context of their physical vulnerabilities and emphasised that indirect and direct victimisation have a significant impact on fear of crime. On the other hand, she also emphasised that not all crime victimisations have the same significance and that the repercussions of significant crimes elicit varying degrees of fear. Regarding general coping methods, it was noted that individuals adopted behaviours such as avoiding unsafe regions (Çardak, 2012). As can be noticed, within the context of Çardak's findings, Ferraro and LaGrange's (1987) and Warr and Stafford's (1983) assumption that different crimes had distinct consequences and dimensions was supported.

Addressing the fear of crime in the context of gender, Öztürk and others sought to determine what types of crimes women fear. Accordingly, in the study, which employed different types of crimes to measure fear of crime, women were defined as more fearful and having a greater risk perception than males (Öztürk et al., 2016). Moreover, they also found that women have adopted behaviours such as avoidance and protection in response to fear of victimisation. In this sense, it can be interpreted that the findings of Öztürk and others' study are in line with the discoveries of Çardak's (2012) qualitative study.

Adapting Ferraro's fear of crime scale to her research, Sipahi (2016) conducted her research in 26 Turkish city centres. Accordingly, it was reported that participants did not feel safe walking outside at night, that drunks, strangers, and groups of young people were unpleasant, and that sexual assault, terrorism, and armed or physical assault were the most feared crimes. In this sense, it is possible to say that the study has supported certain situations from the theory of neighbourhood cohesion and incivilities that are associated with fear of crime. Furthermore, the study revealed that different types of crimes produce varying levels of fear and unlike other studies, participants were asked where they may be exposed to crime, and streets, parks, immigrant neighbourhoods, and public transportation were identified as the most dangerous locations (Sipahi, 2016). Therefore, it can be said that for policies and research that can be developed in the future, it is

important to ask where the probability of being exposed to certain types of crimes is high. Adoption of such questions is also consistent with the recommendations for future research made by Farrall et al. (1997), who analysed methodological issues associated with fear of crime. Moreover, as can be observed, the elevated fear of crime associated with serious crimes appears to be consistent with the findings of numerous studies discussed in this thesis.

Among the research undertaken in Türkiye within the context of fear of crime literature, Özaşçılar and Ziyalar's (2017) study on university students in Istanbul is one of the most credible. In the study, which included both emotional and risk measurement of fear of crime and tested vulnerability, victimization, Shadow hypothesis, neighbourhood cohesion and incivilities approaches, women were found to be more fearful than men, in accordance with the literature findings. In the study where the shadow theory was validated and sexual crimes were among the most feared, avoidance behaviour was discovered to be negative associated with fear of crime, whereas protective behaviour was found to be positively associated (Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017).

Karasu (2018), who conducted her research in Şanlıurfa utilising single indicator question types, that is formless fear questions, stressed that locals view asylum seekers, tribe members, drunks, and beggars as security risks on the whole. However, because of its measurement technique, it is questionable how accurately the assessment reflects crime fear and how comparable it is to other studies. According to a study conducted by Akyuz and others (2021) on the fear of crime expected to be caused by Syrian refugees, the public views asylum seekers as an economic burden and a general security concern. Finally, Ozcurumez and Mete (2021), who examined locals' attitudes of refugees and their fear of crime, found that local women marginalise asylum seekers, perceive them as a threat, and stigmatise them by connecting them with criminality.

In addition to publications published in academic research, there are several master's and doctoral theses on fear of crime in Türkiye. This thesis does not explore all of them, but research that are deemed relevant will be included. In a study that related to the scope of the thesis and is the oldest in history, it was intended to demonstrate that, despite the prevailing literature findings, the fear of crime in the lives of women and the elderly occupies less room and is less significant (Gaziarifoğlu, 2009). As indicated by Ferraro and LaGrange (1987), the questionnaire containing several variables was administered in three distinct Kadıköy areas. Consequently, it has been determined that

question types with a single indication cannot produce the same findings as scales with multiple indicators, and that gender and age are not relevant variables when assessing fear of property crimes. However, indirect and direct victimisations were highlighted as relevant and positively effective variables under the category of crimes against property, while gender was deemed a major variable and age was considered irrelevant within the category of against individuals (Gaziarifoğlu, 2009). In this respect, it may be claimed that different types of crime have varying effects and scopes, and that characteristics such as gender and age are ineffective for creating fear of every sort of crime. Again employing the questionnaire form proposed by Ferraro (1995) within the framework of his study, Kul (2009), whose research focuses on evaluating the fear of crime and its social structure, has employed a mixed approach. It was reported that the rise in crime rates led to a rise in fear of crime and that participants adopted adaptive actions such as avoidance or protection. At the same time, it was noted that, on average, women exhibit greater fear than men, and the disparity of fear levels grew when it came to sexual offenses. In addition, hearing about crime victims in the news and losing faith in the security-justice system were identified as fear-inducing factors (Kul, 2009). In a related thesis study, which noted that women have a high level of fear and that indirect direct criminal victimisation has a positive effect on fear of crime, it was reported that life-threatening, that is, serious crimes elicit a greater level of fear (Çetin, 2010). In addition to these findings, which correlate with Warr and Stafford's (1983) assertion that significant crimes elicit greater fear, it is argued that employment, high education and income lessen fear. Relations with neighbours was not shown to be a significant determinant on fear of crime; nevertheless, social trust was discovered to be negatively associated to fear, while incivilities was found to be positively related (Çetin, 2010). Noting that women exhibit a greater fear of crime than men and that individuals adopt adaptive behaviours such as avoidance and protection due to their fear of crime, Gökulu (2011) used the fear of crime scale produced by Ferraro (1995) for his study. Along with the findings supporting the victimisation theory, in line with the Çetin's research, he also asserted that different types of crime have distinct victimisation impacts. Boztoprak (2018), who sought to describe in depth the fear of crime experienced by university students regarding the effects of various types of crime, reported that, based on in-depth interviews with 40 students, female participants were most afraid of sexual assault, armed or physical attack, whereas male participants were most afraid of fraud, armed or physical attack. Considering the

victimisations, it was claimed that women experienced sexual harassment the most, and it was also underlined that women's daily lives were more constrained than men. Examining the association between gender perception and fear of crime, Taşcı (2020) came to the same conclusion as international and domestic research: women have a greater fear of crime than men. Similarly, Taşcı, who utilised Ferraro's fear of crime scale, reported that based on his fieldwork in Istanbul's Sultangazi and Kadıköy neighbourhoods, Sultangazi inhabitants with low incomes have a higher risk perception, but do not differ much from Kadıköy in terms of fear of crime. In addition, Taşcı emphasised that the length of time spent in a populated location is negatively correlated with fear, and noted that individuals with high earnings have a low risk perception (Taşcı, 2020).

Unlike previous research in the national literature, Mıstaçoğlu (2021), who examined the association between education and fear of crime, measured the difference in the degree of fear of crime between those who had received education about crime and those who had not. Consequently, according to the findings of the study involving students of forensic science and new media and communication, it was emphasised that fear of crime and perception of insecurity were high for both groups, and that academic competence regarding crime may be a minor factor in reducing fear. In the study, which examined several types of crime, it was also mentioned that crimes against persons elicited greater fear than crimes against property, and it was emphasised that victimisation was positively connected to fear for some crime types but negatively related to fear for others (Mıstaçoğlu, 2021). In the final research of the national literature conducted within the scope of this thesis, the measurement of formless fear and the effect of social and physical problems and police attitudes on fear were examined. According to the findings of the research, the fear of crime has a negative impact on the usage of public places by persons, whereas environmental incivilities have a positive impact on the fear of crime (Alkan, 2021).

When these studies, which have contributed to the national and international literature from Türkiye, are evaluated in general terms, it can be stated that there is no consensus on fear of crime studies in Türkiye, and it is questionable how comparable the studies are due to the differences in measurement types. However, although there are different types of measurement, in each of the studies conducted in Türkiye, in parallel with the international literature, it can be stated that women have a higher fear of crime

than men (Karakus et al., 2010; Kul, 2009; Öztürk et al., 2016; Taşçı, 2020; Uludağ, 2010). Moreover, based on the findings of articles and dissertations, it can be asserted that different types of crime produce distinct victimisation effects and varying levels of fear (Çardak, 2012; Gaziarifoğlu, 2009; Gökulu, 2011; Mıstaçoğlu, 2021). Instead of employing question patterns assessing formless fear in research, it may be possible to better depict the reality of daily life by structuring questionnaires to include more than one crime type. An further intriguing finding from the studies conducted in Türkiye is that a positive correlation between age and fear of crime could not be established in some of the studies, regardless of whether the formless fear question pattern was utilised or not (Gaziarifoğlu, 2009; Karakus et al., 2010; Uludağ, 2010). Although this is an expected conclusion in studies employing multiple indicators, it is unexpected in studies employing single indicators (formless fear) question formats. The difference in cultural and social structure between European and American societies may be the cause of this anomaly. In short, it can occur as a result of population and sample differentiation. It is also seen that many studies conducted in Türkiye do not claim to be generalizable, unlike studies conducted in Western societies that aim to represent the nation or a city. Lastly, when examining the elements that influence a person's fear of crime, several research have found that past victimisations influence the fear, while different types of crime have distinct effects (Çardak, 2012; Gaziarifoğlu, 2009; Gökulu, 2011; Mıstaçoğlu, 2021). In addition, the majority of studies have indicated that social and physical incivilities influence the fear of crime (Alkan, 2021; Çetin, 2010; Karakus et al., 2010; Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017; Sipahi, 2016).

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

This section of the thesis describes the methodological technique utilised within the scope of this research. The research model, the construction of the applied questionnaire within the context of the literature, the variables employed and their relationships, the pilot study, the sample selection, the technique of data collection procedure, and its analysis were described, respectively. This chapter offers a justification of the relationship between the approach used and the fear of crime, as well as a discussion of the relationship between the variables used and the method applied.

4.1. Type of the Study

Both criminology and victimology studies can be evaluated as developing fields in the literature of Türkiye. For this reason, descriptive and generalizable information about the fear of crime experienced by people of different provinces, urban centres, or rural areas is lacking for a large number of provinces and regions. Therefore, the main purpose of the research conducted within the scope of this thesis is to produce descriptive information about the fear of crime and risk perception that may be encountered in daily life practices, and to examine the factors affecting the fear of crime and risk perception in two Eskişehir neighbourhoods with different socio-economic structure and location. Thus, the study is not restricted to collecting solely descriptive data. It also seeks to evaluate hypotheses derived from national and international literature, discover the correlations between variables, and compare the results with those of other studies. The research is therefore correlational and comparative as well as descriptive.

Within the aim of this thesis, a survey was conducted to acquire descriptive information about the two selected neighbourhoods of Eskişehir and to measure the fear of crime. In survey research, which is one of the non-experimental approaches, information about attitudes, thoughts, and the current situation, in brief, is acquired via survey questions. In this context, the primary purpose of survey research is to collect data by asking the target population questions about the research problem and to evaluate hypotheses formulated within the context of the relevant literature (Christensen et al, 2020, p.368-393). In the process of acquiring information about the population, the selection of the sample from the population is crucial, and it can be said that the size of the sample and quotas such as gender and age influence the generalizability of the survey (Creswell, 2012, p.375-422). It can be noted that there are normally three techniques for

administering questionnaires (İslamoğlu, 2011, p.117). For the purposes of this thesis, the method of administering questionnaire was used. In addition to the use of a questionnaire, e-mail, telephone, and in-person interactions are also available in descriptive information-gathering survey studies. Among these options it can be said that face-to-face interview-based survey research has a high rate of generating responses to questions and enables the researcher to make observations (Neuman, 2014, 315-365). However, considering the high funding, labour, and expense requirements, as well as the nature of the fear of crime questions, it can be said that the questionnaire format is more appropriate for this study.

4.2. The Design of The Questionnaire and The Pilot Study

As stated in this thesis under the heading "Defining and Measuring the Fear of Crime," there is no consensus in the literature regarding the definition and operationalization of fear of crime. Warr and Stafford (1983) asserted that the British Crime Survey and the National Crime Survey fail to distinguish between the fear of crime and the perception of risk, and that the perception of risk and the severity of crimes influence the fear of crime. Taylor and Hale (1986) remarked that the word crime is not even mentioned in commonly used surveys such as the British Crime Survey, and that the question form "how safe do you feel being out alone in the dark?" may have nothing to do with the fear of crime at all. Finally, Ferraro and LaGrange (1987), who made the greatest contribution to the literature, stated that "fear of crime is a negative emotional reaction to crime or the symbols associated with crime." Therefore, according to them, it is important to know the difference between perception and fear. In addition, researchers asserting that not every type of crime will have the same significance and meaning stated that the impact of the phenomenon in daily life can be better comprehended with the questionnaires created by including various types of crimes and that risk perception can influence a person's fear of crime (Ferraro, 1995, p.21-36; Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987). In this context, both emotional and cognitive measurements of fear of crime were incorporated into the questionnaire developed for this thesis study. In the preparation of the questionnaire and the development of the question patterns, the operational definition of fear of crime was derived from Ferraro's and LaGrange's studies; accordingly, questions like "how afraid are you of being victim of fraud in your everyday life?" were adopted for the emotional measurement of fear of crime. For the risk perception measurement, questions like "how likely do you think it is to become a victim of fraud in

the next year?” were employed (Ferraro, 1995; Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987). Based on statistics from the Turkish Statistical Institute (2021), the most often prosecuted crimes in Eskişehir were chosen for the selection of crime types. In addition to these crimes, crimes of different seriousness and importance, which Warr and Stafford (1983) also stated, arouse fear in different degrees with different individual and social effects, and in this context, crimes such as sexual assault and murder were added to the research. The reason for this preference is that national and international publications on fear of crime in Türkiye have determined that women are generally more fearful than men, that different types of crimes create varying degrees of victimisation and fear, and that women are generally more fearful of becoming victims of sexual crimes (Çardak, 2012; Gaziarifoğlu, 2009; Gökulu, 2011; Karakus et al., 2010; Kul, 2009; Mıstaçoğlu, 2021; Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017; Öztürk et al., 2016; Taşçı, 2020; Uludağ, 2010). Odunpazarı and Tepebaşı, which are the centre areas of the city, contain the 88 percent of the city’s inhabitants. Therefore, it can be said that the records of the Turkish Statistical Institute (2021), which lists the offences for Eskişehir, mainly represents the urban areas. Therefore, the research questions were expected to better grasp the reality of fear of crime in the daily lives of the participants. In addition, as part of the emotional assessment, participants were asked how often they experienced fear over the past year. The primary purpose of this question is to prevent fear from being viewed as a greater or lesser problem than it actually is when measuring fear of crime (Gray et al., 2008; Warr, 2000). In their research on methodological problems in the measuring of fear of crime, Farrall et al (1997). concluded that asking where fear is felt is essential for capturing the reality of fear of crime. In this sense, participants were asked separately for each type of crime where they were afraid in the emotional measurement and where they were likely to experience crime victimisation in the risk measurement. The primary objective of these questions is to identify potential problematic areas and provide insight into the policies and research that may be implemented in this context.

Before the emotional and cognitive measurement, the participants' perceptions of their own vulnerability, their cohesion with the neighbourhood, and the social and physical incivilities in the neighbourhood were measured. Afterwards, they were asked whether they were victims of any of the crimes mentioned in the survey in the past year. According to the vulnerability hypothesis, people with varied sociodemographic features would exhibit varying levels of fear (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.29-30). However,

empirical contradictions based on measurement differences are a typical finding in the scientific literature. With the question patterns used in the formless fear measurements, such as the National Crime Survey or the British Crime Survey, women and the elderly are generally found to be more fearful than men. However, similar results were not found in studies that distinguished between emotional and cognitive measurements (Box et al., 1988; Ferraro, 1995; Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987; Rountree & Land, 1996; B. R. Taylor & Hale, 1986).

Although it can be said that measurement type can be important and affect the results of the study based on the findings, there was no evidence of a significant relationship between age and fear of crime, regardless of the measurement in some of the Turkish fear of crime literature (Gaziarifoğlu, 2009; Karakus et al., 2010; Uludağ, 2010). Also, another explanation for women's high fear of crime results, rather than the vulnerability hypothesis' explanations, is that the possibility of sexual assault is hidden in face-to-face crimes, resulting in high fear outcomes. This hypothesis, also known as the shadow hypothesis, is supported by the findings of empirical studies (Ferraro, 1996; Özascilar, 2013; Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017; Warr, 1984). Numerous research conducted in Türkiye have also confirmed that women are more fearful of being victims of sexual crimes (Boztoprak, 2018; Çardak, 2012; Kul, 2009; Sipahi, 2016). Another characteristic that is likely to interact negatively with fear and risk is neighbourhood cohesion. In these questions, which assess neighbourhood integration, participants are questioned about the frequency of communication with their neighbours, neighbourhood cohesion, and whether or not they feel a part of the neighbourhood. In addition, neighbourhood cohesion was discovered to be negatively correlated with fear of crime in a number of research employing formless fear measuring methodologies (Box et al., 1988; Karakus et al., 2010; Rountree & Land, 1996; Scarborough et al., 2010; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, p.80-124). The perception of neighbourhood social and physical incivilities is connected with the perception that the living area is in a state of collapse (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.36). Respondents were asked how problematic certain situations in the neighbourhood were, such as beggars, drunks, drug users, unsupervised youth, irritating neighbours, trash, graffiti, vandalism, abandoned vehicles, and empty houses and buildings. Neighbourhood incivilities have been identified as a factor positively influencing fear of crime and risk perception in both traditional and emotional-cognitive measurements (Alkan, 2021; Borooah & Carcach, 1997; Chadee et al., 2017; Gray et al., 2011; Karakus et al., 2010;

Lane & Meeker, 2003; Özascılar, 2013; Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017; Pantazis, 2000; Sipahi, 2016). In the study conducted by LaGrange et al. (1992), social and physical incivilities were identified as a variable that influences fear via risk perception, that is, risk perception was evaluated as a mediating factor.

In the literature, criminal victimisation of persons in the past has also been investigated as a factor influencing fear or risk perception under the name victimisation hypothesis (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.26-27; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, p.59-69). Even among studies that used the same approach to measure fear of crime, various results were obtained about whether past victimisation affected fear; thus, there is no consensus in the literature regarding this issue (Box et al., 1988)(Jason Ditton et al., 1999)(Ferraro, 1996)(Lalli & Savitz, 1976)(Mesch, 2000). Regarding the ambiguity in the literature, Skogan (1987) asserted that not every crime victimisation will have the same effect and that the effects of previous victimisation on fear and risk may diminish over time. Therefore, in the questionnaire produced for this thesis, the participants were questioned if they have been a victim of various and specific crimes within the previous year. The goal of this type of question is to eliminate ineffective prior victimisation recalls by imposing a time limit and to differentiate between the impacts of crimes such as threats, theft, and attempted murder. In addition, participants were asked how frequently and where they had been victims of the specified crime in the previous year. On this basis, it is intended to have foresight regarding the policies that can be implemented in the problematic areas, as well as to determine the amount to which the stated crime categories provide a problem for society and how they impact fear and risk perception. Lastly, Yin (1980), who argued that crime victimisation can help to the development of adaptive behaviours in participants when previous victimisations do not have a significant effect, suggested that victimisation may have a negative influence on fear in this case.

The last section of the questionnaire consists of behavioural measurement. This section's primary objective is to collect data on the participants' observable adaptive responses following the crime, fear, and risk perception, and to look beyond the results of fear or risk measurements, that is, to lessen their limitations (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.76-79). This section's most essential aspect is that the behaviours that result from fear or risk influence fear and risk, that is, fear of crime, risk perception, and adaptive behaviours can be dealt with reflexively (Ferraro, 1996; Gray et al., 2011; Özaşçılar &

Ziyalar, 2017). Again, there is no consistency among the findings about the connection between fear and behaviour. According to Ferraro (1996), avoidance behaviour and protective behaviour, such as carrying a defensive device, increase fear. However, Özaşçılar (2013) discovered a negative relationship between avoidance behaviour and fear, and Özaşçılar and Ziyalar (2017) discovered that avoidance behaviour was negatively correlated with fear of crime and protection behaviour was positively correlated with fear of crime. Despite of having contradicting results, adoption of behaviours for avoidance or protection is also among the general findings in the Turkish literature (Çardak, 2012; Gökulu, 2011; Kul, 2009; Öztürk et al., 2016). In behavioural measuring questions, participants are typically asked if they have additional locks or alarms on their homes, if they have a gun or dog for protection, and if they avoid certain neighbourhoods due to crime (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.76-79; Ferraro, 1995, p.135-136; Garofalo, 1981; Özascilar, 2013).

Within the scope of this study, it has been agreed that risk and fear have different meanings and measures, and that Ferraro and LaGrange's (1987) definition of fear of crime as "a negative emotional reaction to crime or the symbols associated with crime" has been accepted. The main reason why the fear of crime was not asked with the question pattern "how worried are you about becoming a victim of the (specific offence)?" in the survey questions is due to the methodological issue that participants might interpret the word "worry" in different ways and, therefore, not provide the same responses (Farrall et al., 1997). In this context, the emotional and risk assessment questions contained a variety of crimes. Because evidence from several studies suggest that not all crimes have the same impact on both individuals and society in social behaviours, and because the severity of crimes influences fear (Ferraro, 1995, p.21-37; Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987; Hale, 1996; Rountree & Land, 1996; Warr & Stafford, 1983). As stated, the data of the Turkish Statistical Institute (2021) was used to determine the different types of crimes, and according to these data, the most convicted crimes between 2011 and 2020 are assault, theft, traffic crimes, opposition to bankruptcy, violation of the protection of the family, fraud, threat, murder and drug use. Some crimes that were not committed against an individual were removed from the questionnaire and some crimes that may serve as examples in real life but are difficult to discover were added to the study. Therefore, the study includes the following crimes: theft within the home, theft outside the home, property damage, threats, fraud, extortion, assault, murder, sexual harassment, and sexual

assault. In the emotional measurement of fear of crime, participants were asked to rate their fear of becoming a victim of the specified categories of crime in their daily lives on a scale from 1 to 10. As a result of Ferraro and LaGrange's (1987) study, the expression of the word "everyday life" is associated with their recommendation. The inquiry is meant to replicate the participants' daily habits. Afterwards, it was intended to prevent fear from appearing as a lesser or larger problem than the existing one by asking the participants how often and where they experienced such fear over the last year, and by identifying the socially problematic places. In the risk measurement, also known as the cognitive measurement, participants were asked to provide a score between 1 and 10 for the likelihood of becoming a victim of the same types of crimes in the next year. In addition, participants were questioned about the likely location of the crime. The purpose of this section is to identify risky regions and make comparisons to the questions in the emotional measuring title.

The objective of the vulnerability hypothesis section of the questionnaire was to determine whether respondents considered themselves healthy and whether they could defend themselves against crimes that could threaten their physical integrity. Due to the invalid reliability coefficient, however, these items were excluded from the primary study. Concerning the Neighbourhood Cohesion theory, respondents were asked if they considered themselves to be a part of the neighbourhood, how frequently they communicated with their neighbours, whether they trusted their neighbours, and if they observed outsiders in their neighbourhood. In the framework of neighbourhood incivilities, the respondents were asked how much of a problem were littered trash, annoying neighbours, graffiti, empty houses, unsupervised youth, drunks, drug users, abandoned vehicles, beggars, vandalism and inefficient street illumination. A seven-option Likert scale was utilised in all three sections. Typically, the Likert scale consists of five alternatives, although on scales with five options, participants are occasionally required to select options that are further away than typical (Joshi et al, 2015). In order to avoid this limitation, seven different options are presented, and it is aimed to better understand practical life.

Questions about crime victimization are related to specific types of crimes that participants have been victims of in the last year. In accordance with the recommendations of Skogan (1987) and Yin (1980) on victimisation, the questions include a time restriction and the number of victimisations in the past year. The crime

types used in the emotional and cognitive scales were used. In the final section of the questionnaire, participants were asked, using yes or no questions, which of the adaptive behaviours against crime they may have acquired. The forms of behaviour described in this chapter of the questionnaire are derived from numerous studies or have been culturally modified (Doran & Burgess, 2012; Ferraro, 1995; Garofalo, 1981; Özascilar, 2013).

Gender, age, marital status, education, occupation, income, neighbourhood of residence, duration of residence, number of people in the household, and whether they follow the Turkish agenda on television or social media were among the demographic questions asked to determine the participant's position in social life. The reason for asking questions with media monitoring is the possibility of the emergence of fear of crime as a result of seeing and hearing different types of victimizations. Gerbner and others (1986, p.18-28) asserted that television has entered our lives as a new socialisation tool and can therefore influence individuals' perceptions and teach them that the social world can be harsh, aggressive, and unreliable; they termed this phenomenon the cruel world syndrome. However, according to Gerbner and Gross, who examine the representations of violence in television content, those who show violence and those who experience violence have certain types of profiles, that is, ethnic minorities, the elderly, women, and middle-aged men are repeatedly portrayed in certain stereotypes, and those with particular socio-demographic characteristics can be stigmatised or have a heightened fear of crime (Gerbner & Gross, 1976). Similarly, it was noted that within the context of certain characteristics of the victims in the crime news in the media, the perception that particular groups are targeted more and the audience's fear may increase (Jonathan Jackson & Gouseti, 2014). Although it has been asserted that the media can have such an effect, field investigations have shown contradictory results. In their study conducted in Toronto, Doob and Macdonald (1979) were unable to identify a significant relationship between television and fear of crime. Moreover, Heath and Petraitis (1987) found that seeing crime phenomena through media monitoring does not create fear of crime in their own neighbourhoods or regions, but rather in remote inner-city areas that are typically coded as places to fear. Multiple studies in Türkiye have claimed that the media has a positive effect on fear of crime. In this regard, inquiring whether news contents are watched in the media and paying attention to how often they are followed can contribute to the controversial point in the literature.

4.2.1. Pilot study and the reconstruction of the questionnaire

Pilot studies are essential components of quantitative studies in general, as they provide the researcher with the information necessary to identify questionnaire flaws and inaccuracies and to address potential field problems (Christensen et al, 2020, p.368-393). After establishing the questionnaire's content, a questionnaire was administered to 30 adults over the age of 18 in four different neighbourhoods in Eskişehir to evaluate the measurement's validity and reliability. In the pilot study, 14 of the 30 participants were interviewed via voice recordings regarding the survey items. The determined neighbourhoods were selected at random from the districts of Odunpazarı and Tepebaşı, which make up 88.79% of Eskişehir's total population, according to the Eskişehir Governorship of the Turkish Republic (2022). Two neighbourhoods are located in the city's core, while the remaining two can be called suburbs. Similar to the main field study, the researcher established a quota for the pilot field study based on gender and age factors. If gender, ethnicity, location, and similar factors in the universe are relevant to the research and exist in varying quantities throughout the universe, these factors are considered while selecting the sample (Salkind, 2012, p.101-102). Therefore, in order to reflect the primary fieldwork issues that will be addressed in the next step, the pilot study was designed to contain an equal number of male and female participants as well as individuals from different age groups. During the fieldwork, it was not possible to reach female participants beyond the age of 60 or male participants between the ages of 36 and 44. This is owing to the fact that the majority of male participants were working during the pilot study, and elderly female volunteers generally refused to engage in the study out of concern for their safety. Due to these reasons, access to the various age groups intended for the pilot study was not possible.

In providing measurement reliability, it is crucial that the same result is obtained even if the measurement is performed at different times, and that the same answers are obtained from different groups when asked the same questions (Neuman, 2014, p.201-245). Therefore, it can be said that clear conceptualizations, the use of a precise measurement, the use of multiple indicators, and a pilot study are required to strengthen the reliability. According to the results of the participant interviews conducted following the pilot study carried out for the purpose of this thesis, the concept of net household income, which is included in the demographic questions, is misunderstood by the participants. However, one of the most challenging problems of the study is the

understanding of the neighbourhood incivility ($\alpha=0.91$) questions. Some of the participants responded by imagining how problematic these conditions might be in our neighbourhood, as opposed to stating how problematic these situations (litter on the ground, annoying neighbours, drunks, etc.) are in their neighbourhood. In addition to answering with hypothetical reasoning in this section, some participants, particularly the elderly, do not understand what graffiti and vandalism are, thus these terms should be clarified.

Greatest challenge to the research's measurement reliability is the ambiguity among the participants about the definition of criminal concepts due to the inclusion of many crime types in the survey. The majority of interviewees claimed that they did not receive assistance from the paper, which provided the general definitions of offences in the survey regarding the context of the Turkish Penal Code, and that they were aware of the crimes' meanings. However, interviews showed that participants confuse some crimes with each other, and the difference between sexual harassment and sexual assault is often unknown. In addition, most of the interviewed participants stated that they would answer these questions more easily if they solved the questionnaire on their own.

In the emotional measurement of fear of crime ($\alpha=0.93$) step of the study, the participants were asked to rate their fears between 1 and 10 by asking how much they feared the following specific types of crime in their daily lives. Due to a lack of agreement on the definitions of crimes, it cannot be argued that all participants understood and rated the same scenarios. In addition, several of the participants, particularly the older participants, did not comprehend that they may assign any number between 1 and 10 points to their level of fear. Another issue is that it is not understood that there are multiple answers to the question "where do you fear most?". Under the risk measurement headline ($\alpha=0.96$), participants were asked to rate the likelihood of becoming a victim of certain types of crime, but the emotional measurement issues were also valid in this section, so it was determined that the questionnaire form could not be understood in a similar or approximate manner based on the findings obtained from the participants who were interviewed.

As a result, without putting the definitions of the offences on the survey form, it is impossible for the participants to grasp the survey in a same manner, and this circumstance significantly impacts the reliability and validity of the study. Therefore, the questionnaire was redesigned with the aforementioned issues in mind, and the definitions

of the concepts were included in the questions in place of the incomprehensible concepts, and efforts were made to prevent participants from providing subjective responses. If this modification is illustrated with an example, the question "How fearful are you of being a victim of extortion in your daily life?" is replaced with "How afraid are you of someone taking your money or property through force and/or threats in your daily life?" Similar changes were also made to other types of crime, such that their respective definitions were included in the questions. In addition, graffiti and vandalism with their descriptive forms were included in the survey.

According to the findings of the pilot study, the question "Do you have a weapon for home protection?" under the behavioural measuring scope was interpreted by many participants as referring to only firearms. In order to prevent this, the question was redesigned and the question "Do you have a weapon (gun, stick, knife, etc.) for protection in your home?" was included.

The decision was made to implement additional questions that were not included in the pilot study. This conclusion was made after reviewing relevant literature and consulting with scholars regarding survey questions. In order to better establish the status of the participants in social life, it was decided to ask whether they lived with their families, with others, or alone, as well as questions on the educational standing of their families. In addition, Mıstaçoğlu (2021) inquired whether the participants' homes were insured against burglary, whether they owned their houses, and how often they went out at night. It is possible to view these questions as pertaining to theft and crimes that may be committed against life or property in society. Therefore, within the scope of this thesis, it was decided to include these questions in the research.

Other variables that fell outside the scope of the pilot study and did not find a place on Ferraro's (1995) fear of crime scale were the participants' level of confidence in law enforcement and to what extent the inadequate street lighting in their neighbourhoods poses a problem. Studies that conducted in Türkiye revealed that inadequate street lighting might be factor that could affect the people's fear of crime. Therefore, the participants were asked, under the neighbourhood incivilities section, to what extent inadequate street illumination is a problem in their neighbourhood.

The primary study also contained questions about confidence in police force, which were anticipated to affect fear of crime. It can be said that there is no consensus regarding the relationship between confidence in police force and fear of crime. There are research

demonstrating a negative correlation between police trust and fear of crime (Alda et al., 2017; Box et al., 1988; Jackson et al., 2009). If these findings are analysed in further depth, it can be stated that areas with high social cohesion and elderly have a higher degree of police confidence (Alda et al., 2017). Jackson and others (2009), who offer a different perspective on the development of confidence in police, asserted that while fear of crime and perspectives of neighbourhood incivilities have negative effects on trust in police, neighbourhood cohesion has a positive correlation with confidence in police force. Despite of these findings, Gray and others. (2011) stated that there was no significant relationship between trust in police and fear of crime. However, Çakar (2015), who studied the relationship between trust in police and fear of crime in Türkiye, concluded that there is a negative correlation between the two variables. Based on these contrary findings, it was decided that the primary study should examine the link between trust in police and fear of crime. The researcher of this thesis adapted the questionnaire used by Gray and others (2011). and included additional questions in order to construct the police confidence questionnaire.

According to the pilot study's reliability calculations, health-related items that were also included in the vulnerability measurement were removed from the main study due to an unacceptable alpha value ($\alpha=0.47$). In addition, despite the ambiguities, the alpha values for neighbourhood cohesion ($\alpha=0.7$), incivilities ($\alpha=0.91$), cognitive ($\alpha=0.96$) and emotional ($\alpha=0.93$) measurements were found to be within the acceptable range. When calculating alpha values, the spss statistics programme was utilised, and calculations were performed on valid questionnaires. However, one of the significant denominators that should be mentioned is that the high scores of the reliability measurements calculated in the pilot studies do not indicate that the questions were properly interpreted, and social reality was captured.

4.3. Research Universe and Sampling

Originally, it was intended that the research sample would be able to represent the universe using stratified sampling, one of the probability sampling types, but stratified sampling was abandoned because the researcher lacked access to the basic demographic data of the research population during the development stage of the research. Consequently, the quota sampling method is chosen for the research as an alternative. Generally, quota sampling can be selected due to the researcher's lack of knowledge of

the target population and the high requirements of probability sampling techniques in terms of time, finance and labour (Neuman, 2014, p.248; Salkind, 2012, p.102). If the characteristics of quota sampling are mentioned; the quota sampling is one of the non-probability sampling types and is typically employed when age, gender, and other similar factors are crucial to the research and stratified sampling is not feasible (Kumar, 2019, p.306-307). When employing such sampling, the population can be divided into small clusters, and the number of participants to enter each cluster can be determined based on the information acquired by the searcher about the research population, and relevant literature findings (Singh & Masuku, 2014). In this way, even though it cannot be asserted that quota sampling has the same representative power as probability sampling, it offers the chance to reflect the diversity of the research population. (Neuman, 2014, p.246; Salkind, 2012, p.104). From this perspective, it can be claimed that it is a recommended sampling method in quantitative research when there are insufficient resources and information to ensure the representativeness of the research.

As stated in the introduction chapter of the research, the primary objective of the research conducted for this thesis is to present the first descriptive information about Eskişehir, which is frequently mentioned in security-related news ([http-1](#) & [http-2](#)), and to investigate the factors affecting fear of crime and risk perception through two neighbourhoods with different locations and socio-economic levels. Therefore, in order to comprehend the effects of neighbourhood cohesion and incivilities and socioeconomic conditions on fear of crime and risk perception, two neighbourhoods with different socioeconomic levels that can be evaluated within the urban area were selected. It has been considered using the development index as the primary criterion for neighbourhood selection; however, the development indexes published by the Turkish Ministry of Industry and Technology include counties, not neighbourhoods, and the Tepebaşı and Odunpazarı counties, which form the centre of Eskişehir, are similar in terms of development (Acar et al., 2022). For this reason, without access to official data, it has been necessary to use data derived from a website that independently analyses real estate values to select two neighbourhoods with different socio-economic statuses. According to the Endeksa's ([http-3](#)) data, the unit prices of the neighbourhoods in the Tepebaşı and Odunpazarı counties were determined on a square metre basis. Consequently, the socioeconomically middle-lower class Gültepe neighbourhood and the middle-upper class Yenibağlar neighbourhood were chosen as the two neighbourhoods to compare.

Location is an additional factor that influences the selection of these two neighbourhoods. It can be said that the Yenibağlar neighbourhood is located in the heart of the city and is a place undergoing constant, dynamic change. Gültepe, on the other hand, is further from the city centre and less dynamic than Yenibağlar. Therefore, it is expected that both neighbourhoods will differ in terms of observed problems and cohesion.

Considering the total population of the selected neighbourhoods, there are 14943 people living in Yenibağlar neighbourhood and 17070 people living in Gültepe neighbourhood (TÜİK, 2022a). Furthermore, there are 26436 people aged 18 or older among the total population (TÜİK, 2022a). Although a probability sampling cannot be used, when 95% Confidence level, 5% Margin of Error, and 83% population proportion (18 years old and older) are requested for a given population size, the appropriate number of participants is determined to be 226 (Taherdoost, 2016). Taking into account the population ratios of the neighbourhoods, it has been determined that minimum 114 participants should come from the Yenibağlar neighbourhood, and 114 participants should come from the Gültepe neighbourhood. However, due to the nature of the quota sampling, it cannot be claimed that the sampling methodology has a confidence level or margin of error (Rea & Parker, 2005, p.172-173). In order to better capture social diversity and collect descriptive data, it is desired to recruit more participants than the sample size considered representative. Accordingly, 130 individuals from each neighbourhood were reached (http-4). Therefore, the questionnaire was applied to 300 people in order to avoid the negative impacts of invalid surveys and to reach the minimum number of 260. It is aimed to ensure equal number of participants from both neighbourhoods and equality in the number of female and male participants in total. The main reason for demanding equality in the number of female and male participants is related to the ratio of men and women in Eskişehir. According to Turkish Statistical Institute (2023) data, there are 455 women and 451 thousand men living in Eskişehir when the gender ratio is considered. Due to the 0.2% disparity in the ratio of men to women, it was determined that men and women should have equal representation in the study. Lastly, to reduce the researcher effect on participants, the questionnaires were conducted face-to-face only when it's necessary.

4.4.. Data Collection Technique and Tool

Within the scope of this thesis, research was conducted in accordance with the quantitative paradigm. Individuals over the age of 18 who reside in the neighbourhoods specified in the sampling section were administered a questionnaire as the unit of analysis for this study.

When conducting a survey study, the main goal is to ascertain attitudes and views of the research population (Christensen et al., 2020). However, survey research itself encompasses a variety of subtypes and applications. According to İslamoğlu (2011, p.117), there are three distinct surveys: the questionnaire, the interview schedule, and the interview guide. Each survey differs from the others within the context of various types of participant-researcher interactions. In this study, a questionnaire is applied, and the participants and interviewer only interacted face-to-face during the submission of the form, and no open-ended questions were posed. The reason for minimising interaction as much as possible is that, based on the results of the pilot study, the majority of participants felt more secure completing the questionnaire alone. However, the questionnaire was administered face-to-face when individuals who were unable to complete the questionnaire on their own, such as the elderly, requested that the questions be read aloud and completed based on their responses. Due to the face-to-face administration of the questionnaire, even though it's rare, the survey application may also be referred to as an interview schedule (İslamoğlu, 2011, p.117). According to Creswell (2012, p.375-422), face-to-face surveys increase response rates, but also increase the researcher's influence on the field and diminish anonymity. Therefore, it can be stated that the researcher employed a mixed approach during the data collection process and the implemented strategy can have both positive and negative outcomes. Lastly, it is generally requested that jargon, prejudices, or vernacular not be included in the research questions (Neuman, 2014, p.365). Hence, such practises were therefore avoided in the design of the questions, and efforts were made to protect the participants from any harm.

Before participating in the survey, each respondent was informed of the topic, scope, and purpose of the study. Participants were not compelled to complete the questionnaire; participation was entirely voluntary.

In order to protect the confidentiality of the participants' information, anonymity was assured, and no names or last names were requested. The collected data were stored

in a password-protected folder on the researcher's computer and were not shared with any third parties.

On March 13, 2023, the field research was initiated in the Yenibağlar neighbourhood, and a total of 150 questionnaires were applied. On March 21, the field research was terminated. For the second neighbourhood, fieldwork initiated on April 2 and 150 questionnaires were collected on April 20. In order to implement the quota sample, the researcher asked individuals living in buildings located in different regions in both neighbourhoods to be participants. Thus, it is desired that the research findings reflect the diversity of the regions. In addition, appropriate and willing participants were recruited using the convincing sample method. The questionnaires were not administered face-to-face unless specifically requested, and efforts were made to minimise the researcher's impact. However, to increase the representativeness of the elderly participants in the field research, a limited number of questionnaires were administered face-to-face in accordance with participant preferences. Except for the collection of the survey data, no audio or video recording, photography, or other similar techniques were employed.

In May 2023, after determining that 25 of the questionnaires obtained from the Yenibağlar neighbourhood were invalid, a questionnaire was administered to 4 female and 1 male participants. As a result, 260 legitimate questionnaires were collected by reaching out to 130 residents of both neighbourhoods.

4.5. Data Analysis

As stated, 130 individuals were reached in each neighbourhood, for a total of 260 people. Using SPSS Version 22, the collected survey information was analysed. As a result of the analysis conducted, descriptive statistics regarding the gender, age, education, income levels and occupations of the participants, media consumption and victimisation rates of males and females from both neighbourhoods were included, followed by analyses of the relationships between the variables in order to answer the main hypotheses and research questions. The missing value analysis of the scales utilised in the research is an additional essential analysis. Therefore, a missing value analysis was conducted for each scale and mean values for each scale were assigned to the missing values. Due to the respective EM means, random missing value distribution is postulated for cohesion ($p=.998$), incivilities ($p=.628$), trust in police force ($p=.861$), and risk

perception ($p=.182$) (Akbaş & Koğar, 2020, p.12-28). Because EM means ($p=.028$) for emotional fear of crime scale, a similar value assignment could not be developed. Lastly, the number of missing values are 1 for cohesion, 14 for incivilities, 5 for trust in police force, and 7 for risk perception. As a result of this analysis, a reliability analysis was performed on the cohesion, incivilities, confidence in police force, and risk perception scales, and values similar to those obtained in the pilot study were acquired. Accordingly, the risk perception scale has a Cronbach alpha value of 0.93, the emotional fear of crime scale has an alpha value of .94, the incivilities scale has a alpha value of .90, and the confidence in police force scale has an alpha of value .86. The cohesion scale consists of 4 different questions as mentioned in the pilot study. However, this value ($\alpha=.61$) was not similar to the Cronbach alpha value from the pilot study. As a result, it was decided to eliminate the fourth question of the Cohesion scale in order to improve its reliability, and a missing value analysis was conducted. Thus, the new alpha value of the scale has been increased ($\alpha=.81$).

4.5.1. Normality distribution of the dependent variables

It is necessary to know the normality distribution of the data acquired from the scales used in the field research in order to comprehend the findings and understand the rationale behind the tests used for the hypotheses. Because whether or not the data exhibit a normal distribution determines whether parametric or non-parametric tests will be used to test hypotheses, and it has been determined that parametric tests are appropriate for a normally distributed data (Güriş & Astar, 2015, p.176). Additionally, it can be said that there are multiple methods for determining whether a scale is normally distributed or not. For instance, the significance values derived from the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk statistical tests should be greater than 0.05, or for the traditionally treated alpha value of 0.05, the skewness and kurtosis values should fall between ± 1.96 (Ho, 2014, p.57). The cohesion, incivilities, confidence in police force, emotional fear of crime, and risk perception scales employed in this study were therefore subjected to a normal distribution test. All Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk test values are less than 0.05 for all scales ($p<.001$). In addition, the skewness, kurtosis, and standard error values for each scale were measured. According to Ho (2014, p.57), the pertinent equation must be used to determine if a scale falls within the range of ± 1.96 ;

$$Z_{skewness} = \frac{Skewness\ value}{\sqrt{Standard\ error\ of\ skewness}} \quad (1)$$

Using the same equation for kurtosis value, general values can be determined. Parallel to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk statistical tests, an examination of the resultant values reveals that the scales do not exhibit a normal distribution.

Table 1 *Skewness and Kurtosis values*

Values Scales	Skewness	Kurtosis	Standard error for skewness	Standard error for kurtosis	Skewness result	Kurtosis result
Cohesion	-0.868	0.077	0.151	0.301	-2.23	1.40
Incivilities	-0.573	-0.588	0.151	0.301	-1.47	-1.07
Confidence in police force	-0.809	0.198	0.151	0.301	-2.08	0.36
Emotional fear of crime	1.228	0.409	0.151	0.301	3.16	0.74
Perception of risk	1.406	1.182	0.151	0.301	3.60	2.15

Consequently, parametric tests cannot be used to evaluate hypotheses. Non-parametric tests, which can be said to be weaker than parametric tests, were employed instead.

CHAPTER 5: KEY FINDINGS AND NOTES

5.1. Demographic Characteristics

5.1.1. Gender

Due to the significance of the gender variable in relation to fear of crime, it was necessary to find an equal number of male and female participants from both neighbourhoods. Even though men were less inclined to participate in the study than women, it was possible to find 65 male and female participants from both neighbourhoods, as seen in the table 2.

Table 2 *Gender*

The neighbourhood currently reside in			Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Yenibağlar	Valid	Female	65	50.0	50.0	50.0
		Male	65	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	130	100.0	100.0	
Gültepe	Valid	Female	65	50.0	50.0	50.0
		Male	65	50.0	50.0	100.0
		Total	130	100.0	100.0	

5.1.2. Age

Similar to the relationship between gender and fear of crime, studies also indicate that there is a positive correlation between age and fear of crime (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.29-30; Sacco & Glackman, 1987; Skogan & Maxfield, p.69-79, 1981; Taylor & Hale, 1986). For this reason, in terms of the accuracy of the analysis of the relationship between fear of crime and age, it could be argued that it is essential to have a balanced distribution of individuals from various age groups in the research. However, field research has revealed that middle-aged and elderly individuals have an extremely low propensity to participate in research.

Table 3 *Age distribution*

The neighbourhood currently reside in			Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Yenibağlar	Valid	18-26	49	37.7	37.7	37.7

		27-35	22	16.9	16.9	54.6
		36-44	22	16.9	16.9	71.5
		45-53	19	14.6	14.6	86.2
		54-62	7	5.4	5.4	91.5
		63-71	9	6.9	6.9	98.5
		72+	2	1.5	1.5	100.0
		Total	130	100.0	100.0	
Gültepe	Valid	18-26	18	13.8	13.8	13.8
		27-35	27	20.8	20.8	34.6
		36-44	39	30.0	30.0	64.6
		45-53	22	16.9	16.9	81.5
		54-62	19	14.6	14.6	96.2
		63-71	4	3.1	3.1	99.2
		72+	1	.8	.8	100.0
		Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Table 3 (The rest of the table) *Age distribution*

In order to prevent the low representation of the middle-aged and elderly groups face-to-face survey conducted when it was necessary. However, as can be seen in the table 3, 68,1 percent of the total participants are under the age of 44. Therefore, it can be said that the number of elderly participants in the study is insufficient. This is notably evident in the Yenibağlar neighbourhood, where the majority of residents are young adults. As anticipated, the proportion of middle-aged participants is higher in the Gültepe neighbourhood, which is home to more working adults and senior citizens than students. The observation that can be made for both communities is that elderly participants, in particular, may be hesitant to participate in research out of fear of being defrauded. During fieldwork, it was also observed that elderly participants had difficulty comprehending the purpose of the study. Due to this, a significant number of elderly individuals declined to partake in the study without the assistance of their younger relatives.

5.1.3. Education levels

The relationship between the education levels of individuals and the fear of crime they experience in daily life is among the questions that this study attempts to answer. In this regard, it may be necessary to provide descriptive information about the participants' general and neighbourhood-specific educational levels.

Table 4 *Education levels*

Education levels		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	I did not graduate from any educational institution.	3	12	1.2	1.2
	Primary School	22	8.5	8.5	9.7
	Secondary School	18	6.9	6.9	16.6
	High School	104	40.0	40.2	56.8
	Associate or Undergraduate	102	39.2	39.4	96.1
	Master's or PhD	10	3.8	3.9	100.0
	Total	259	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		260	100.0		

As can be seen in the table 4, 40 percent of the participants are high school graduates, while 39.2 percent hold an associate or baccalaureate degree. The participants in the Yenibağlar neighbourhood were slightly more educated than those in the Gültepe neighbourhood. Accordingly, 85.4% of Yenibağlar neighbourhood residents have a high school diploma or an undergraduate-associate degree, compared to 73.1% of Gültepe neighbourhood residents. While there is no significant difference in education level between men and women, the number of high school and associate or undergraduate graduates between the ages of 18-53 is high, whereas the rate of primary and secondary school graduates aged 54 and older is higher. In brief, the level of education of those over middle age is lower than that of the young. This may be another reason why elderly individuals hesitate to participate in the study.

5.1.4. The levels of income, marital status and sheltering

One of the primary hypotheses of the study is that groups with higher incomes will exhibit less fear of crime than others. Furthermore, as stated previously, the environment in which individuals reside can also be evaluated in relation to their fear of crime. Therefore, general data regarding income, marital status, and sheltering conditions are crucial for providing information about the sample's fundamental characteristics.

Table 5's general income distribution reveals that the majority of the sample comprising the research sample has a household income between 5,501 and 11,00 Turkish Lira. During the time frame for which the survey was designed, the minimum wage in

Türkiye was 5,500 Turkish Lira. However, the minimum wage was increased to 8,506 Turkish Liras in the period when the fieldwork was carried out. Consequently, it can be asserted that the majority of participants have net incomes below the minimum wage.

Table 5 *Income levels*

Income levels		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-5.500 TL	30	11.5	12.0	12.0
	5.501-11.000 TL	75	28.8	29.9	41.8
	11.001-16.501 TL	55	21.2	21.9	63.7
	16.502-22.002 TL	44	16.9	17.5	81.3
	22.003-27.503 TL	26	10.0	10.4	91.6
	27.504-33.004 TL	10	3.8	4.0	95.6
	33.004 TL+	11	4.2	4.4	100.0
	Total	251	96.5	100.0	
Missing	99	9	3.5		
Total		260	100.0		

Taking into consideration the average number of people living in a household, which is 2.77 in the Yenibağlar neighbourhood and 3.37 in the Gültepe neighbourhood, the notion that the majority of the sample can be considered poor strengthens. Regarding the average number of people living in a household, there are missing data for 24 people.

Table 6 *Average number of people living in the household*

The neighbourhoods		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Yenibağlar	How many people live in your current household?	119	1	6	2.77
Gültepe	How many people live in your current household?	117	1	9	3.37

When comparing the incomes of both neighbourhoods, it is possible to conclude that the Gültepe neighbourhood has a higher income level owing to the student population in Yenibağlar. In this case, a comparison was made between the Yenibağlar neighbourhood, which is a more valuable real estate area per square metre and is located

in the city centre (http-3), and the Gültepe neighbourhood, which can once again be assessed as economically poor and is not located in the city centre.

When income levels are considered, even though the primary socioeconomic analysis can still be performed, it appears that the roles of the neighbourhoods in terms of economic income levels are reversed.

Table 7 *Income levels of Yenibağlar and Gültepe*

The neighbourhoods and income levels			Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Yenibağlar	Valid	0-5.500 TL	29	22.3	22.7	22.7
		5.501-11.000 TL	39	30.0	30.5	53.1
		11.001-16.501 TL	30	23.1	23.4	76.6
		16.502-22.002 TL	18	13.8	14.1	90.6
		22.003-27.503 TL	5	3.8	3.9	94.5
		33.004 TL+	7	5.4	5.5	100.0
		Total	128	98.5	100.0	
	Missing	99	2	1.5		
	Total		130	100.0		
Gültepe	Valid	0-5.500 TL	1	.8	.8	.8
		5.501-11.000 TL	36	27.7	29.3	30.1
		11.001-16.501 TL	25	19.2	20.3	50.4
		16.502-22.002 TL	26	20.0	21.1	71.5
		22.003-27.503 TL	21	16.2	17.1	88.6
		27.504-33.004 TL	10	7.7	8.1	96.7
		33.004 TL+	4	3.1	3.3	100.0
		Total	123	94.6	100.0	
	Missing	99	7	5.4		
	Total		130	100.0		

Examining the participants' marital status reveals no significant difference between males and women. Of the 130 female participants, 56.9% are married and 29.2% are single, while 54.6% of the men are married and 31.5% are single. 55.8 percent of the 260 participants are married, while 30.4 percent are unmarried.

Regarding sheltering, according to the data collected from the participants, four individuals did not respond to the question about who owns their home. So, according to the data collected from 256 individuals, 44.6% of the participants reside in a rented house, 36.2% in their own house, and 16.9% in their family's home.

Table 8 *House ownership*

Status		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Rented	116	44.6	45.3	45.3
	I am the owner	94	36.2	36.7	82.0
	My family	44	16.9	17.2	99.2
	Other	2	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	256	98.5	100.0	
Missing	99	4	1.5		
Total		260	100.0		

Examining who the participants share their residence with reveals that the majority of participants (74.6%) reside with their families. 13.5% of the population lives alone.

Table 9 *Household share*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	With my family	194	74.6	74.6	74.6
	With my friend(s)	24	9.2	9.2	83.8
	Alone	35	13.5	13.5	97.3
	Residing in a dormitory	4	1.5	1.5	98.8
	With my relatives	3	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	260	100.0	100.0	

Regarding the housing statistics of women and men, a significant difference cannot be established. However, women are more likely to reside with their families than males. Consequently, 21.5 percent of women and 12.3 percent of males reside with their families. Lastly, the percentage of males who own a home is 41.5%, compared to 30.8% for women(n=260).

5.1.5. Occupation

According to the general occupational distribution of the participants, 44.2 percent of the participants are employed, while 18.8 percent are students, as can be seen in the table 10.

Table 10 Occupational distribution

		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
Participants' Occupations ^a	Student	55	18.8%	21.3%
	Employed	129	44.2%	50.0%
	Retired	51	17.5%	19.8%
	Unemployed and actively looking for a job	20	6.8%	7.8%
	Unemployed and not looking for a job	4	1.4%	1.6%
	Occupied with household chores	28	9.6%	10.9%
	Other	5	1.7%	1.9%
Total		292	100.0%	113.2%

In addition, 17,5% are retired, whereas only 6.8% are unemployed and actively seeking employment (n=258 with two absent values). In this regard, the unemployment rate is lower than the 9.7 percent rate estimated by the Turkish Statistical Institute for 2023 (<http-5>).

When comparing the neighbourhoods of Yenibağlar and Gültepe, it can be seen that 28.2% of the participants in Yenibağlar are students and 33.6% are employed, while the rate of students in Gültepe has decreased to 9.1% and the rate of employees has increased to 55.2% (n=258 with one absent value from each neighbourhood). In addition, the rate of retirement in Gültepe is 21.7%, while in Yenibağlar it is 13.4%. In conclusion, it can be understood from these statistics why Gültepe neighbourhood has a higher income rate than Yenibağlar in general.

Comparing the occupations of men and women reveals that 22.9% of women are students, 38.6% are employed, 15.1% of men are students, and 49.3% are employees. In addition, while 18.6% of women perform housework, only 1.3% of males do so. This can

be interpreted as women participating less in public life (n=258 with one absent value from each gender). Nonetheless, this does not imply that women interact less with the rest of the city. On the other hand, less economic freedom may lead to an unequal form of relationship.

Table 11 *Gender based occupational distribution*

Gender			Responses		Percent of cases
			N	Percent	
Female	Gender based occupations	Student	32	22.9%	24.8%
		Employed	54	38.6%	41.9%
		Retired	11	7.9%	8.5%
		Unemployed and actively looking for a job	14	10.0%	10.9%
		Unemployed and not looking for a job	1	0.7%	0.8%
		Occupied with household chores	26	18.6%	20.2%
		Other	2	1.4%	1.6%
Male	Gender based occupations	Student	23	15.1%	17.8%
		Employed	75	49.3%	58.1%
		Retired	40	26.3%	31.0%
		Unemployed and actively looking for a job	6	3.9%	4.7%
		Unemployed and not looking for a job	3	2.0%	2.3%
		Occupied with household chores	2	1.3%	1.6%
		Other	3	2.0%	2.3%

5.2. Media Consumption

There are numerous studies on the relationship between media consumption and fear of crime, as well as claims that there may be a positive relationship between the two (Kohm et al., 2012; Lane & Meeker, 2003a; Romer et al., 2003; Weitzer & Kubrin, 2004). Furthermore, the relationship between these two phenomena is an additional element that this thesis attempts to explain. The participants were therefore asked if they follow the news content on social media and television. In addition, how often the participants were

interested in news content was also given as an additional question. Thus, it was thought that the relationship between media use and fear of crime could be explained more clearly. According to the analysis of the data obtained from the fieldwork, 90.8 percent of the participants stated that they follow the news content on social media. Moreover, the frequency of following news content on social media was 66.9 percent every day and 11.5 percent every other day (n=254 with 6 missing values). In short, it can be asserted that the vast majority of participants are exposed to news content on daily basis. The relevant statistics can be seen in the table 12.

Table 12 *News content consumption frequency on social media*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	Everyday	174	66.9	68.5	68.5
	Every other day	30	11.5	11.8	80.3
	2 or 3 times a week	24	9.2	9.4	89.8
	Once every two weeks or less	2	.8	.8	90.6
	Never	24	9.2	9.4	100.0
	Total	254	97.7	100.0	
Missing	99	6	2.3		
Total		260	100.0		

Finally, it can be asserted that the consumption of news content from social media does not contain significant differences according to age and gender. The overall consumption of women and men is over 90%, and individuals aged 54-62 have the lowest social media use at 73.1 percent. However, this rate can still be considered as significant. Considering the frequency of following news content on social media by various age ranges, 59.7 percent of the participants between the ages of 18-36 stated that they follow the news content every day. This rate is the lowest daily news observe rate. Consequently, it can be claimed that the consumption of news content on social media is also high in terms of frequency, regardless of age and gender.

When the rate of viewing news content on television is examined, it is seen that 72.3 percent of the participants watch TV. This rate is lower than the use of social media (n=260). There is no significant difference in the rate of viewing television news between

women and men. 73.1% of women and 71.5% of males stated that they consume news content. However, when we look at the consumption frequencies, it can be said that the frequency of consumption of news content by men is higher than that of women, as seen in the table 13.

Table 13 *News content consumption rates on television by gender*

Gender			Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Female	Valid	Everyday	49	37.7	40.5	40.5
		Every other day	9	6.9	7.4	47.9
		2 or 3 times a week	24	18.5	19.8	67.8
		Once a week	2	1.5	1.7	69.4
		Once every two weeks or less	3	2.3	2.5	71.9
		Never	34	26.2	28.1	100.0
		Total	121	93.1	100.0	
	Missing	99	9	6.9		
	Total		130	100.0		
Male	Valid	Everyday	66	50.8	52.8	52.8
		Every other day	9	6.9	7.2	60.0
		2 or 3 times a week	11	8.5	8.8	68.8
		Once every two weeks or less	2	1.5	1.6	70.4
		Never	37	28.5	29.6	100.0
		Total	125	96.2	100.0	
	Missing	99	5	3.8		
	Total		130	100.0		

A similar differentiation is observed in the frequency of viewing news on television by age groups. It can be stated that as the age increases, the rate and frequency of following news content on television also increases. According to this, for example, only 43.3 percent of the 18-26 age group view news content on television, while this rate rises to 88.5% and higher between the ages of 54 and 71. At the same time, while only 10.4 percent of the people aged 18-26 view the news on television every day, this rate is 69.2% in the age group of 54-62 and 84.6% in the age group of 63-71(n=246 with 14 missing value). For this reason, it can be stated that the elderly is more affected by television and

the relationship between television and fear of crime may be more meaningful when considered on an age-based basis.

5.3. Victimisation

The participants were inquired about their crime victimisations in the last 12 months. As mentioned, the selection of crimes covers serious crimes and the most convicted crimes for Eskişehir. Accordingly, 260 people answered 10 distinct crime victimisation questions and there were only two missing values for property damage and fraud crimes. According to the general descriptive data, the percentages of victimisation rates; 3.8 burglary, 9.2 percent theft, 10 percent property damage, 5.8 percent threat and fraud, 1.5 percent injury, 1.2 percent attempted murder, 1.5 percent sexual assault and 9.2 percent sexual harassment.

When women and men are examined separately, as can be anticipated, the greatest difference is seen in the crime of sexual harassment. Accordingly, 15.4 percent of women and only 3.1 percent of males have been victims of sexual harassment.

Table 14 *Sexual harassment rates based on gender*

Gender			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Female	Valid	Yes	20	15.4	15.4	15.4
		No	110	84.6	84.6	100.0
		Total	130	100.0	100.0	
Male	Valid	Yes	4	3.1	3.1	3.1
		No	126	96.9	96.9	100.0
		Total	130	100.0	100.0	

When considering attempted murder victimisation among other crimes, it is seen that no woman has encountered such an experience in the last 12 months, while 2.3 percent of men have experienced such victimisation. There is no significant gender differentiation for other offences. However, another significant statistic is that neither women nor men have been victims of extortion crimes in either neighbourhood.

Considering the victimization of sexual assault as a more severe crime, it is seen that 2.3 percent of women and 0.8 percent of men experience this type of victimisation. Only when these victimisation values are considered can it be understood why women

fear certain types of crime more than men and why men perceive certain types of victimisations as more plausible.

Table 15 *Attempted murder rates based on gender*

Gender			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Female	Valid	No	130	100.0	100.0	100.0
		Yes	3	2.3	2.3	2.3
		No	127	97.7	97.7	100.0
Male	Valid	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Table 16 *Sexual Assault rates based on gender*

Gender			Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Female	Valid	Yes	3	2.3	2.3	2.3
		No	127	97.7	97,7	100.0
		Total	130	100.0	100.0	
Male	Valid	Yes	1	.8	.8	.8
		No	129	99.2	99.2	100.0
		Total	130	100.0	100.0	

When we look at the victimization rates by neighbourhoods, it is seen that crimes such as fraud, injury, sexual harassment and assault are more common in Yenibağlar neighbourhood. Although it is not known in which part of the city these types of crimes occurred, it is seen that the overall victimization rate in Yenibağlar neighbourhood is higher than in Gültepe neighbourhood.

Considering where the crimes took place in the last 12 months, it can be asserted that the areas with the highest risk are the streets and workplaces, as can be seen in the table 17. However, when the crime of sexual harassment is considered alone, it should not be neglected that public transportation vehicles can also be coded as dangerous for women. In addition, it is frequently seen that individuals mark the other option regarding the fraud offense. Many participants stated that the area they want to convey with the other option is cyberspace. In this context, it can be said that not only punitive but also preventive measures should be taken for ongoing fraudulent activities in cyberspace and

crimes such as theft, threats and sexual harassment in transportation systems and workplaces.

Table 17 *The number of cases for relevant crime types based on location*

Places for crime Crime types	Home	Street	Work	Public transport	Other
Theft	6	4	5	1	6
Threat	2	6	3	0	3
Fraud	3	2	3	1	6
Sexual Harassment	0	11	4	5	2

5.4. Neighbourhood Cohesion, Incivilities and Confidence in Police Force

Within the scope of this thesis, it has been hypothesised that individuals' perceptions of unity with the regions they reside in, the social and physical problems they observe in their surroundings, and their general level of trust in security forces may be related to their fear of crime. Therefore, it may be essential to provide the mean values for each scale and the questions it contains, and to investigate these values descriptively by gender, age, and neighbourhood. Before providing descriptive statistics for the associated variables, it is important to note that a missing value analysis has been performed on the cohesion, incivility, confidence in police force, and risk perception scales. As a result, unanswered queries on the relevant scales were filled in using the scales' mean values, preventing data manipulation.

5.4.1. Neighbourhood cohesion

Participants were asked a total of four questions for this scale, which measured whether or not they felt a sense of belonging in their own neighbourhood. On a 7-point Likert scale, participants indicated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with these sentences. However, as a consequence of the Cronbach alpha reliability test, the fourth question was eliminated from the neighbourhood cohesion scale. Because $\alpha=0.61$ was provided for a total of 260 participants. This was a departure from the $\alpha=0.7$ value attained from the pilot study. With the removal of the final question, the alpha value of the scale has attained a level that is very acceptable ($\alpha=.81$). As shown in the table 18, the average

cohesion value for this scale is 1.14, based on the average of all participants. A value of +3 on a 7-point Likert scale indicates strong agreement, while a value of -3 indicates strong disagreement. Consequently, the answer to the question regarding the extent to which the participants have a sense of togetherness is slightly agree.

Table 18 *General mean of neighbourhood cohesion*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Cohesion Mean	260	-3.00	3.00	1.1495	1.54665
Valid N (listwise)	260				

Examining each option separately, table 18 reveals that the option "I regularly communicate with neighbours" has the lowest value.

Table 19 *Cohesion means for each question*

Questions	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
I feel like a part of the neighbourhood I live in.	260	-3.0	3.0	1.587	1.5949
I can trust my neighbours when I have a problem.	260	-3.0	3.0	.962	1.9168
I communicate with my neighbours regularly.	260	-3.0	3.0	.900	1.8861
Valid N (listwise)	260				

If the neighbourhoods of Yenibağlar and Gültepe are examined separately, it can be said that the perception of cohesion in Gültepe is greater than in Yenibağlar. This difference is particularly evident in the question regarding the neighbour trust and regular communication. The average cohesion scale value for Yenibağlar is .85, while the average scale value for Gültepe is 1.44. This distinction can be explained by the fact that the Yenibağlar neighbourhood is the city's epicentre and is constantly undergoing dynamic change. In this sense, dynamic change can be interpreted as a variable that might negatively impacts the perception of cohesion. However, further research is needed to understand the correlation between social change and cohesion. The table 20 displays all values for both neighbourhoods.

Table 20 Cohesion values for both neighbourhoods

The neighbourhood-based cohesion		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Yenibağlar	I feel like a part of the neighbourhood I live in.	130	-3.0	3.0	1.512	1.6849
	I can trust my neighbours when I have a problem.	130	-3.0	3.0	.523	2.0918
	I communicate with my neighbours regularly	130	-3.0	3.0	.523	2.0239
	Valid N (listwise)	130				
Gültepe	I feel like a part of the neighbourhood I live in.	130	-3.0	3.0	1.662	1.5022
	I can trust my neighbours when I have a problem.	130	-3.0	3.0	1.400	1.6168
	I communicate with my neighbours regularly	130	-3.0	3.0	1.277	1.6613
	Valid N (listwise)	130				

When viewed in terms of women and males, it is difficult to identify a general significant change. Average values for both genders; women are 1.2, males are 1.08. Nevertheless, if we make a distinction based on age, it can be seen that as the age increases so will the cohesion. The relationship between these variables is examined in the following pages of the thesis.

Table 21 Cohesion means by age

Age	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
18-26	67	-3.00	3.00	.3085	1.67906
27-35	49	-3.00	3.00	.8639	1.65680
36-44	61	-3.00	3.00	1.2928	1.41046
45-53	41	-1.33	3.00	1.7967	1.05640
54-62	26	-.33	3.00	2.0256	.95649
63-71	13	.33	3.00	1.8205	1.01485
72+	3	1.00	3.00	2.3333	1.15470

5.4.2. The perception of surroundings

The general thoughts and perceptions of individuals about their surroundings are a second phenomenon that is considered and attempted to be measured in relation to fear of crime. In light of this, in addition to the questions addressed in the pilot study, a question regarding the individuals' perceptions of the street lighting in their own neighbourhoods was added. The table 22 displays the overall perception of incivilities and the average values for each query ($\alpha=.90$).

Table 22 *Incivility means for each question and in general*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Incivility values	260	-2.83	3.0	.8141	1.37348
Litter	260	-3.0	3.0	1.515	1.6684
Disturbing neighbours	260	-3.0	3.0	.722	2.0720
Graffiti	260	-3.0	3.0	.120	2.1411
Abandoned buildings	260	-3.0	3.0	-.389	2.0861
Unsupervised youths	260	-3.0	3.0	1.046	1.9045
Excessive noise	260	-3.0	3.0	1.108	1.8898
Drunks	260	-3.0	3.0	1.089	1.9302
Drug users	260	-3.0	3.0	1.271	1.9932
Abandoned vehicles	260	-3.0	3.0	.000	2.0458
Beggars	260	-3.0	3.0	1.239	1.7653
Vandalism	260	-3.0	3.0	1.225	2.0841
Inadequate Street lighting	260	-3.0	3.0	.823	2.1897
Valid N (listwise)	260				

Similar to the Cohesion scale, responses to this scale's questions are measured on a 7-point Likert scale. Consequently, +3 represents the serious problem option, whereas -3 represents the not a problem at all option.

Evidently, the most significant issues are littering, unsupervised youth groups, excessive noise, drunks, drug users, beggars, and vandalism. However, considering the Likert scale of the questionnaire, it should be remembered that every prominent issue should be categorised as a slightly problem. Comparing the neighbourhoods of Gültepe and Yenibağlar, without an analysis it seems that there is no significant difference in mean

values (Yenibağlar mean value=.80 and Gültepe mean value=.81). On their own, however, individuals in Yenibağlar perceive litter, excessive noise, drug users, and vandalism to be major problems (with no mean value exceeding 1.6). Individuals in Gültepe, on the other hand, consider litter, beggars, and vandalism to be prominent issues (with no mean value exceeding 1.40). When evaluating based on gender, the average for women is .90 and for males it is .72. In general, women perceive more issues to be problematic, with the exception of abandoned structures and inadequate street lighting.

5.4.3. Confidence in police force

Since various types of findings on the relationship between trust in police force and fear of crime are found throughout the literature, participants were asked eight distinct questions regarding their trust in police force. A significant and negative correlation is anticipated between the participants' levels of trust and their fear of crime. On a 7-point likert scale, participants were asked to rate their agreement with eight distinct statements. Similar to the cohesion and incivilities scales, +3 indicates strong agreement and -3 represents strong disagreement on this scale($\alpha=.86$). Table 23 reveals what extent the participants trust the police in general and for each item.

Table 23 *Confidence in police force*

	N	Mean	Std. deviation
Confidence in police force value	260	.9747	1.48196
Police forces are effective in preventing terrorism.	260	1.142	1.8006
Police forces respond quickly to emergency calls.	260	1.116	1.7226
Police forces provide visible police patrol service.	260	1.158	1.5627
Police forces are effective in the fight against armed crimes.	260	1.116	1.6469
Police forces are effective in combating drug trafficking and use.	260	.892	1.8380
Police forces are effective in combating dangerous vehicle use in traffic.	260	.765	1.8936
Police forces are effective in protecting crime victims and eyewitnesses.	260	.650	1.8000
Police forces act within the framework of the law.	260	.958	1.9238

As can be seen, the average level of confidence corresponds to the option slightly agree. In addition, there is a decline in confidence regarding substance trafficking and use, as well as the operation of dangerous vehicles. However, it can be said that the issue of protecting crime victims and eyewitnesses with the lowest trust scores has the potential to cause the most social problems. Lack of confidence in this regard might be a factor preventing crime reporting. In addition, because individuals do not feel secure after reporting a criminal activity, they may come to the realisation that they must deal with their own issues and may be indifferent to the victimisation of people in need. This circumstance may lead to a further separation between institutions and the general public, as well as a proliferation of criminal activity.

Comparing the confidence levels of men and women reveals that the average confidence level of women is 1.02 and that of men is 0.92 across 260 participants. On the basis of neighbourhoods, the average level of confidence in Yenibağlar is .81 while in Gültepe it is 1.13,

5.5. Descriptive Data For Risk Perception and Fear of Crime

Within the scope of the study, 260 participants were asked for each category of crime, how afraid they were of becoming a victim of these crimes in their everyday lives, and how likely they were to experience victimisation. In contrast to other instruments, these measurements were made using a ladder-type scale, and participants rated their fears and risk perceptions between 1 and 10. In this context, 10 points indicates that I am very afraid or very probable, while 1 point indicates that I am not at all afraid or very unlikely. As was previously stated, a missing value analysis was conducted on risk perception. At the same time, a result close to the .96 alpha value acquired in the pilot study was obtained, and the Cronbach's alpha value for the primary measurement was .93 (n=260). The table 24 displays the overall risk perception and the average for each crime type. As a reminder, the crimes included in the scale are the most commonly convicted crimes in the Eskişehir, and the more severe crimes include murder and sexual assault. In addition, respondents were asked where the likelihood of victimisation of the specified offences is greatest. In accordance with this, the fundamental options included home, street, work, public transportation, and other alternatives. Participants were permitted to select multiple options. The primary objective of this questioning is to identify risky regions and, if possible, to propose social policy or to highlight the voices of the participants.

Based on the perceptions of the participants, The table 24 displays the overall and average probability of occurrence for each category of crime. Examining the table as a whole reveals that the risk perception is lower than average, or 5 for each category of crime. It can be said that crimes such as burglary, theft, threat, and injury are more likely than other crimes, but all values are close to one another and risk perception is generally low.

Table 24 *Perception of risk for each crime type and in general*

Crime types	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Overall values for risk perception	260	1.00	10.00	2.9690	2.37880
Burglary	260	1.0	10.0	3.477	3.1441
Theft	260	1.0	10.0	3.232	3.1069
Property damage	260	1.0	10.0	3.298	3.1254
Threat	260	1.0	10.0	3.065	3.1192
Fraud	260	1.0	10.0	2.741	2.8823
Extortion	260	1.0	10.0	3.058	3.1403
Injury	260	1.0	10.0	3.265	3.1357
Homicide	260	1.0	10.0	2.469	2.8015
Sexual harassment	260	1.0	10.0	2.780	3.0646
Sexual assault	260	1.0	10.0	2.304	2.6443
Valid N (listwise)	260				

When analysing women and men separately, the average risk perception value for women is 3.47, while for men it is 2.46. In terms of extortion, injury, and sexual offences, women also provided an average higher than 3.0. The perception of risk associated with burglary crimes is the greatest among males, whereas sexual crimes are associated with the lowest risk perception. This situation can be a reflection of a gender-oriented lifestyle.

A neighbourhood-based descriptive evaluation reveals that the average risk perception of the residents of Yenibağlar is higher than that of the residents of Gültepe (Yenibağlar mean value = 3.16, Gültepe mean value = 2.77). However, these values are extremely near to one another.

Participants were also asked, for each form of crime, where the risk is highest. Consequently, the table 25 displays risk perception statistics for specific locations for each form of crime.

Table 25 Possible criminal victimisation locations by crime each crime type

Locations Crimes	Home	Street	Work	Public transportation	Other
Theft	26	105	39	68	15
Property damage	41	90	35	44	20
Threat	26	88	36	48	14
Fraud	24	62	29	33	33
Extortion	16	94	30	47	14
Injury	17	103	30	56	14
Homicide	16	69	20	38	12
Sexual harassment	11	77	25	55	11
Sexual assault	9	64	19	43	10

When comparing women and men, it can be stated that women perceive more danger than men, even at home, for every form of crime. This holds true for both sexual and violent crimes. Burglary is coded as home and away from home. 72 of the 171 respondents who assigned this question more than 1 point believe that someone could break into their residence and steal while they are present.

Similar to their perception of risk, the participants' fear of crime is typically below average. This also holds true for all types of crimes, including the violent ones. The average fear on the emotional fear of crime scale ($\alpha=.94$) was therefore 3.18. The average value of the Yenibağlar neighbourhood is 3.25, while the average value of the Gültepe neighbourhood is 3.12. Accordingly, the three most feared forms of crime in the Yenibağlar neighbourhood are burglary (3.94), injury (3.72), and theft (3.52), in that order. For the Gültepe neighbourhood, the most feared crimes are burglary (3.98), theft (3.79), and injury (3.36). Considering the gender, it is possible to discern a difference in fear averages. The general fear level of women was 4.07, while that of males was 2.29. Considering the fear of victimisation for different crimes, it can be assumed that women are more afraid of sexual crimes than males. The types of crime that men are most afraid of are burglary, theft, and injury. Burglary, injury, and sexual harassment are the types of crime that women fear the most. The general levels of fear for different kinds of crimes are displayed in the table 26.

Table 26 *Fear of victimisation means by gender*

Gender		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Female	Fear Mean	130	1	10	4.0749	2.84859
	Burglary	129	1	10	4.86	3.622
	Theft	129	1	10	4.49	3.430
	Property damage	129	1	10	3.75	3.274
	Threat	128	1	10	3.41	3.415
	Fraud	128	1	10	2.98	3.009
	Extortion	129	1	10	4.01	3.598
	Injury	129	1	10	4.66	3.705
	Homicide	129	1	10	3.67	3.705
	Sexual harassment	129	1	10	4.57	3.777
	Sexual assault	130	1	10	4.38	3.755
	Valid N (listwise)	126				
Male	Fear Mean	130	1	10	2.2969	2.00004
	Burglary	130	1	10	3.07	2.918
	Theft	130	1	10	2.89	2.981
	Property damage	130	1	10	2.75	2.653
	Threat	130	1	10	1.87	2.154
	Fraud	129	1	10	2.16	2.454
	Extortion	129	1	10	2.13	2.363
	Injury	130	1	10	2.43	2.576
	Homicide	130	1	10	2.33	2.783
	Sexual harassment	130	1	10	1.66	2.219
	Sexual assault	130	1	10	1.55	1.973
	Valid N (listwise)	129				

In addition to their fears, the participants were asked how frequently they felt fear for each category of crime over the past 12 months. Although this question was phrased as "how often have you felt such fear in the past year? ", it was classified because the participants provided answers such as "occasionally," "sometimes," and "rarely" rather than a number. Categorization is comparable to a hierarchy. Accordingly, 0-10 corresponds to the answer rarely, 10-20 corresponds to the answer sometimes, and 20-30

corresponds to the answer sometimes. Accordingly, the frequency responses for each crime are displayed in the table 26.

Table 27 *Fear of victimisation frequencies for each type of crime*

Frequency Crimes	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Sometimes	Frequently	Usually	All the time
Burglary (13 missing)	151	73	13	0	8	0	2
Theft (10 missing)	161	67	4	4	5	3	6
Property damage (15 missing)	167	58	6	4	5	1	4
Threat (10 missing)	207	29	4	2	5	1	2
Fraud (13 missing)	196	41	6	0	2	1	1
Extortion (15 missing)	195	37	4	4	2	2	1
Injury (16 missing)	176	50	5	0	4	6	3
Homicide (12 missing)	212	21	8	1	1	3	2
Sexual harassment (14 missing)	202	27	4	0	5	2	6
Sexual assault (12 missing)	212	23	4	0	3	1	5

Finally, the participants were asked where they felt the most fear. The workplace and public transport vehicles were the locations that participants feared the most, outside of the streets. These regions are usually coded with crimes such as theft, threats. When it comes to sexual crimes, workplaces and public transport can be coded as problematic areas especially for women. Lastly, cyberspace is one of the most feared places in terms of fraud.

5.6. Coping with Fear and Risk

The final variables assumed to be related to fear of crime and measured within the scope of this study are individuals' behaviour patterns in response to fear of crime and risk perception. These actions can be classified as defensive and avoidant.

As can be seen, the behaviours of carrying a defence tool, installing additional locks, and avoiding certain areas at night received the most affirmative responses from

the participants. Taking into account the disparity between men and women, the rate of having a weapon at home is 45.4 percent for the men and 25.4 percent for the women.

Table 28 *Avoidance and defensive behaviours of the participants*

Behaviours	Yes	No	N
Have you installed extra locks on windows and/or doors?	94	163	257 (3 missing value)
Have you installed an alarm system?	34	224	258 (2 missing value)
Have you added extra outside lighting?	45	214	259 (1 missing value)
Do you keep any weapons (such as knife, gun, bat etc.) in your home for protection?	92	166	258 (2 missing value)
Have you acquired a dog for protection purposes?	15	244	259 (1 missing value)
Do you carry any self-defence tools such as pepper spray, knives, etc. in your daily life?	50	208	258 (2 missing value)
Have you attempted to learn any martial arts for self-defence purposes?	54	201	255 (5 missing value)
Have you limited or changed your daily activities because you could be harmed by any crime?	49	208	257 (3 missing value)
Do you stay away from certain areas during the day because you may be harmed by any crime in your daily life?	48	209	257 (3 missing value)
Do you stay away from certain areas during the night because you may be harmed by any crime in your daily life?	151	107	258 (2 missing value)
Since you may be harmed by any crime in your daily life, have you asked someone you know to accompany you before you go from one place to another?	55	202	257 (3 missing value)

Only 1.5 percent of male participants have limited or altered their daily activities due to crime-related reasons, while this rate is 26.2 percent for the women. Another notable distinction is the behaviour of avoiding certain areas at night. While 71.5% of women stay away from certain areas at night, this rate is 44.6% for the male participants. Lastly, 35.4% of women desire a companion in order to avoid being victimised by a crime, compared to 6.9% of men.

5.7. Analysis of Relationships Between Variables and Key Results

This section of the thesis is devoted to testing the proposed hypotheses within the research framework and resolving the research questions. Fear of crime and risk perception rates in both neighbourhoods, the most feared crimes, and areas associated with fear were revealed by descriptive statistics. In addition, when only the general fear of crime averages are considered, it is possible to conclude that women exhibit more fear than men and are more sensitive to sexual crimes. In this section, however, fundamental analyses of the groups to be compared based on variables were conducted. Therefore, the relationship between demographic characteristics, fear of crime, and risk perception is explained initially. The relationships between cohesion, incivilities, confidence in police force, fear of crime, risk perception, and adaptive behaviours were then investigated.

5.7.1. Vulnerability, fear of crime and risk perception

5.7.1.1. Gender and fear

Before presenting the results of the analysis, it is crucial to remember that the data in the scales do not have a normal distribution. Because of this, non-parametric tests were employed. Under the vulnerability approach, the research hypotheses that women will exhibit greater fear of crime than men, that there will be no significant difference between the elderly and the young in terms of fear of crime, and that a high-income level will have a negative correlation with risk perception were tested. According to the vulnerability approach, the inability of individuals to protect themselves and to compensate for damages resulting from a possible victimisation of crime increases the fear of crime, and in this context, women, the elderly and low-income groups are believed to have the highest rates of fear of crime (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.29-30; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, p.69-79; Taylor & Hale, 1986) Despite the fact that women are generally more fearful than males, there is no correlation between age and fear of crime, according to the results of numerous studies conducted in Türkiye on the subject (Gaziarifoğlu, 2009; Karakus et al., 2010)(Uludağ, 2010). Comparing the data obtained from 130 female and 130 male participants, as shown in the table 29 and 30, reveal that the level of fear of crime among women is substantially greater than that of men. Because of this, the first hypothesis of the study, "On average, women experience a greater fear of crime than men" is accepted ($p < .001$).

Table 29 *Fear means for both gender*

	Gender	N	Mean rank	Sum of ranks
Fear Mean	Female	130	157.22	20439.00
	Male	130	103.78	13491.00
	Total	260		

Table 30 *Mann-Whitney U test results for gender and fear of crime*

	Fear mean
Mann-Whitney U	4976.000
Wilcoxon W	13491.000
Z	-5.788
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

Similarly, it was accepted that women would be more afraid of becoming victims of sexual crimes than males. Compared to men, women exhibited a significantly higher level of fear when considering sexual crimes, and this difference is significant ($p < .001$).

In addition to the significant difference in overall fear levels, within the framework of the shadow hypothesis, it was assumed that women would exhibit greater fear than males when considering crimes that occur on face-to-face interactions. Consequently, burglary, extortion, injury, and homicide were counted as the crimes need face-to-face interactions. Sexual crimes were not included on purpose to test shadow hypothesis. The results of the Mann-Whitney U test for the specified crimes, reveals that the fear level of women is significantly higher than of men ($p < .001$).

When the Mann-Whitney U test is applied to the relationship between gender and risk perception, it can be stated that women's average risk perception is higher than men's, similar to fear of crime; therefore, it can be asserted that gender influences risk perception when other variables are not included in the analysis ($p < 0.001$).

Table 31 *Mann-Whitney U test results for gender and risk perception*

	Risk mean
Mann-Whitney U	6012.500
Wilcoxon W	14527.500
Z	-4.054
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

5.7.1.2. Is elderly more afraid than other?

As previously stated, the second hypothesis of this study is that there will be no significant difference between the elderly and the young in terms of fear of crime. Consequently, the Kruskal-Wallis test was utilised. The comparison of seven distinct age groups in terms of fear of crime revealed a significant difference ($KW(x^2)=14.778$, $p=.022$). Therefore, the Mann-Whitney test was conducted to determine which group or groups exhibited a significant difference. According to the results, only the difference between the 18-26 and 63-71 age groups was statistically significant ($p=.001$). Therefore, the hypothesis that there is no difference between young and old in terms of fear of crime is partially rejected. Because the values derived from comparing other age groups revealed no statistically significant difference. A similar picture was also observed between age and risk perception. Accordingly, the Kruskal-Wallis test revealed a significant difference in the relationship between age and risk perception ($KW(x^2)=15.837$, $p=.015$). However, this distinction was only observed between the 18-26 and 63-71 age groups ($p=.001$). Considering the age groups that show significant differences, it can be argued that as age increases, so do fear of crime and the perception of risk. For other age categories however, the age variable did not produce a significant difference.

5.7.1.3. The relationship between income and perception of risk

The level of an individual's income can be another factor that can influence their fear of crime and risk perception. Therefore, the relationship between those variables was tested to see whether there is a significant difference in participants' fear of crime and perception of risk based on their income levels. The results of the analysis indicate that the fear of crime experienced by participants with varying income levels varies significantly ($KW(x^2)=13.2789$, $p=.039$). Only between those with a household net income between 0 and 5,500 TL and those with a net income between 27,504 and 33,004 TL is there a significant difference in fear of crime rates ($p<.001$). The higher income group has a lower fear of crime mean rank than the other, as can be seen in the table 32. Comparing the remaining income groups, however, revealed no statistically significant differences.

Table 32 *Income levels and mean rank of fear of crime*

	What is your household net income?	N	Mean rank
Fear Mean	0-5.500 TL	30	161.85
	5.501-11.000 TL	75	126.03
	11.001-16.501 TL	55	126.62
	16.502-22.002 TL	44	117.70
	22.003-27.503 TL	26	121.98
	27.504-33.004 TL	10	76.30
	33.004 TL+	11	112.82
	Total	251	

Regarding the relationship between income levels and risk perception, it was seen that the risk perception did not differ when the participants with different income levels were compared ($KW(x^2)=11.768$, $p=.067$). This indicates that the fifth hypothesis of this study, "High income level is negatively associated with risk perception", was rejected.

Consequently, it can be stated that, consistent with the literature (Doran & Burgess, 2012; Lane & Fisher, 2009; Sacco & Glackman, 1987; Taylor & Hale, 1986), women have a higher level of fear than men on average. According to studies, this may be due to the likelihood of sexual assault, which may be hidden behind the crimes that needs face-to-face encounters (Ferraro, 1996; Warr, 1984). Similarly, the findings obtained from this study supports the shadow hypothesis. In parallel studies conducted in Türkiye (Gaziarifoğlu, 2009; Karakus et al., 2010; Uludağ, 2010), a strong positive correlation between age and fear of crime was not found, despite the fact that a significant difference can be observed between age groups in terms of fear of crime. As previously stated, this may be due to distinct cultural structures. The relationship between income level and risk perception was thought to be negative. Because it is believed that high-income groups will avoid crime-ridden areas due to their financial resources. However, the analysis indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in risk perception between income groups. This result may be attributable to the socioeconomic composition of the chosen neighbourhoods. Therefore, a quota sample that includes various income groups might reveal a different conclusion regarding the relationship's existence or absence.

5.7.1.4. Education, fear of crime and risk perception

In the course of the study, participants were asked about their highest level of education. The primary objective is to determine whether there are any differences in the level of fear of crime or risk perception among individuals based on their level of education. In this sense, the Kruskal-Wallis test was utilised to determine whether or not there is a correlation between an individual's level of education and their fear of crime. Consequently, it can be asserted that the degree of fear of crime of individuals does not differ according to their education level. Consequently, it can be asserted that the degree of fear of crime of individuals does not differ according to their education level ($KW(\chi^2)=3.166$, $p=.674$). Table 33 displays the observation values and averages of fear of crime among the relevant education groups.

Table 33 Education levels and mean ranks of fear of crime

	Educational level	N	Mean rank
Fear Mean	I did not graduate from any educational institution.	3	141.50
	Primary school	22	120.05
	Secondary school	18	112.06
	High school	104	130.63
	Associate or undergraduate	102	131.42
	Master's or PhD	10	159.65
	Total	259	

Similarly, comparing the risk perceptions of individuals with varied levels of education revealed no significant correlation between education level and perception of risk ($KW(\chi^2)=3.145$, $p=.678$). In light of the analysis conducted, it can be concluded that education level has no effect on fear of crime and risk perception.

5.7.1.5. Sheltering, marital status and fear of crime

Another pair of variables that can be evaluated using the vulnerability approach is the marital status and home-aloneness of the individuals. In this context, individuals were questioned about their marital status, with whom they share the house they live in, and number of persons living with them. Examining the relationship between marital status and fear of crime using the Kruskal-Wallis test reveals that there is no significant

difference in terms of fear of crime between the participant groups with various marital status ($KW(x^2)=3.018$, $p=.555$). Same applies to risk perception ($KW(x^2)=6.197$, $p=.185$). Therefore, differing marital status has no effect on fear of crime and risk perception when no other variables, such as gender, age, and others, are considered. When analysed on the basis of gender, it can be seen that fear of crime and risk perception are not affected by marital status in either men or women.

Table 34 *Differentiation of risk and fear based on marital across genders*

Gender		Risk mean	Fear mean
Female	Chi-Square	5.131	1.311
	df	4	4
	Asymp. Sig.	.274	.860
Male	Chi-Square	3.209	2.542
	df	4	4
	Asymp. Sig.	.524	.637

Comparing the risk perception and fear of crime of individuals living with different groups reveals that the individuals' fear of crime and risk perception vary significantly ($KW(x^2)=10.391$, $p=0.034$ for fear of crime comparison, $KW(x^2)=14.820$, $p=0.005$ for risk perception comparison). As can be seen in the table 35, the fear and risk perception of individuals who do not reside with their families is greater.

Table 35 *Risk and fear ranks of individuals who share her/his house with others*

	With whom do you share the household/house you live in?	N	Risk Mean Rank	N	Fear Mean Rank
Risk and Fear Mean	With my family	194	121.55	194	123.05
	With my friend(s)	24	141.00	24	149.46
	Alone	35	161.99	35	150.71
	Residing in a dormitory	4	154.38	4	134.25
	With my relatives	3	225.83	3	219.67
	Total	260		260	

However, when comparing women and men, it can be claimed that residing with different groups significantly affects the level of fear of crime for women ($KW(\chi^2)=9.682$, $p=.46$), whereas for men, there was no significant differentiation ($KW(\chi^2)=5.095$, $p=.165$). If a comparison made between the two neighbourhood, based on the finding of the Kruskal-Wallis test, it cannot be stated that there is a significant difference ($p=.077$ for Yenibağlar, $p=.344$ for Gültepe neighbourhood)

It was also examined whether there is a relationship between the duration of residence of individuals in their neighbourhoods and the fear of crime they feel. If a one-way hypothesis is tested between two variables using Spearman correlation analysis, it is observed that there is a weak negative correlation between two variables ($r= -.153$, $p=.007$). A similar negative but weak correlation is found between the risk perception and the length of residence ($r= -.177$, $p=0.002$). If the neighbourhoods are compared, it can be claimed that there is a significant but weak negative correlation between the duration of residence and fear of crime for the Yenibağlar neighbourhood ($r= -.193$, $p=.014$). For Gültepe on the other hand, Spearman correlation test revealed no significant correlation ($r= -.085$, $p=.170$). A similar scenario appears to apply to risk perception as well. In contrast to Yenibağlar ($r= -.263$, $p=.001$), there was no significant correlation between the duration of residence and perception of risk, regarding the participants live in Gültepe ($r= -.047$, $p=.301$). When women and males were analysed individually, the picture changed. While it can be claimed that both crime risk and fear are weakly negatively correlated to the duration of the women's residence in a neighbourhood ($r= -.0173$, $p=0.025$ for fear of crime and $r= -.242$, $p=.003$ for risk perception), no significant correlation was discovered for men ($r= -.071$, $p=.212$ for fear of crime and $r= -.63$, $p=.239$ for risk perception).

In conclusion, it should be said that marital status does not influence risk perception and fear of crime, this is also true for different genders. Sharing house with different group may affect the individuals' fear of crime and risk perception rates. In this way, the idea that living in close-knit communities may have a negative impact on vulnerability can be highlighted. However, when gender-based analysis is conducted, it is seen that this is true only for the female participants. Finally, the length of residence in the neighbourhood has a weak and negative correlation with both risk perception and fear of crime. However, when neighbourhood-based analysis is conducted, it is seen that this scenario is relevant only for Yenibağlar.

5.7.2. Media consumption, fear of crime and risk perception

Another subject addressed by this research is the effect of following the news on both social media and television on fear of crime and perception of risk. Alongside this inquiry, it was also examined whether the frequency of news consumption has an impact on fear of crime. The purpose of limiting the questions to news content is to account for the fact that individuals may have access to vastly different content, making it impossible to discern which content influences fear of crime. The point that should be kept in mind is the research cannot produce results regarding the relationship between other media contents and fear of crime because it does not explicitly examine the relationship between the media and fear of crime.

Regarding the monitoring of news content on social media, 236 of 260 participants stated that they follow news content on social media. According to the results of the Mann-Whitney U test, there is no significant difference between those who follow news content on social media and those who do not in terms of fear of crime ($p=.221$). A similar situation is seen among those who follow the news on television and those who do not. Among 260 participants, 188 follow television news content. When comparing the fear of crime rates of those who watch television news and those who do not, no significant difference was found between the two groups ($p=.165$). When television news content viewers are excluded from the analysis, no significant difference was found between those who follow social media news and who do not ($p=.727$). Similarly, there was no significant difference between those who follow news on television and who do not, in terms of fear of crime ($p=0.251$).

The results of an investigation into the relationship between the frequency of social media news consumption and fear of crime indicate that the level of fear of crime does not change significantly ($KW(x^2)=1.252$, $p=.740$). In line with these findings, there is no correlation between the frequency of news viewing and fear of crime among those who only watch news on television ($KW(x^2)=5.524$, $p=.137$). However, when those who follow the news content in both areas are examined together, a significant difference between the groups that consume news content on television at various frequencies is observed ($KW(x^2)=11.194$, $p=.024$). However, this distinction does not exist among social media consumers ($KW(x^2)=1.252$, $p=.740$).

In contrast to the relationship between fear of crime and media consumption, the results differ when comparing risk perception. Consequently, there are significant

differences between the risk perceptions of those who follow news content on social media and those who do not. It appears that social media has an increasing impact on risk perception ($p=.022$). A similar finding is observed among those who watch television and those who do not. Interestingly, those who do not watch television have a higher risk perception than those who do ($p=.002$). However, it should not be neglected that individuals may not watch television but may follow the news contents on social media. Therefore, when social media news followers are omitted from the analysis, Mann-Whitney U test results indicate that there is still a significant difference between those who do and do not watch television, and interestingly those who do not monitor news on television have a higher risk perception ($p=.013$). However, there is no significant difference in risk perception between those who follow news content on social media and those who do not, when television viewers are excluded from the analysis ($p=0.664$). When social media users and television news viewers are analysed together, no significant relationship between the frequency of news content access and the perception of risk is observed ($KW(x^2)=1.792$, $p=.774$ for tv news consumption frequencies and $KW(x^2)=1.128$, $p=.770$ for social media news consumption frequencies). When each group is analysed separately, this situation remains unchanged ($p=.439$ for tv news consumption frequencies and $p=.921$ for social media news consumption frequencies).

Consequently, there is no distinction between those who follow news content in the media and those who do not in terms of fear of crime. When social media users and television users are analysed separately, this situation remains unchanged. Examining the consumption of news content on television without segregating social media users and television users reveals a positive correlation between the frequency of media consumption and fear of crime. Accordingly, as the frequency of media consumption increases, the fear of crime increases. Regarding risk perception, when those who watch news on television and those who consume news content on social media are evaluated together, it can be said that social media use has a positive impact on risk perception. The opposite is true for individuals who watch television. Those who do not watch television news have a greater perception of risk. When both media platforms were evaluated independently, there was no correlation between the frequency of content consumption and the perception of risk.

In terms of fear of crime, there is no significant gender-based distinction between those who follow news content on social media and those who do not; this is true for both

genders (for the female participants $p=.156$ and for the male participants $p=.943$). On the other hand, it can be said that watching news on television has a reducing effect on the fear of crime for men ($p=.006$). Regarding the perception risk, women who follow news content on social media have a higher risk perception than women who do not ($p=0.036$). When only males are considered, there is no significant difference ($p=.324$).

5.7.4. Neighbourhood cohesion, fear of crime and perception of risk

Within the scope of the study, it was hypothesised that neighbourhood cohesions would have a negative impact on individuals' fear of crime and risk perception. Because, as stated, the unity of individuals can also have a negative influence on vulnerability due to the collective effect, indicating that there may be a collective effort on the perceived problems in the region and that it can increase sensitivity to the issues (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.36; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, p.99-106). In this regard, the survey participants were asked four distinct questions. These questions are about participants' relations with their neighbours, whether they feel a sense of unity and see stranger in their neighbourhood. The Cronbach alpha value derived from the relevant scale was .61. At this juncture, the final question, namely whether individuals notice strangers in their neighbourhoods, was eliminated from the analysis, and the alpha value was increased to .81. To test the research hypothesis, a Spearman correlation analysis was conducted for the one-way hypotheses "There is a negative correlation between neighbourhood cohesion and fear of crime" and "There is a negative correlation between neighbourhood cohesion and risk perception." Accordingly, a weak negative correlation between cohesion and fear of crime was discovered ($r= -.103$, $p=.048$). Likewise, there exists a weak negative correlation between risk perception and cohesion ($r= -.128$, $p=.020$). In this context, it can be said that the relationship between individuals and their neighbourhoods influences their perception of their surroundings and their daily fear of crime. Therefore, when other variables are excluded from the analysis, both hypotheses are accepted. In addition, it appears that the relationship between cohesion and fear of crime does not change substantially when a different method for measuring fear of crime and risk perception is employed.

One of the important questions here is the question of what effect cohesion has on fear of crime and risk perception when women and men are examined separately. When a spearman correlation test is conducted based on gender, it appears that the cohesion

variables have no significant relationship with women's fear of crime ($r = -.100$, $p = .129$) and risk perception ($r = -.76$, $p = .195$). For males on the other hand, while neighbourhood cohesion decreases males' risk perception ($r = -.161$, $p = .034$), there is no significant correlation between fear of crime and neighbourhood cohesion ($r = -.130$, $p = .070$). The Mann-Whitney U test indicates that women and men do not have a significant difference in terms of cohesion, in response to the question of whether this scenario is true due to significantly different cohesion values between males and females ($p = .872$).

When Yenibağlar and Gültepe neighbourhoods were compared in terms of the relationship between cohesion and fear of crime, the results indicate that the cohesion of participants has no impact on the fear of crime rates in Yenibağlar ($p = .304$) and Gültepe ($p = .056$). However, the Spearman correlation test also reveals that in the Yenibağlar neighbourhood, there is a negative but weak correlation between cohesion and risk perception ($r = -.176$, $p = .022$), in contrast to the Gültepe neighbourhood ($p = .229$). When women and men from both neighbourhoods are analysed separately, cohesion and risk perception have a weak and negative correlation only for males residing in Yenibağlar ($r = -.233$, $p = .031$).

Consequently, it was stated that studies that discovered a significant negative correlation between cohesion and fear of crime differed from this study due to the methodology they employed (Box et al., 1988; Karakus et al., 2010; Rountree & Land, 1996; Scarborough et al., 2010; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, p.80-124). Although diverse measuring techniques were utilised, there is still a weak negative correlation between fear of crime and social cohesion. The same holds true for the relationship between cohesion and risk perception. However, it should not be neglected that these results are only valid when other variables are excluded from the analysis. As a result, it can be stated that a decrease in neighbourly relations and indifference towards neighbourhood problems, or, in brief, an intense individualization, can have a negative effect on environmental attitudes and feelings. Although it cannot be asserted that women and men have significantly different cohesion averages, the Kruskal-Wallis test reveals a significant difference between age groups ($KW(\chi^2) = 39.180$, $p < .001$). This can be normal because there is a positive, significant and moderate correlation between length of residence and neighbourhood cohesion ($r = .452$, $p < .001$).

5.7.5. The effects of social and physical incivilities on fear and risk perception

Even if various techniques are used to measure fear of crime, perceived incivilities, which is one of the factors influencing fear of crime and risk perception, is an effective variable (Borooah & Carcach, 1997; Chadee et al., 2017; E. Gray et al., 2011; Lane & Meeker, 2003b; McCrea et al., 2005; Özascilar, 2013; Pantazis, 2000). Incivilities essentially indicate that social control and collectiveness are on the decline and that there is a general threat (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.39; Ross & Mirowsky, 1999).

Incivilities can be divided essentially into physical and social categories. Abandoned structures, vehicles, trash on the ground, and graffiti can be examples of physical incivilities, whereas disturbing neighbours, noise, drug or alcohol users, and unsupervised youth can be considered examples of social incivilities. In accordance with this distinction, all participants were asked how much of a problem these specific incivilities pose in their regions during the research conducted for this thesis ($\alpha=.90$). Therefore, one-tailed hypotheses developed within the context of the literature were analysed. The following hypotheses are;

- There is a positive correlation between neighbourhood incivilities and fear of crime.
- There is a positive correlation between neighbourhood incivilities and risk perception.

According to Spearman's correlation analysis, when all participants are included without a separation, there is a significant, positive, but weak correlation between incivility and fear of crime ($r=.242$, $p<.001$). Similar to this result, the analysis shows that there is a weak but significantly positive correlation between risk perception and incivilities ($r=.119$, $p=.028$). Therefore, it can be concluded from a general analysis that both hypotheses are accepted. The effect of the individual's perception of the problems in the environment on the perception of danger and fear of crime can be seen. Therefore, the extent of the problems can differ between individuals who reside in close proximity. Furthermore, it cannot be asserted, as stated previously, that the presence of perceived incivility increases the likelihood of becoming a victim of crime in the region. Relevant correlations can be seen in the table 36.

Table 36 *Correlation regarding incivilities, fear of crime and risk perception*

			Incivility mean	Fear mean	Risk mean
Spearman's rho	Incivility mean	Correlation coefficient	1.000	.242**	.119*
		Sig. (1-tailed)	.	.000	.028
		N	260	260	260

When the relevant correlation analysis is conducted separately for both neighbourhoods, it is discovered that there is a significant positive relationship between incivilities and fear of crime in both. For Yenibağlar neighbourhood, this was a weak positive relationship ($r=.186$, $p=.017$). For Gültepe neighbourhood, this correlation is moderately strong, positive and significant ($r=.303$, $p<.001$). When examining the correlation between risk perception and incivilities in both neighbourhoods, there is a positive but non-significant correlation ($p=.070$ for Yenibağlar, $p=.119$ for Gültepe). One of the points that should be made at this time is that the perception of incivility is not significantly different between the two neighbourhoods. The table 37 displays the relevant averages according to the Mann-Whitney U test results ($p=.960$).

Table 37 *Difference between the two neighbourhood in terms of incivility scores*

	The neighbourhood currently reside in	N	Mean rank	Sum of ranks
Incivility mean	Yenibağlar	130	130.73	16995.50
	Gültepe	130	130.27	16934.50
	Total	260		

For women, a gender-based Spearman correlation test reveals a positive and statistically significant correlation between perceived incivility and experienced fear of crime ($r=.267$, $p=.001$). In line with these findings, there is a significant positive correlation between male participants' incivilities and their fear of crime ($r=.206$, $p=.009$). However, similar outcomes cannot be said to exist between risk perception and incidents. Consequently, although there is a positive correlation between risk perception and incivilities for women ($r=.242$, $p=.003$), there is no correlation when the male participants are considered ($p=.374$). However, this situation can also be attributed to the fact that, in

terms of risk and fear, males typically do not provide realistic responses, when gender roles are taken into account.

Women residing in Gültepe have a moderately positive and statistically significant correlation between incivilities and fear of crime, when gender and neighbourhoods are taken into account ($r=.376$, $p=.001$). For the same population, there is a positive but weak correlation between risk perception and incivilities ($r=.280$, $p=.012$). Based on male participants residing in Gültepe neighbourhood, a weak but positive, significant correlation was found between incivilities and fear of crime ($r=.276$, $p=.013$). No significant correlation was found for the other participant groups.

Consequently, it can be stated that the relationship between individuals and their environment influences how they make sense of the world around them, and that certain situations can be coded as indicators of poor control, collapse, and peril in the area. Therefore, it can be said that this scenario can have a positive impact on fear of crime and risk perception.

When incivilities are separated as social and physical, a second question under this heading is whether incivilities still have a positive and significant relationship with fear of crime and risk perception. According to this, disturbing neighbours, unsupervised youth, drug or alcohol users, beggars, and vandalism fall under the category of social incivility. Litter, graffiti, abandoned houses and vehicles, excessive noise, and inadequate street illumination are examples of physical incivilities. When Spearman correlation analysis is performed for both types of incivilities, it is seen that there is a significant, positive but weak correlation between social incivilities and fear of crime ($r=.282$, $p<.001$). In parallel with this result, there is a positive and significant correlation between risk perception and social incivilities ($r=.169$, $p=.003$). The result changes when Spearman correlation analysis is applied to the influence of physical incivilities on fear of crime and risk perception. There is a positive, significant, but weak correlation between fear of crime and physical incivilities ($r=.187$, $p=.001$), but there is no correlation between physical incivilities and the perception of risk ($p=.179$). Comparing the neighbourhoods of Yenibağlar and Gültepe, it has been found that the correlation between fear of crime and social incivilities is significantly positive but weak for the Yenibağlar neighbourhood ($r=.203$, $p=.010$). This is also true regarding the relationship between risk perception and social incivility ($r=.226$, $p=.005$). Examining the effect of physical incivilities on fear of crime and risk perception reveals that the relationship between physical incivilities and

fear of crime is weak but significant and positively correlated only among participants from the Gültepe neighbourhood ($r=.259$, $p=.001$). In order to explain this difference, it investigated whether the social and physical incivility of the two neighbourhoods differed significantly. According to the Mann-Whitney U test results, neither social nor physical incivility results differ significantly between the two neighbourhoods ($p=.225$ for social and $p=.352$ for physical incivilities).

A gender axis analysis reveals a positive and significant correlation between perceived physical incivilities and women's fear of crime and risk perception ($r=.213$, $p=.008$ for fear of crime and $r=.175$, $p=.023$ for risk perception). When male participants are considered, a significant and positive correlation is found solely between fear of crime and physical incivilities ($r=.188$, $p=.016$).

Social incivilities appear to affect women more than males. Consequently, while a moderately positive correlation was discovered between social incivilities and fear of crime ($r=.303$, $p<.001$), the same holds true for risk perception and social incivilities ($r=.289$, $p<.001$). For the male participants, social incivilities only correlated positively and significantly with fear of crime ($r=.213$, $p=.008$). Therefore, it can be stated that women are more affected than males by the incivility generated by the behaviour of those around them. Because when the social incivilities values of both genders are compared with the Mann-Whitney U test, no significant difference can be found ($p=.080$).

In general, taking into account all participants, it can be stated that incivilities have a positive influence on fear of crime and risk perception. In this context, it may be advantageous to expand social services in neighbourhoods, engage in healthy interactions with individuals, and support individuals and families with economic and educational social policies. In this way, it is possible to ensure that both punitive and preventative measures are taken to ensure physical and social public peace. Therefore, the fear of crime, which negatively impacts daily life, induces anxiety, and leads to social isolation, can be prevented. In the discussion section of the thesis, related social policies are elaborated upon.

5.7.6. The impact of confidence in police force on fear of crime and risk perception: A gap between the institution and society

As previously stated, not every deviant act constitutes a crime. An act can be defined as criminal only when it violates the laws established by society. In this regard,

it can be said that police force plays an important role. Because the institution itself can perform a role that is both deterrent and punitive. However, punitive role should be regarded as symbolic since the determination of whether an act is criminal or not depends on the decision of court. In addition to intervening in criminal acts and apprehending suspicious individuals, it is possible to claim that police can contribute to a reduction in crime rates and to the maintenance of social peace by providing a visible service and gaining the trust of the public. Therefore, it may be beneficial to explain the connection between individuals' trust in law enforcement and their fear of crime. Accordingly, a literature review reveals that numerous studies indicate a negative correlation between fear of crime and trust in the police (Alda et al., 2017; Box et al., 1988; Çakar, 2015; Jackson et al., 2009). However, it should be noted that not all studies have reached the same conclusion (Gray et al., 2011).

For the purpose of analysing the relationship between fear of crime and trust in police, 260 participants were given an 8-question survey designed to assess trust in police ($\alpha=.86$). In the survey, confidence in the police force averaged .97 point, where +3 points indicate strong agreement, and -3 points indicate strong disagreement. On the basis of neighbourhoods, this ratio decreases to .81 in Yenibağlar neighbourhood and rises to 1.13 in Gültepe neighbourhood. Therefore, it can be concluded that participants in both neighbourhoods have little faith in the authorities. It was hypothesised that fear of crime and risk perception are negatively correlated with trust in police. The hypothesis that risk perception and fear of crime will increase as trust in police decreases has thus been tested. Therefore, a Spearman correlation analysis was conducted. Fear of crime and perception of risk are negatively and significantly correlated with confidence in police forces. The pertinent values are displayed in the table 38.

Table 38 *The correlation results of confidence in police force*

			Trust mean	Fear mean	Risk mean
Spearman's rho	Trust mean	Correlation coefficient	1,000	-.113*	-.187**
		Sig. (1-tailed)	.	.035	.001
		N	260	260	260

When the neighbourhoods of Yenibağlar and Gültepe are examined separately, the results change. In contrast to the cumulative assessment, no correlation was observed

between fear of crime and trust in police in either neighbourhood. As shown in the table 39 however, the relationship between risk perception and trust in police forces is significant and negative in both neighbourhoods ($r = -.147$, $p = .047$ for the Yenibağlar neighbourhood and $r = -.222$, $p = .006$ for the Gültepe neighbourhood).

Table 39 Confidence in police force and risk perception based on neighbourhoods

	The neighbourhood currently reside in			Trust mean	Risk mean
Spearman's rho	Yenibağlar	Trust mean	Correlation coefficient	1.000	-.147*
			Sig. (1-tailed)	.	.047
			N	130	130
		Risk mean	Correlation coefficient	-.147*	1.000
			Sig. (1-tailed)	.047	.
			N	130	130
	Gültepe	Trust mean	Correlation coefficient	1.000	-.222**
			Sig. (1-tailed)	.	.006
			N	130	130
		Risk mean	Correlation coefficient	-.222**	1.000
			Sig. (1-tailed)	.006	.
			N	130	130

As a consequence, it can be concluded, based on a general evaluation, that trust in the law enforcement agency can be effective at reducing fear and risk. However, as indicated previously, trust in police is only slightly above neutral in both neighbourhoods. Very little trust is placed in the security forces, particularly when it comes to the protection of crime victims and witnesses. Therefore, it may be necessary to devise social policies to change the image of the police forces, defend democratic values, and enable them to respond to region-specific issues.

Table 40 Spearman correlation results of cohesion and confidence in police force

	The neighbourhood currently reside in			Trust mean	Cohesion mean
Spearman's rho	Yenibağlar	Trust mean	Correlation coefficient	1.000	.374**
			Sig. (1-tailed)	.	.000
			N	130	130

		Cohesion mean	Correlation coefficient	.374**	1.000
			Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.
			N	130	130
	Gültepe	Trust mean	Correlation coefficient	1.000	.032
			Sig. (1-tailed)	.	.359
			N	130	130
		Cohesion mean	Correlation coefficient	.032	1.000
			Sig. (1-tailed)	.359	.
			N	130	130

Table 40 (The rest of the table) *Spearman correlation results of cohesion and confidence in police force*

Within the scope of this study, one of the hypotheses tested is that trust in police forces increases neighbourhood cohesion. According to Spearman correlation analysis, there is a significant, positive, but weak correlation between police trust and neighbourhood cohesion ($r=.238$, $p<.001$). Based on a neighbourhood-by-neighbourhood analysis, it was determined that only the Yenibağlar neighbourhood exhibited such relationship, as shown in the table 40.

5.7.7. Victimization, fear of crime and risk: Is Eskişehir really safe?

An additional variable considered within the scope of the study and believed to be associated with the fear of crime is the crime victimisations encountered by individuals over the past 12 months. As previously stated, individuals who have been victims of any crime may experience anxiety and distress, making them more susceptible to future victimisations (Clark, 2003; Doran & Burgess, 2012; Mesch, 2000; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, p.59-69). In this regard, the participants were asked, via a 10-question questionnaire, if they had been victims of the specified crimes, which included the most convicted crimes and more severe crimes in Eskişehir between 2011 and 2020. In this way, if a general frequency table is included, as seen in the table 41, 26.9 percent of the participants reported being victims of a crime within the past year.

Table 41 *Prior victimisation rates of the participants*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Valid	Yes	70	26.9	26.9	26.9

	No	190	73.1	73.1	100.0
	Total	260	100.0	100.0	

Table 41 (The rest of the table) *Prior victimisation rates of the participants*

Considering that 2,819 inmates entered the Eskişehir penitentiary facility between 2011 and 2020 (TÜİK, 2021), these percentages can be considered quite high. In this sense, although different time periods can be mentioned, either crimes are not reported to the police after they occur, or individuals are not convicted and sent to a penal institution as a result of their criminal behaviour. Another explanation is that crime rates in Eskişehir have skyrocketed since 2020. However, no report regarding this situation was discovered. Similar circumstances are evident regarding the offence of sexual harassment against women. According to the table 14's in the Victimization subsection, 15.4% of women have experienced sexual harassment within the past 12 months. In addition, there is no sexual harassment offence among the top ten crimes with the highest conviction rate in Eskişehir between 2011 and 2020.

In light of these observations, the Mann-Whitney U test reveals a statistically significant difference in fear of crime between those who have and have not experienced a victimisation. As shown in the table 42, when the relevant averages are evaluated, it can be concluded that the group experiencing any victimisation has a greater fear of crime ($p=.001$).

Table 42 *Mann-Whitney mean results of victimisation and fear of crime*

	Prior victim	N	Mean rank	Sum of ranks
Fear mean	Yes	70	154.72	10830.50
	No	190	121.58	23099.50
	Total	260		

When victims of any crime are compared to one another, it can be seen that victims of sexual harassment have a substantially greater fear of crime than those who are not victims ($p=.035$). When the comparison was made for other crimes, no significant difference could be detected.

Similar to the effect that heightens the fear of crime, the risk perception of individuals who have been victims of any crime is significantly greater than that of

individuals who have not been victims of any crime ($p<.001$). The respective average values are displayed in the table 43.

Table 43 Mann-Whitney mean results of victimisation and risk perception

	Prior victim	N	Mean rank	Sum of ranks
Risk Mean	Yes	70	167.65	11735.50
	No	190	116.81	22194.50

The total number of victimisations is a further finding that can be regarded significant. As previously stated, 70 of the 260 participants have been victimised in the past year. However, some participants have experienced more than one victimisation. Accordingly, the total number is 180. Of these, 49 are sexual harassment and 41 are threats. In this context, the effect of gender structure on the phenomenon of crime can be observed, and the safety of Eskişehir can be questioned based on the victimisation rates revealed by the research.

Consequently, without a non-parametric version of multivariate analysis, it can be stated that past victimisation increases both fear of crime and risk perception only when the effect of victimisation on fear of crime and risk perception in the previous 12 months is evaluated. In addition, when recalling a general frequency table of crime victims, it is possible to state that many criminal acts were not witnessed by law enforcements or reported by people in general. In light of the fact that there is no public access to crime statistics in Türkiye, it is recommended that research be conducted to map the victimisations with a representative random sample for the cities and to assess the impact of this circumstance on the perception of fear and risk. Because, as stated, crime can have negative impacts not only on the victim but also on society as a whole. Obviously, a functionalist perspective can be developed in light of the progression of the offences and the subsequent responses. In the absence of statistical data however, it may be impossible to establish a target for implementable social policies.

Even though it was not addressed as a question within the scope of the study, another issue that should be mentioned last is whether the level of trust that crime victims have in law enforcement has changed or not. Accordingly, the Mann-Whitney U test indicates that any group of crime victims has significantly less trust in the police than the other participants ($p=.023$). Relevant confidence values can be seen in the table 44.

Table 44 Mann-Whitney results of victimisation and confidence in police forces

	Prior victim	N	Mean rank	Sum of ranks
Trust mean	Yes	70	113.00	7910.00
	No	190	136.95	26020.00
	Total	260		

5.7.8. Fear of crime and risk perception: A cognitive impact on emotions

It is known that different studies within the fear of crime literature use different techniques and questions for measuring fear of crime, and it cannot be said that there is a consensus on the operational definition of fear of crime. Within the scope of this research however, the questions are directly related to specific types of crimes, and both cognitive and emotional scales were employed to measure participants' fear rates and risk perceptions. In other words, participants were asked how much they are afraid of becoming victims of 10 distinct types of crimes in their daily lives and how probable it was that they would experience these criminal victimisations. Consequently, the following research hypotheses will be examined;

- As the severity of the crimes increases, so will the fear of crime.
- There is a significant and positive relationship between risk perception and fear of crime.

Aside from these hypotheses, it will be determined whether the two neighbourhoods differ significantly in terms of crime fear and risk perception. Accordingly, mean averages for each type of crime can be seen in the table 45.

Table 45 Fear of crime mean values for all participants

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Burglary	259	1	10	3.96	3.402
Theft	259	1	10	3.69	3.305
Property damage	259	1	10	3.25	3.015
Threat	258	1	10	2.63	2.947
Fraud	257	1	10	2.57	2.771
Extortion	258	1	10	3.07	3.180

Injury	259	1	10	3.54	3.372
Murder	259	1	10	3.00	3.336
Sexual harassment	259	1	10	3.11	3.416
Sexual assault	260	1	10	2.97	3.311
Valid N (listwise)	255				

Table 45 (The rest of the table) *Fear of crime mean values for all participants*

As can be seen, the average fear values of severe crimes such as injury, murder, and sexual crimes do not appear to differ from those of other crimes. Wilcoxon Signed Rank test was administered to compare the total fear of crime and the fear of crime averages covering serious crimes, and it was determined that the fear of serious crimes did not significantly differ from the total ($p=.207$). When injury, murder, and sexual crimes are compared to other crimes, a similar situation is observed; no significant differences were discovered ($p=.199$). When viewed along the gender axis, the picture alters. Women have a significantly higher fear scores of serious crimes than the average fear scores ($p=.022$). However, fear of serious crimes is significantly lower among men than cumulative fear ($p<.001$). The results can be seen in the table 46.

Table 46 *Comparison of serious and other crime's fear ranks*

Gender			N	Mean rank	Sum of ranks
Female	Serious crimes – Fear mean	Negative ranks	44	44.07	1939.00
		Positive ranks	58	57.14	3314.00
		Ties	28		
		Total	130		
Male	Serious crimes – Fear mean	Negative ranks	62	38.81	2406.00
		Positive ranks	15	39.80	597.00
		Ties	53		
		Total	130		

The Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between the two neighbourhoods in terms of crime fear and risk perception. The results indicates that there are no significant differences between the two neighbourhoods ($p=.350$ for fear of crime, $p=.264$ for perception of risk). The respective mean rank values are displayed in the table 47.

Table 47 Fear and risk mean ranks of Yenibağlar and Gültepe

The neighbourhoods	N	Fear mean rank	Sum of ranks	Risk mean rank	Sum of ranks
Yenibağlar	130	134.82	17526.00	135.67	17636.50
Gültepe	130	126.18	16404.00	125.33	16293.50
Total	260				

When examining the relationship between risk perception and fear of crime, which is another research hypothesis, Spearman correlation analysis on 260 participants reveals a significant, positive, and strong correlation between risk perception and fear of crime ($r=.745$, $P<.001$). The one-tailed hypothesis that "there is a significant and positive relationship between risk perception and fear of crime" was therefore accepted. This situation remains unchanged when the analysis is performed by gender as well. The correlation between risk perception and fear of crime is positive and significant for both men and women ($r=.774$, $p<.001$ for women). For men only, this relationship is moderate, not strong ($r=.651$, $p<.001$).

When a distinction is made on the basis of neighbourhoods, a nearly strong positive correlation exists for Yenibağlar ($r=.704$, $p<.001$). Regarding the neighbourhood Gültepe, significant, positive and strong correlation is observed once again ($r=.768$, $p<.001$).

In addition, respondents were asked if they had burglary insurance and how frequently they went out at night. According to the study's findings, having an insurance against theft does not significantly decrease the fear of burglary, although the level of fear was lower among participants who reported having insurance ($KW(x^2)=3.788$, $p=.150$). The relationship between going out at night and fear of crime is another finding. The Kruskal-Wallis test results did not reveal any statistically significant differences when applied to the entire research sample ($KW(x^2)=6.339$, $p=.175$). When participants were retested based on their gender, there were no significant differences again ($KW(x^2)=4.439$, $p=.350$ for the male participants and $KW(x^2)=4.864$, $p=.302$ for the female participants).

In conclusion, there is not a significant difference between fear of serious crimes and fear of other crimes. This discovery contradicts Warr and Stafford's (1983) research findings. However, when only female participants are considered is there a significant difference. In terms of fear of crime and perception of risk, there is no significant

difference between the two neighbourhoods. Considering Yenibağlar, which is in the city's centre, and the Gültepe neighbourhood, which is more remote and quiet, it is possible to say that this situation is unexpected, despite the fact that an h_1 hypothesis has not been established within the scope of this study. As anticipated, a significant and robust positive correlation was discovered between risk perception and fear of crime. In this context, rather than relying on a single emotive or cognitive scale for fear of crime measurements, it may be prudent to employ both scales and examine the relationship between them. Lastly, when measuring fear of crime, it is essential to include in the questions the categories of actions that will be considered illegal. Different categories of crimes elicit varying levels of fear and can indicate which groups are particularly impacted by which types of crimes. In this sense, this should be regarded as a factor to be considered in future research, both to create a general descriptive picture and to produce data for the suggested policies and research.

5.7.9. Avoidance and defence as coping mechanism to counter fear and risk

The final section of the questionnaire administered to the participants focuses on identifying the behaviours individuals develop in response to crime fear and risk perception. Participants were asked if they had developed avoidance behaviours, such as limiting activity and avoiding certain areas during the day and night, as well as defensive behaviours, such as installing an alarm, acquiring a guard dog, and carrying a defensive tool. Although these behaviours may be acquired as a consequence of a fear or risk perception, there is a reflexive relationship between these behaviours and the sense of fear and risk perception (Ferraro, 1996; Gray et al., 2011; Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017). Consequently, the following hypotheses were examined;

- People who adopted avoidance behaviour show less fear than others.
- People who adopted avoidance behaviour show less risk than others.
- People who adopted defensive behaviour show higher fear than others.

If the numbers of those who acquired an avoidance and defensive behaviour in general are included, the majority of participants exhibit avoidance and defence behaviours, as shown in the table 48.

Table 48 *The number of people who adopted avoidance and defensive behaviour*

		Avoidance frequency	Avoidance percent	Defensive frequency	Defensive percent
Valid	Yes	186	71.5	181	69.6
	No	74	28.5	79	30.4
	Total	260	100.0	260	100.0

There are 130 individuals in each of the two behaviour categories. In this regard, a comparison of fear of crime and risk perception for both behavioural groups were conducted by including the common denominator into the analyses. After removing the individuals from the common cluster, the remaining analysis was conducted. However, the most important factor for verifying hypotheses is the type of analysis that includes the common set. Because it is generally assumed that avoidance behaviour has a negative impact on fear of crime and risk perception.

The Mann-Whitney U test was conducted on those who exhibited avoidance behaviour and those who did not. In terms of fear of crime, the participants who adopted the avoidance behaviour differed significantly from the others. In accordance with the relevant median values, it has been observed that avoidance behaviour reduces the fear of crime ($p < .001$). Despite being less effective on risk perception, it should be also noted that the group with avoidance behaviour has significantly lower risk perception than the others ($p = .026$). The corresponding values can be seen in the table 49.

Table 49 *The impact of avoidance on fear and risk*

	Avoidance	N	Mean rank	Sum of ranks
Fear mean	Yes	186	119,79	22280,50
	No	74	157,43	11649,50
	Total	260		
Risk mean	Yes	186	123.99	23062.00
	No	74	146.86	10868.00
	Total	260		

In accordance with the findings of the literature, the fear of crime among participants who adopt any defensive behaviour is significantly higher than that of the

other participants ($p < .001$). Similar scenario is also valid for the comparison of risk perception ($p < .001$). The relevant fear and risk values can be seen in the table 50.

Table 50 *The impact of defensive behaviours on fear and risk*

	Defensive	N	Mean rank	Sum of ranks
Fear mean	Yes	181	141.95	25692.50
	No	79	104.27	8237.50
	Total	260		
Risk mean	Yes	181	143.92	26049.00
	No	79	99.76	7881.00
	Total	260		

When those who adopted specific behaviours from both groups were excluded from the analysis, it was discovered that the group that adopted the avoidance behaviour had significantly lower values for both fear of crime ($p < .001$) and risk perception than the other groups ($p = .004$). When only individuals with defensive behaviour were examined, however, similar results were not observed. Analysing the group that does not adopt any avoidance behaviour reveals that the group with defensive behaviour does not have significantly greater fear of crime ($p = .469$) and risk perception ($p = .098$) than the other group. Examining the participants who acquired the behaviours of defence and avoidance along the axis of gender reveals that there is no statistical difference between women and men in both behaviours.

As a result, it can be stated that avoidance behaviour has a negative impact on fear of crime and perception of risk. In contrast, it is observed in people who acquire defensive behaviours. Defensive behaviours can heighten fear and the perception of risk. Therefore, the investigated hypotheses were supported. Among the observations to be made at this time is the high prevalence of avoidance and defensive behaviour styles among the 260 participants. Avoidance behaviour involves avoiding certain areas during the day and/or night and limiting daily activities. Due to the risk of becoming a victim of crime, it can be said that certain sections of the public sphere are inaccessible to individuals. This situation can progress to the point where it exacerbates itself by fostering social isolation, alienation, and further withdrawal from the public sphere. Due to alienation, it is

important to observe that without intervention, fear of crime and prejudices toward certain people and areas may increase and interactions may decrease. On the other hand, the majority of participants display defensive behaviour patterns. Consequently, when the lower rates of crime fear and risk perception are taken into account, it can be emphasised that the prospect of crime victimisation as a way of life may be normalised, and individuals may believe that they must protect themselves. Confidence data for the police forces obtained in both neighbourhoods can be read as a supporting idea. As a result, qualitative research on the likelihood of crime victimisation can be suggested in order to identify micropatterns in individuals' lifestyles and suggest social policy based on daily life observations.

5.8. Discussion & Suggestion

Deviant behaviour and crime can sometimes be viewed as similar, sometimes different kinds of behaviour that are discussed and attempted to be explained from sociological and psychological perspectives. Therefore, in order to comprehend the research conducted for this thesis, it is necessary to first understand the distinction between deviant behaviour and criminal activity. Deviant behaviour can be defined as forms of behaviour that violates the norms of the group or groups and, in some instances, may constitute a crime (Kaplan, 2003; Kristiansen, 2017). However, a criminal activity should be regarded as form conduct that violates the law directly. Criminal activities can have negative effects on victims, such as shock, anxiety, and trauma, as well as on society, such as social isolation and decreased mutual trust (Dolu et la, 2010; Morrall et la, 2010). In order to ensure social interactions and a trustworthy environment, it is crucial to investigate the fear of crime and the perception of the risk of becoming a victim of any crime.

In comparison to research on crime phenomenon, it can be said that studies on fear of crime are comparatively recent. Compared to Western societies, the development of such disciplines in Turkiye is still in its early stages. Because, with the exception of studies examining large cities such as Ankara and Istanbul, there are very few studies that provide information about small cities and rural areas and investigate the relationships between variables in these regions. In this context, the primary objective of the research conducted for this thesis is to provide the first descriptive information about Eskişehir, which is frequently mentioned in the news in relation to its safety ([http-1](#) and [http-2](#)), and

to investigate the factors influencing the fear of crime and risk perception in two neighbourhoods with different locations and socio-economic levels. However, a secondary objective is to compare the results to those of other studies. Therefore, this research is correlational, and comparative as well as descriptive.

Before discussing the research findings and suggestions, it is essential to note that the research conducted for this thesis has significant limitations. Due to the absence of a representative sample, it cannot be asserted that the research is representative of Eskişehir. In addition, despite efforts to ensure the representation of groups with various socio-demographic characteristics through quota sampling, field conditions posed a significant barrier to recruiting a sufficient number of elderly participants. Non-parametric tests were used for data analysis because the data acquired from participants did not have a normal distribution, and it is stated that these tests are weaker than parametric ones (Güriş & Astar, 2015). Similarly, multivariate analysis must be performed on the scales obtained from the participants, but the researcher lacks access to software that can perform non-parametric multivariate analyses. The limitations of the research are discussed in greater detail in the introduction chapter.

As previously stated, criminal acts are those that violates the law. In this way, only the types of criminal actions such as fraud, threat, extortion, and sexual harassment were included in the emotional and cognitive scales of the questionnaire used to measure fear of crime and risk perception, in accordance with the literature-derived recommendations (Ferraro, 1995, p.21-36; Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987; Taylor & Hale, 1986; Warr & Stafford, 1983). The purpose of this is to strengthen the relationship between the phenomenon to be measured and the measurement, and to determine the position of fear of crime in social reality more precisely. The primary reason for including both cognitive and emotional fear of crime scales simultaneously was based on the Ferraro and LaGrange (1987) suggestions and their definition of fear of crime "fear of crime is a negative emotional reaction to crime or symbols associated with crime". In this regard, it was expected that the distinction between the participants' risk perceptions and their emotional fear of crime would be meaningful. Therefore, it can be stated that the research differs from numerous formless fear measurements, i.e., measurement forms that do not even include criminal actions. The crimes to be included in the survey were selected from the top ten offences that lead to penitentiary institution in Eskişehir (TÜİK, 2021). In order

to measure the fear caused by crimes of varying severity, the questionnaire was expanded to include more severe offences such as murder and sexual assault.

The study was conducted in two distinct Eskişehir neighbourhoods using quota sampling. The primary reason for utilising quota sampling is the inability to obtain population data on the research population and, consequently, the inability to obtain a highly representative probabilistic sample. This situation can be viewed as a limitation of the research. Location and income level were taken into account during the neighbourhood selection process. Because it was anticipated that the unique dynamics of the neighbourhoods can be crucial for investigating the variables that can influence the fear of crime and perception of risk. Consequently, the research universe consists of the Yenibağlar neighbourhood, which is located in the city's centre and is socially dynamic, and the Gültepe neighbourhood, which is relatively distant from the city centre and can be considered more static in terms of social change. Quotas were established to reach an equal number of participants from both neighbourhoods and to ensure an equal number of male and female participants. During the fieldwork, a questionnaire was administered to participants at various neighbourhood locations. Even though the research area is smaller than the city, it was intended to represent the neighbourhoods' diversity.

There are a number of factors that influence fear of crime. Within the context of these factors, the research questionnaire was designed. In order to gain a greater understanding of the social position of the participants, demographic information was requested from them first. Because, according to the vulnerability hypothesis, which attempts to explain the cause of fear of crime, people with various socio-demographic characteristics, such as women, age groups, and low-income groups, may have a greater fear of crime and risk perception than others (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.29-30; Sacco & Glackman, 1987; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, p.69-79). With some exception of positive correlation between age and fear of crime, It can also be stated that the findings of the research conducted in Türkiye on fear of crime supported the vulnerability hypothesis (Çardak, 2012; Gaziarifoğlu, 2009; Karakus et al., 2010; Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017; Öztürk et al., 2016; Sipahi, 2016; Uludağ, 2010). Accordingly, it is hypothesised that women will be more fearful than men, and that there will be no difference in fear of crime between the elderly and the young. In addition, the scope of the research includes inquiries about the relationship between socio-demographic characteristics such as income and education levels and fear of crime and risk perception. The primary findings

of the study indicate that women are more fearful and risk-aware than men. Examining this situation in terms of sexual crime it has been seen that the difference between women and men has widened even more. In studies that attempted to explain why women are more fearful than men, in addition to the vulnerability hypothesis, it was emphasised that women may be more fearful due to the possibility of sexual assault underlying face-to-face crimes, and the findings from several studies supported this hypothesis (Ferraro, 1996; Mellgren & Ivert, 2019; Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017; Warr, 1984). This approach, known as the Shadow hypothesis, was also examined in this study, and it was found that, when sexual crimes were excluded, women had a greater fear of crime than men when their fear of crime was measured in relation to crimes requiring face-to-face contact. Therefore, it can be claimed the analysis supported the shadow hypothesis. The existence of patriarchal structures in all denominators of the society, as well as explanations of the vulnerability hypothesis, may be among the primary causes of these results. The relationship between age and fear of crime did not reveal a significant difference between all age categories, but a pairwise comparison revealed a significant difference in fear of crime between the young and the elderly. Consequently, it is possible to say that the hypothesis is partially validated. Regarding the lack of significant distinction between the elderly and the young, Türkiye's relatively distinct social structure can be considered. To determine and explain the situation, it is recommended, however, to explore the dynamics by conducting a qualitative study on why there is such a difference between the studies conducted in Türkiye (Gaziarifoğlu, 2009; Karakus et al., 2010; Uludağ, 2010) and the studies conducted in the West (Braungart et al., 1980; Cossman & Rader, 2011; Pantazis, 2000; Toseland, 1982).

As the income level increases, the perception of risk can decrease because individuals will have the resources to stay away from crime-related areas or to protect themselves is another research problem examined within the scope of this research. However, the findings indicate that income does not significantly decrease risk perception. This may be owing to the fact that only two neighbourhoods were examined in the study. In this way, it is possible that a sample with a high level of representativeness and a citywide distribution would yield different research results. Similarly, the impact of education level on crime risk and fear is another area of inquiry. The results indicated that there was no correlation between education level, fear of crime, and perception of risk. Other studies have also examined the relationship between education and fear of

crime, and in accordance with the vulnerability hypothesis, a negative correlation or no correlation has been found (Box et al., 1988; Katz et al., 2003; Taylor & Hale, 1986). Therefore, it cannot be said that a consensus exists on this issue.

Among the approaches that explain the fear of crime and the perception of risk, it can often be found that the perceptions of individuals about their environment can be effective on fear and risk. This situation is similarly seen in studies dealing with the relationship between the media and fear of crime (Gerbner et al., 1986, p.18-28). By influencing the meaning world of consumers, media content can create fear of crime and perception of risk (Eschholz, 1997; Gerbner & Gross, 1976), but this relationship is not consistently observed in every research (Ditton et al., 2004; Lane & Meeker, 2003a; Romer et al., 2003; Weitzer & Kubrin, 2004). In the research conducted for this thesis, participants were asked if they follow news content on social media and television and, if so, how frequently they do so. The findings show that when both television and social media users are analysed together, no significant correlation was found between the consumption of news content in the media and the fear of crime. However, when analysed separately, it was found that following news content on social media increased risk perception, and curiously, those who did not watch television had a significantly higher risk perception than those who did. This circumstance is discussed in greater depth in the section on media content and fear of crime. However, this may be because the queries only asked whether news content is followed or not, while it is unknown which media organs are followed. This limitation can be crucial to understand the relationship between variables, because it has been empirically determined that news content can vary according to the ideological perspective (Efe, 2019; Sacco, 1995). This is consistent with Althusser's (2015) work "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses". Therefore, discovering which media organs are followed in a future study may alter the interpretation of the current study's findings. In addition, the study revealed that the increase in the frequency of watching television by individuals increases the fear of crime. In this sense, the frequency of exposure of individuals to media content can be described as another important variable.

Cohesion with one's neighbourhood is another variable considered to influence individuals' fear of crime and perception of risk that is supported by empirical evidence (Box et al., 1988; Karakus et al., 2010; Lindström et al., 2003; Markowitz et al., 2001; Rountree & Land, 1996; Scarborough et al., 2010).. In order to determine the level of

cohesion between individuals and their neighbourhoods, four distinct queries were posed in the research. However, the final question was excluded from the scope of the study on the premise that it diminished the scale's reliability. In response, the participants were asked how much they feel a part of their neighbourhood, how much they trust their neighbours, and how often they communicate with their neighbours. It was determined that the level of cohesion in both neighbourhoods was low. When this situation is examined more closely, it becomes apparent that the Yenibağlar neighbourhood has a lower degree of cohesion than Gültepe. This is typical given the locations of the neighbourhoods and the dynamic and ever-changing nature of Yenibağlar. However, it cannot be said that the Gültepe neighbourhood has a high level of sense of cohesion either. The urban transformation that the Gültepe neighbourhood is still undergoing may be one of the primary causes of this situation, or it may be interpreted as the result of individualisation, which can be regarded a general result of urbanisation. Regarding the relationship between cohesion, fear of crime, and perception of risk, the hypothesis that cohesion will reduce both fear of crime and perception of risk has been tested in accordance with the literature. According to the results, there is a significant but weak negative correlation between cohesion and fear of crime and perception of risk. When this situation was examined by segregating the neighbourhoods and excluding other variables from the analysis, it was discovered that cohesion was only negatively correlated with risk perception for the Yenibağlar neighbourhood. In order to comprehend the effect of cohesion on fear of crime and risk perception, executing a multivariate analysis is another suggested method of analysis.

In addition to individuals' sense of cohesion with their own neighbourhoods, there is an assumption that their perceptions of neighbourhood issues will influence their fear of crime and risk perception. Accordingly, it has been theorised and empirically supported by numerous studies that when individuals perceive a large number of problems in their region, their perception of social control diminishes (Bennett & Flavin, 1994; Borooah & Carcach, 1997; Box et al., 1988; Brunton-Smith, 2011; Chadee et al., 2017; Gray et al., 2011; LaGrange et al., 1992; Lane & Meeker, 2003b; Scarborough et al., 2010). Within the scope of this thesis, individuals were asked 11 distinct inquiries about the social and physical incivilities in their neighbourhoods. The results indicate that perceived incivility increases both crime fear and the perception of risk. Thus, two distinct one-way hypotheses were validated, indicating that incivilities are positively correlated with both

fear of crime and risk perception. When both neighbourhoods were examined separately, a positive correlation was found between incivilities and fear of crime, but there was no correlation between risk perception and incivilities. Consequently, it should be stated that, on a fundamental level, the perceptions of an individual's environment can be an influential variable on fear and risk. When the two neighbourhoods are compared with each other in terms of incivilities, there is no significant difference. However, the problems perceived by the residents of the neighbourhood are different. While vandalism is described as a prominent problem in both neighbourhoods, drug use in Yenibağlar and beggars in Gültepe are described as major concerns. However, it should be noted that the scale only focuses on the perceptions of the participants. In this regard, neighbour's perceptions of problems can also vary. Nonetheless, a site-specific analysis for the determination of problems and potential policy plans according to findings can be suggested. Because policies or informing residents about the issues may alter the overall fear of crime and perception of risk.

Another variable evaluated for its effect on fear of crime and risk perception is individuals' confidence in police forces. There are fewer studies in the literature that examine the relationship between trust in law enforcement and fear of crime, and it cannot be claimed that the findings are consistent (Alda et al., 2017; Çakar, 2015; Gray et al., 2011; Jackson et al., 2009). In this sense, two different one-way hypotheses that state confidence in police force is negatively correlated with fear of crime and risk perception are tested. According to the findings of the study, both fear of crime and the perception of risk decrease as trust in the police increases. Both hypotheses are therefore justified. Another important finding of the research is the low trust in the police forces in both Yenibağlar and Gültepe. This scenario especially can be seen regarding the article in confidence in police force scale that states police force is effective in protecting victims of crime and eyewitnesses. Therefore, it can be said that individuals generally have low trust in the police and may have the idea that they should take care of themselves. This may result in a statistically low crime rate by preventing individuals from reporting crimes they have seen or personally experienced to law enforcements. In addition, the attempts of individuals to cope with crime using their own methods can be viewed as a factor that may facilitate the committing of more crimes and the spread of violence collectively. In this context, it may be advantageous to conduct a study on confidence in law enforcement and on the extent to which individuals report crimes to the police in order to comprehend

the gap between institutions and individuals and to effectively assess the magnitude of the problem that criminal activities pose in the practical world.

Another approach that aims to explain the fear of crime is the victimisation hypothesis. As stated, individuals may experience anxiety, shock or trauma after their crime victimization (Clark, 2003; Doran & Burgess, 2012; Mesch, 2000; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981, p.59-69), and this may increase sensitivity towards the environment . In this context, study participants were asked if they had been victims of 10 distinct offences in the past 12 months. Possibly the most intriguing findings of the study are revealed in this context. Eskişehir has been in the news due to its low crime rate and high level of safety ([http-1](#) and [http-2](#)). The analysis obtained from the field, however, contradicts this perception. Seventy of the 260 participants had been victims of a crime in the previous 12 months. This rate is quite high for a city that is characterised as safe. A second factor is repeated victimisations. Accordingly, the participants were asked how many times they had been victims of crime, and a total of 180 victims were identified. Moreover, in the light of the data on where individuals experience these victimisations, it is concluded that streets, public transportation and workplaces may be suitable environments for committing crimes. Cyber environments are frequently cited as being peculiar to fraud. In light of the number of people who experienced any victimisation and the total number of victimisations, a query that was not included in the research's scope was derived. Is there a significant difference in the level of confidence in police forces between individuals who have undergone victimization and those who have not? The results of the analysis indicate that crime victims have significantly less faith in the police than the general population. In addition, despite the absence of a representative sample, it can be said that the number of people sent to the penitentiary institution in Eskişehir between 2011 and 2020 and the field data do not overlap when victimisation rates are taken into account (TÜİK, 2021). In light of this information, the safety of Eskişehir must be called into question. By removing the barrier to accessing official crime statistics and developing a victimisation map for Eskişehir, it will be possible to compare the actual and official crime rates. Without this comparison, when the possible beliefs of individuals that they should take care of themselves and distrust in the police are evaluated together, it can be assumed that a large number of crime victimisations are not reported or, if reported, that no results can be obtained after the legal process. If no action is taken for a solution, the normalisation and expansion of criminality is possible.

The questions addressed in the research related to crime victimization are related to whether any victimization affects the fear of crime and risk perception. According to the results obtained from the analyses, the fear of crime and risk perception of individuals who have been victims of any crime are significantly higher than the others. In short, experiencing victimization increases the fear of crime and risk perception. The crimes to which women and men are subjected is a further point of significance. Sexual offences account for 49 of the 180 victims of crime. Sexual offences do not, however, make the top ten list of offences committed by individuals entering Eskişehir prisons. This demonstrates that women do not report their daily victimisations or, if they do, that no results can be obtained. In a broad sense, this scenario may encourage women to withdraw from social life or develop defensive mechanism. The qualitative research on fear of crime by Çardak (2012) yields comparable results. It has been reported that women fear sexual crimes more and avoid certain areas of the city.

Taking into account the overall results of fear of crime and perception of risk, descriptive statistics demonstrate that participants have a lower-than-average fear of crime and perception of risk. This holds true for both Yenibağlar and Gültepe. Theft and sexual crimes are the most feared crimes by women, while burglary, theft, and injury crimes are the most feared by men. In this context, one of the primary reasons for including serious crimes among 10 different categories of crime is the empirical support in the literature for the notion that serious crimes will elicit greater fear than others (Warr & Stafford, 1983). However, analyses indicate that fear of serious crimes is not significantly greater than that of other crimes. The one-way hypothesis regarding this issue was therefore rejected. Risk perception is another variable considered to have a positive effect on fear of crime. The perception of risk can exist without the presence of an actual threat. Studies have uncovered the positive effect of risk perception on fear of crime (Ferraro, 1995, p.7-39; Ferraro & LaGrange, 1987; Warr & Stafford, 1983). Thus, the one-way hypothesis that a positive relationship exists between risk perception and fear of crime has been tested and confirmed. There is a significant and strong positive correlation between risk perception and fear of crime.

As can be seen, in addition to different types of crimes, individuals with different demographic characteristics are more fearful of various types of crimes and perceive certain crimes to be more probable. In this respect, the use of multiple indicators in fear of crime research scales can be viewed as a necessity instead of formless fear

measurements. Moreover, risk perception and fear of crime can be viewed as two separate and distinct scales. Consequently, it is essential to conduct simultaneous measurements and establish the relationship between variables. Moreover, when investigating where there is risk and where it is associated with fear, it is evident that the streets pose the greatest problem. Nonetheless, many participants characterise public transport and workplaces as unsafe. It can also be stated that night-time locations such as pubs and bars can be dangerous, whereas cyber environments pose a risk for fraud according to the participants. Parallel to the general fear of crime results, when the frequency of fear of the participants is examined, it can be seen that the majority of them have not experienced fear in the past year. This situation is consistent with the perception that Eskişehir is secure, but it contradicts the crime victimisation statistics. Therefore, it can be claimed that similar to how there is no requirement for an actual threat to feel threatened, there is no requirement for a secure environment to feel safe.

Two other questions addressed within the scope of the research are whether participants having home burglary insurance and the frequency of going out at night have any influence on crime fear. Although it can be observed that those who have insurance exhibit lower levels of crime fear, the analysis indicates that this difference is not statistically significant. Similarly, no significant relationship was found between the frequency of going out at night and crime fear.

Fear of crime and risk perception can also motivate individuals to take particular actions. In the literature, these types of actions are categorised as defence or avoidance, and it is evident that these actions have a reflexive relationship with fear of crime and the perception of risk (Ferraro, 1996; Gray et al., 2011; Özaşçılar & Ziyalar, 2017). Therefore, at the end of the questionnaire, participants were asked which of the eleven categories of actions they had taken. The majority of participants adopted avoidance behaviours, such as avoiding certain areas and limiting their activities, as well as defensive behaviours, such as carrying a defensive device and learning martial arts. In this context, it can be argued that these measures are an attempt to mitigate the existing danger and fear. It is hypothesised that avoidance behaviour will reduce fear of crime and risk perception within the scope of the study. The findings support these two hypotheses. To be considered, however, is the fact that the majority of participants exhibit at least one of the avoidance behaviours. In this sense, in addition to avoiding certain locations, it is possible to claim that most of the participants restrict their daily activities. As a result,

leaving certain areas could suggest that certain groups do not have access to certain public spaces, and it may also contribute to the strengthening of prejudices against certain groups and regions. In advanced cases, a social structure on which the fear of crime can build on itself may emerge due to social isolation, although accurate values cannot be obtained through measurements. Likewise, the vast majority of participants exhibit defensive behaviour patterns. Taking into account the victimisation rates and the level of trust in police forces, it is possible to conclude that criminal activities are normalised and that individuals may believe they must protect themselves.

Consequently, it should be stated that the fear of crime and the perception of risk are below the norm in the two neighbourhoods examined for this study. Taking into account the number of individuals who are victims of a crime and the total number of victimisations, it is apparent that this situation can be interpreted as a false sense of security. However, as stated, the research only focuses on two neighbourhoods, so the findings may differ in other regions of the city or in general. Thus, there are social policies that can be suggested for altering individuals' perceptions of their environment, given the findings of the research. According to Allatt (2000), the implementation of these measures has the potential to reduce fear of crime by inducing a change in the residents' mindsets, as opposed to being perceived as a direct effort to reduce crime rates. Regarding the policies that can be adopted, Henig and Maxfield (2000) stated that while there is a high level of fear of crime when the crime rate is low, accurate crime statistics can be made public and novel practises can be implemented by identifying the problems. They also stated that it would be important to implement regulations to prevent the sensationalization and exaggeration of criminality in the media. In this way, as Gerbner and Gross (1976) noted, this can be effective in preventing the perception that certain groups are prone to committing crimes or that certain groups are suitable victims. Similarly, considering the relationship between the police and criminal activity, it has been suggested that the police should be on the streets as a preventative measure before a criminal act occurs and should intervene in behaviour that disrupts public order (Doran & Burgess, 2012, p.51-61). Considering the ideological reflections of institutions, the morality of this practise is debatable. Because, from a critical perspective, it should not be forgotten that this practise is susceptible to abuse and that groups in power may implement alternative practises to impose their own norms. In terms of building trust in institutions, there is an opinion that the police taking part in patrol areas on foot can

increase the interaction between the police and the public and renew the trust in institutions (Henig & Maxfield, 2000). In light of the low levels of trust in the police revealed by this study, it can be recommended that practises be implemented to increase the interaction between police and individuals. Finally, Skogan and Maxfield argued that improving community cohesion and lowering the impression of vulnerability can be achieved by recognising region-specific problems through community-oriented programming and public participation in the management of problem resolution. As a result, rather than a centralised structure, granting institutions more autonomy and ensuring effective public participation can be viewed as practises aimed at resolving perceived problems.



CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

In comparison to western societies, it can be stated that studies on fear of crime and risk perception in Türkiye are at an early stage of development. In this sense, although it is possible to speak of fear of crime studies covering large cities in Türkiye, there was no study on fear of crime and risk perception in a relatively small and safe city such as Eskişehir. In this sense, the primary objective of the study is to generate descriptive statistics on fear of crime and risk perception in two neighbourhoods with different locations and socio-economic levels in Eskişehir, as well as to assess the factors that influence fear of crime. Consequently, 260 participants were asked to complete a questionnaire assessing their emotional and cognitive fear of crime. By employing quota sampling, it was intended to reach an equal number of participants from each neighbourhood, namely Yenibağlar, which has a central location, and Gültepe, which can be considered to be relatively far from the city centre. The gender was the second criterion, and an equal number of men and women were surveyed.

The primary findings of the study indicate that both Yenibağlar and Gültepe neighbourhoods have relatively low rates of crime fear and risk perception. However, this is observed when males and women are evaluated together. Comparing the rates of women's fear of crime and risk perception with those of men reveals that women have a significantly higher fear of crime and risk perception than men. When this disparity is examined in terms of sexual offences, it becomes even more pronounced. In this sense, it can be claimed that women are more fearful than men. Furthermore, the comparison between the offences requiring face-to-face interactions and others revealed that women are more fearful due to the possibility of sexual assault. Consequently, the results support the shadow hypothesis. Another point to be made regarding these findings is that men generally give the lowest scores to questions about fear and victimization risks. This may be the result of a learned conception of masculinity.

Another important finding is that living with various groups of people can be a factor that affects a person's fear of crime. For instance, it has been observed that women have less fear of crime when they reside in groups with relationships, such as families. This situation can be interpreted as helping and solidarity in closely related groups create a factor influencing the vulnerabilities of individuals.

Several studies conducted in Türkiye have rejected the hypothesis that the elderly is more fearful than the young (Gaziarifoğlu, 2009; Karakus et al., 2010; Uludağ, 2010).

Similar results are found in this study as well. Although paired comparisons revealed a significant difference in fear of crime between one of the young and elderly group, it cannot be concluded that age has a positive correlation with fear of crime in general. An additional intriguing finding is that individuals' perception of risk does not change significantly as their income increases. However, this result may be owing to the fact that the study was conducted in only two neighbourhoods. In this way, distinctions between neighbourhoods with high income levels and others are more easily detectable in citywide surveys. However, it should not be forgotten at this point that the unique dynamics of neighbourhoods can play a significant role in fear of crime and risk perception.

The relationship between the media and fear of crime was another factor that this study investigated. Consequently, it is evident that the majority of participants monitor the news. However, when the relationship between media consumption and fear of crime was investigated, no correlation was found. When those who view news on television and those who follow news content on social media were analysed independently, the results has changed. While it is evident that consuming news content on social media increases the perception of risk, it is interesting to note that television has the opposite effect. Additionally, viewing the news on television frequently has a positive impact on fear of crime. The effect of the consumption of news content in the media is discussed in more detail in the findings chapter. It should be noted that the reason why news content is generally regarded as ineffective in reducing fear of crime may be because the questions are limited to news content only. Consequently, it can be asserted that a study on the relationship between the media and fear of crime may be crucial for capturing the relationship between the variables in depth. Because it has been observed that the majority of research participants frequently monitor the national agenda via social media and television.

Understanding how individuals' perceptions of their environment and their ties to their environment influence their fear of crime and risk perception is one of the primary purposes of including neighbourhoods with two different locations and income levels in the scope of the research. Accordingly, it was determined that a person's ties to their neighbourhood, their associations, and their neighbourhood relations are factors that reduce their fear of crime and risk perception. In short, neighbourhood cohesion is negatively correlated with fear of crime and risk perception. Therefore, it can be argued that the perception of unity and the ability to solve problems make people feel more

secure. In addition to the perception of belonging it has been discovered that the participants' perceptions of their environmental problems have a significant and positive effect on their fear of crime and perception of risk. In other words, the problems that individuals perceive in their environment and neighbourhood may indicate that the region has entered a state of collapse, that social control has diminished, and that deviant behaviours have increased. This circumstance can increase fear of crime and perception of risk. When social and physical incivilities are examined separately, it is seen that social incivilities increase both the fear of crime and the perception of risk, while physical incivilities only have a positive effect on the fear of crime. In addition, it is observed that women are more affected than males by social incivilities.

Within the scope of the study, participants' trust in the police force was also assessed, and the results indicate that trust in the police forces is quite low in both neighbourhoods. Confidence level is especially low regarding the article stating that the police force is effective in protecting crime victims and eyewitnesses. Therefore, it is possible to emphasise the possibility of a perception that individuals should take care of themselves. Examining the effect of confidence in police forces on fear of crime and risk perception reveals a negative and significant correlation between the participants' level of trust and both fear of crime and risk perception. Therefore, why people do not trust the police, what can be done about it, and the extent to which they report crimes they have witnessed or experienced can be suggested as research topics.

Perhaps the most surprising results in the study were seen in the light of the information obtained about the past victimization of the participants. The participants were asked about their experience of crime victimization in the last 12 months, and it was seen that 70 out of 260 participants were victims of one or more crimes, and the total number of victimizations was 180. This is an intriguing result for Eskişehir, which is regarded as a secure city and is among the safest cities mentioned in the news ([http-1](#) and [http-2](#)). In this sense, it is possible to conclude that victims are reluctant to report the crime to the police or that, even if they do, no result can be obtained. The analysis revealed that crime victims have a significantly greater fear of crime and perception of risk than others. They also have less faith in the police. Therefore, it may be necessary to construct a map of Eskişehir's victimisation and assess its impact on trust and fear. In addition, data from the representative sample should be compared to official crime statistics. Nonetheless, the issue of accessing official data must be resolved at this time, as only

then can descriptive information regarding the existence of actual crime rates and projections for social policies be obtained.

In terms of fear of crime and risk perception, it is thought that neighbourhoods will vary based on their locations and income levels; thus, comparison is necessary. However, the analysis of the participant data reveals that the fear of crime and perception of risk do not vary considerably between neighbourhoods. Consequently, comparing rural and urban regions and measuring the impact of social change dynamics on fear of crime and risk perception can be proposed as additional research topic that can be important. In accordance with the literature, a positive, statistically significant, and robust correlation was found between risk perception and fear of crime. However, the hypothesis that serious crimes elicit greater fear than others is not supported. In light of the fact that different types of crimes elicit varying levels of fear, and that men and women fear different types of crimes to varying degrees, it is possible that methodologically including different types of indicators into emotional and cognitive scales could be effective in enhancing our understanding of social reality.

Finally, it has been observed that fear of crime and perception of risk lead to certain types of behaviour, and that these behaviour patterns have a reflexive effect on fear of crime and risk perception. While avoidance behaviour was found to be a factor reducing fear of crime and risk perception, it was observed that individuals with defensive behaviour patterns had higher fear of crime and risk perception than others. The number of participants who exhibit avoidance and defensive behaviours is a further significant finding. The majority of the participants adopted avoidance behaviours. Therefore, it is possible to state that individuals reduce their fear of crime by decreasing the existing risk and avoiding certain areas. Although not certain, this scenario may also account for the low fear of crime and risk perception.

In terms of future research, it can be said that fear and cognitively perceived risk have different meanings for participants; thus, it may be useful to use cognitive and emotional scales together within the accepted operational definition of fear of crime and to examine their relationship. In addition, considering the different levels of fear caused by different types of crimes and the differentiation of these fears based on socio-demographic factors, it may be recommended to include the types of acts that are considered crimes by the law in the scales instead of employing formless fear measurements. Another essential consideration is whether the victimisation rate obtained

during the research overlaps with the city's crime statistics. This comparison can reveal the extent to which crime rates are problematic in the city and the extent to which crimes are reported to the authorities. In addition, given the significant disparity in trust in police forces between victimised and non-victimized individuals, it may be essential and useful to investigate the relationship between the rate of crime reporting and trust in police forces. In a nutshell, the methodology and measurement techniques utilised in the research can have a direct impact on the results produced. In this regard, it is essential for the researcher to create a road map to depict the social reality as accurately as possible. Nonetheless, the length of the questionnaire administered to the participants should not be disregarded, and the use of concepts should be avoided.

As a consequence, it can be concluded that environmental perceptions can influence fear of crime and risk perception, that women and men perceive social life differently, and that crime can have negative effects on both the individual and society. In this sense, the research is limited because it only examines two neighbourhoods, but it is significant in that it provides the first descriptive information for Eskişehir, which is regarded as safe, and reaches interesting conclusions regarding victimisation rates and confidence in police forces.

REFERENCES

- Acar, S., Cinoğlu Şahin, D., Karagöz, T., Kaygısız, G., Meydan, M. C., & Işık, M. (2022). *İlçelerin sosyo-ekonomik gelişmişlik sıralaması araştırması: Sege-2022*. Ankara: Kalkınma Ajansları Genel Müdürlüğü.
- Adler, F., Mueller, G. O. W., & Luafer, W. S. (2013). *Criminology* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Agnew, R. S. (1985). Neutralizing the Impact of Crime. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 12(2), 221–239. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854885012002005>
- Akbaş, U., & Koğar, H. (2020). *Nicel Araştırmalarda Kayıp Veriler ve Uç Değerler: Çözüm Önerileri ve SPSS Uygulamaları*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Akers, R. L., Greca, A. J., Sellers, C., & Cochran, J. (1987). FEAR OF CRIME AND VICTIMIZATION AMONG THE ELDERLY IN DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITIES. *Criminology*, 25(3), 487–506. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1987.tb00807.x>
- Akıncı Sokullu, F. (2020). *Kriminoloji* (14th ed.). İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım.
- Akyuz, K., Akbas, H., & Onat, I. (2021). Evaluating the impact of Syrian refugees on fear of crime in Turkey. *European Journal of Criminology*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14773708211010665>
- Alda, E., Bennett, R. R., & Morabito, M. S. (2017). Confidence in the police and the fear of crime in the developing world. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 40(2), 366–379. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-03-2016-0045>
- Alkan, İ. N. (2021). *Kamusal Mekan Kullanımında Suça Maruz Kalma Korkusu: Ordu Rüsumat Sahili Örneği*. Published Master Thesis. Düzce: Düzce Üniversitesi, Institute of Science.
- Allatt, P. (2000). Fear of Crime: The Effect of Improved Residential Security on a Difficult To Let Estate. In Jason Ditton & S. Farral (Eds.), *The Fear of Crime* (pp. 461–474). London: Routledge.
- Althusser, L. (2015). *İdeoloji ve Devletin İdeolojik Aygıtları* (2nd ed.; A. Tümertekin,

- Trans.). İstanbul: İthaki Yayınları.
- Appadurai, A. (2006). *Fear Of Small Numbers: An Essay On The Geography Of Anger*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Aytaç, S., Derdiman, R. C., Baştürk, Ş., & Öngen, B. (2015). Kent Güvenliği Olarak Suç Korkusu: Bursa Örneği. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Mühendislik Bilimleri ve Tasarım Dergisi*, 3(3), 259–267.
<https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/jesd/issue/20874/224036>
- Baker, L. A., Jacobson, K. C., Raine, A., Lozano, D. I., & Bezdjian, S. (2007). Genetic and environmental bases of childhood antisocial behavior: A multi-informant twin study. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 116(2), 219–235.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.116.2.219>
- Baker, L. A., Tuvblad, C., & Raine, A. (2010). Genetics and Crime. In E. McLaughlin & T. Newburn (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Criminological Theory* (pp. 21–39). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Baker, M. H., Nienstedt, B. C., Everett, R. S., & McCleary, R. (1983). The Impact of a Crime Wave: Perceptions, Fear, and Confidence in the Police. *Law & Society Review*, 17(2), 319–336. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3053350>
- Bauman, Z. (2018). *Kapımızdaki Yabancılar* (E. Barca, Trans.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Baxandall, R., & Gordon, L. (2005). Second-wave Feminism. In N. A. Hewitt (Ed.), *A Companion to American Women's History* (pp. 414–432). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Beauvoir, S. de. (2011). *The Second Sex* (C. Borde & S. Malovany-Chevallier, Eds.). New York: Vintage Books.
- Beauvoir, S. de. (2013). “Introduction” and Chapter 12 from *Second Sex*. In W. K. Kolmar & F. Bartkowski (Eds.), *Feminist Theory: A Reader* (4th ed., pp. 161–168). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Becker, H. S. (2019). *Hariciler (Outsiders) Bir Sapkınlık Sosyolojisi Çalışması* (4th ed.; Şerife Geniş & L. Ünsaldı, Trans.). Ankara: Heretik Basım Yayın.

- Beirne, P., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2011). *Criminology: A Sociological Approach* (5th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bellair, P. E. (1997). SOCIAL INTERACTION AND COMMUNITY CRIME: EXAMINING THE IMPORTANCE OF NEIGHBOR NETWORKS. *Criminology*, 35(4), 677–704. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1997.tb01235.x>
- Bennett, R. R., & Flavin, J. M. (1994). Determinants of fear of crime: The effect of cultural setting. *Justice Quarterly*, 11(3), 357–381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418829400092311>
- Best, S. (2005). *Understanding Social Divisions*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Blalock, H. M. (1956). Economic Discrimination and Negro Increase. *American Sociological Review*, 21(5), 584–588. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2089093>
- Blalock, H. M. (1957). Per Cent Non-White and Discrimination in the South. *American Sociological Review*, 22(6), 677–682. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2089197>
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. California: University of California Press.
- Borooah, V. K., & Carcach, C. A. (1997). CRIME AND FEAR: Evidence from Australia. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 37(4), 635–657. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjc.a014202>
- Box, S., Hale, C., & Andrews, G. (1988). Explaining Fear Of Crime. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 28(3), 340–356. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/23638157?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Boxer, M. J. (1982). ‘First wave’ feminism in nineteenth-century France: Class, family and religion. *Women’s Studies International Forum*, 5(6), 551–559. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395\(82\)90096-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395(82)90096-6)
- Boztoprak, A. (2018). *Suç Korkusu: Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi Öğrencileri Üzerinde Bir İnceleme*. Published Master Thesis. Karaman: Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Brake, M. (2013). *The Sociology of Youth Culture and Youth Subcultures: Sex and Drugs and Rock ‘n’ Roll?* London: Routledge.

- Braungart, M. M., Braungart, R. G., & Hoyer, W. J. (1980). Age, Sex, and Social Factors in Fear of Crime. *Sociological Focus*, 13(1), 55–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00380237.1980.10570360>
- Brown, S. E., Esbense, F.-A., & Geis, G. (2013). *Criminology: Explaining Crime and Its Context* (8th ed.). Boston: Anderson Publishing.
- Bruinsma, G. (2014). Differential Association Theory. In G. Bruinsma & D. Weisburd (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice* (pp. 1065–1075). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5690-2_691
- Brunton-Smith, I. (2011). Untangling the Relationship Between Fear of Crime and Perceptions of Disorder: Evidence from a Longitudinal Study of Young People in England and Wales. *British Journal of Criminology*, 51(6), 885–899. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azr064>
- Bulmer, M. (1986). *The Chicago School of Sociology: Institutionalization, Diversity, and the Rise of Sociological Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burawoy, M. (1998). The Extended Case Method. *Sociological Theory*, 16(1), 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0735-2751.00040>
- Burgess-Proctor, A. (2006). Intersections of Race, Class, Gender, and Crime. *Feminist Criminology*, 1(1), 27–47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085105282899>
- Burgess-Proctor, A. (2014). Feminist Criminological Theory. In G. Bruinsma & D. Weisburd (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal justice* (pp. 1603–1612). New York: Springer.
- Burke, R. H. (2009). *An Introduction to Criminological Theory* (3rd ed.). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203118283>
- Çakar, B. (2015). Factors affecting trust in police in Turkey. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 12(1), 1381–1393. <https://doi.org/10.14687/ijhs.v12i1.3192>
- Çardak, B. (2012). Kadınların Suç Korkusu Üzerine Nitel Bir Çalışma. *Güvenlik Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1(1), 23–45. <https://doi.org/10.28956/gbd.239715>
- Çetin, D. (2010). *A Study Of Fear Of Crime In Two Districts Of Ankara*. Published Doctoral Thesis. Ankara: Middle East Technical University, The Graduate School

of Social Sciences.

- Chadee, D., Ali, S., Burke, A., & Young, J. (2017). Fear of crime and community concerns: Mediating effect of risk and pragmatic fear. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 27(6), 450–462. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2326>
- Chadee, D., & Ditton, J. (2005). Fear of crime and the media: Assessing the lack of relationship. *Crime, Media, Culture: An International Journal*, 1(3), 322–332. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741659005057644>
- Chambliss, W. J. (1964). A Sociological Analysis of the Law of Vagrancy. *Social Problems*, 12(1), 67–77. <https://doi.org/10.2307/798699>
- Chambliss, W. J. (1975). Toward A Political Economy Of Crime. *Theory and Society*, 2(1), 149–170. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00212732>
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Morash, M. (2013). Transformative Feminist Criminology: A Critical Re-thinking of a Discipline. *Critical Criminology*, 21(3), 287–304. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10612-013-9187-2>
- Chiricos, T., Hogan, M., & Gertz, M. (1997). Racial Composition of Neighborhood And Fear Of Crime. *Criminology*, 35(1), 107–132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1997.tb00872.x>
- Christensen, L. B., Johnson, R. B., & Turner, L. A. (2020). *Araştırma Yöntemleri: Desen ve Analiz* (3rd ed.; A. Aypay, Trans.). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Clark, J. (2003). Fear in Fear-of-crime. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 10(2), 267–282. <https://doi.org/10.1375/pplt.2003.10.2.267>
- Clarke, J., Hall, S., Jefferson, T., & Roberts, B. (1997). Subcultures, Cultures and Class. In K. Gelder & S. Thornton (Eds.), *The Subcultures Reader* (pp. 100–111). London: Routledge.
- Cloward, R. A., & Ohlin, L. E. (1960). *Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315007274>
- Cohen, A. K. (1997). A General Theory of Subcultures. In K. Gelder & S. Thornton (Eds.), *The Subcultures Reader* (pp. 44–54). London: Routledge.

- Cohen, A. K., & Short, J. F. (1958). Research in Delinquent Subcultures. *Journal of Social Issues*, 14(3), 20–37. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1958.tb01414.x>
- Comte, A. (2019). *Pozitif Felsefe Dersleri ve Pozitif Anlayış üzerine Konuşma* (2nd ed.; E. Ataçay, Trans.). Ankara: BilgeSu Yayıncılık.
- Coser, L. A. (1957). Social Conflict and the Theory of Social Change. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 8(3), 197. <https://doi.org/10.2307/586859>
- Cossman, J. S., & Rader, N. E. (2011). FEAR OF CRIME AND PERSONAL VULNERABILITY: EXAMINING SELF-REPORTED HEALTH. *Sociological Spectrum*, 31(2), 141–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02732173.2011.541339>
- Cressey, D. R. (1960). The Theory of Differential Association: An Introduction. *Social Problems*, 8(1), 2–6. <https://doi.org/10.2307/798624>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planing, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.; P. A. Smith, Ed.). Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- Croake, J. W., & Hinkle, D. E. (1976). Methodological Problems in the Study of Fears. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 93(2), 197–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1976.9915813>
- Daly, K., & Chesney-Lind, M. (1988). Feminism and criminology. *Justice Quarterly*, 5(4), 497–538. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418828800089871>
- De Fleur, M. L., & Quinney, R. (1966). A Reformulation of Sutherland's Differential Association Theory and a Strategy for Empirical Verification. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 3(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002242786600300101>
- DeKeseredy, W. S. (2011). *Contemporary Critical Criminology*. London: Routledge.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (2010). Friedman economic policies, social exclusion, and crime: toward a gendered left realist subcultural theory. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 54(2), 159–170. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-010-9251-8>
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (2013). Confronting Progressive Retreatism and Minimalism: The Role of a New Left Realist Approach. *Critical Criminology*, 21(3),

273–286. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10612-013-9192-5>

Denzin, N. K. (1992). *Symbolic Interactionism and Cultural Studies: The Politics of Interpretation*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

DiCristina, B. (2016). Durkheim's theory of anomie and crime: A clarification and elaboration. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 49(3), 311–331. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0004865815585391>

Ditton, J., Chadee, D., Farrall, S., Gilchrist, E., & 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(4), 595–610. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azh028>

Ditton, Jason, Bannister, J., Gilchrist, E., & Farrall, S. (1999). Afraid or Angry? Recalibrating the 'fear' of Crime. *International Review of Victimology*, 6(2), 83–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026975809900600201>

Dolu, O., Uludağ, Ş., & Doğutaş, C. (2010). Suç Korkusu: Nedenleri, Sonuçları Ve Güvenlik Politikaları İlişkisi. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 65(1), 57–81. https://doi.org/10.1501/SBFder_0000002154

Doob, A. N., & Macdonald, G. E. (1979). Television viewing and fear of victimization: Is the relationship causal? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(2), 170–179. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.37.2.170>

Doran, B. J., & Burgess, M. B. (2012). *Putting Fear of Crime on the Map : Investigating Perceptions of Crime Using GIS* (L. Sherman W. & H. Strang, Eds.). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-4419-5647-7>

Durkheim, E. (1986). *İntihar: Toplumbilimsel İnceleme* (Ö. Ozankaya, Trans.). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Durkheim, E. (2014). *Sosyolojik Yöntemin Kuralları* (Ö. Doğan, Trans.). Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.

Durkheim, E. (2020). *Toplumsal İşbölümü* (4th ed.; Ö. Ozankaya, Trans.). İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi.

Efe, İ. (2019). A corpus-driven analysis of representations of Syrian asylum seekers in

- the Turkish press 2011–2016. *Discourse and Communication*, 13(1), 48–67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481318801624>
- Eley, T. C., Lichtenstein, P., & Stevenson, J. (1999). Sex Differences in the Etiology of Aggressive and Nonaggressive Antisocial Behavior: Results from Two Twin Studies. *Child Development*, 70(1), 155–168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00012>
- Ellwood, C. A. (1912). Lombroso's Theory of Crime. *Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 2(5), 716–723. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1132830>
- Erkan Ç., N., & Sevin, B. (2018). Suç Korkusu Konusunda Bir İnceleme: Kadıköy Örneği. *Planlama*, 28(3), 315–327. <https://doi.org/10.14744/planlama.2018.82787>
- Eschholz, S. (1997). The Media and Fear of Crime: A Survey of the Research. *University of Florida Journal of Law & Public Policy*, 9(1), 37–60. Retrieved from <https://scholarship.law.ufl.edu/jlpp/vol9/iss1/2>
- Eve, R. A., & Eve Brown, S. (1984). The Effects of Powerlessness, Fear of Social Change, and Social Integration on Fear of Crime Among the Elderly. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 9(2), 290–295. Retrieved from https://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc461720/m2/1/high_res_d/eve_003.pdf
- Farganis, J. (2014). *Readings in Social Theory: The Classic Tradition to Post-Modernism* (7th ed.). Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
- Farrall, S., Bannister, J., Ditton, J., & Gilchrist, E. (1997). Questioning The Measurement Of The Fear Of Crime: Findings From A Major Methodological Study. *British Journal of Criminology*, 37(4), 658–679. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjc.a014203>
- Farrington, D. P. (1977). The effects of Public Labelling. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 17(2), 112–125. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjc.a046802>
- Featherstone, R., & Deflem, M. (2003). Anomie and Strain: Context and Consequences of Merton's Two Theories. *Sociological Inquiry*, 73(4), 471–489. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-682X.00067>

- Ferguson, K. E. (2017). Feminist Theory Today. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 20, 269–286. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-052715-111648>
- Ferraro, K. F. (1995). *Fear Of Crime: Interpreting Victimization Risk*. Albany: State University Of New York Press.
- Ferraro, K. F. (1996). Women's Fear of Victimization: Shadow of Sexual Assault? *Social Forces*, 75(2), 667–690. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2580418?seq=1>
- Ferraro, K. F., & LaGrange, R. (1987). The Measurement of Fear of Crime. *Sociological Inquiry*, 57(1), 70–97. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315086613-15>
- Fisher, B. S., & Sloan, J. J. (2003). Unraveling the fear of victimization among college women: Is the “shadow of sexual assault hypothesis” supported? *Justice Quarterly*, 20(3), 633–659. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820300095641>
- Friedan, B. (2013). The Problem That Has No Name from The Feminine Mystique. In W. K. Kolmar & F. Bartkowski (Eds.), *Feminist Theory: A Reader* (4th ed., pp. 172–177). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Furstenberg, F. F. J. (2000). Public Reaction to Crime in the Streets. In Jason Ditton & S. Farrall (Eds.), *The Fear of Crime* (pp. 3–12). London: Routledge.
- Garofalo, J. (1981). The Fear of Crime: Causes and Consequences. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 72(2), 839–857. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1143018>
- Gaziarifoğlu, Y. (2009). *Suç Mağduriyeti Korkusu ve Algılanan Suç Mağduriyeti Riskinin Değerlendirilmesi*. Published Master Thesis. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. (1976). Living with Television: The Violence Profile. *Journal of Communication*, 26(2), 172–199. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1976.tb01397.x>
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., & Signorielli, N. (1986). Living with Television : The Dynamics of the Cultivation Process. In J. Bryant & D. Zillman (Eds.), *Perspectives on media effects* (pp. 17–40). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Glas, I., Engbersen, G., & Snel, E. (2019). Going Spatial: Applying Ego-hoods To Fear

- Of Crime Research. *British Journal of Criminology*, 59(6), 1411–1431. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azz003>
- Goffman, E. (2020). *Damga Örselenmiş Kimliğin İdare Edilişi Üzerine Notlar* (5th ed.; Ş Geniş, L. Ünsaldı, & S. N. Ağırnaslı, Trans.). Ankara: Heretik Basım Yayın.
- Gökulu, G. (2011). *Perceived Risk Of Victimization And Fear of Crime: A Case Study Of METU Students*. Published Doctoral Thesis. Ankara: Middle East Technical University, The Graduate School of Social Sciences.
- Goode, E. (2015). The Sociology of Deviance: An Introduction. In E. Goode (Ed.), *The Handbook of Deviance* (pp. 3–29). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118701386>
- Gordon, M. M. (1997). The Concept Of The Sub-Culture And Its Application. In K. Gelder & S. Thornton (Eds.), *The Subcultures Reader* (pp. 40–43). London: Routledge.
- Gramsci, A. (2010). *Gramsci Kitabı: Seçme Yazılar 1916-1935* (D. Forgacs & İ. Yıldız, Trans.). Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.
- Gray, E., Jackson, J., & Farrall, S. (2011). Feelings and Functions in the Fear of Crime: Applying a New Approach to Victimisation Insecurity. *British Journal of Criminology*, 51(1), 75–94. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azq066>
- Gray, Emily, Jackson, J., & Farral, S. (2008). Reassessing the Fear of Crime. *European Journal of Criminology*, 5(3), 363–380. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370808090834>
- Güriş, S., & Astar, M. (2015). *Bilimsel Araştırmalarda SPSS ile İstatistik* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Der Kitabevi Yayınevi ve Dağıtım.
- Hagan, J., Gillis, A. R., & Simpson, J. (1985). The Class Structure of Gender and Delinquency: Toward a Power-Control Theory of Common Delinquent Behavior. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90(6), 1151–1178. <https://doi.org/10.1086/228206>
- Hagan, J., Simpson, J., & Gillis, A. R. (1987). Class in the Household: A Power-Control Theory of Gender and Delinquency. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92(4), 788–816. <https://doi.org/10.1086/228583>
- Hagedorn, J. M. (1994). Homeboys, Dope Fiends, Legits and New Jacks. *Criminology*,

- 32(2), 197–219. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1994.tb01152.x>
- Hale, C. (1996). Fear of crime: A review of the literature. *International Review of Victimology*, 4(2), 79–150. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026975809600400201>
- Hallsworth, S., & Young, T. (2010). Street Collectives and Group Delinquency: Social Disorganization, Subcultures and Beyond. In E. McLaughlin & T. Newburn (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Criminological Theory* (pp. 72–95). <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446200926.n5>
- Heath, L., & Gilbert, K. (1996). Mass Media and Fear of Crime. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 39(4), 379–386. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764296039004003>
- Heath, L., & Petraitis, J. (1987). Television Viewing and Fear of Crime: Where Is the Mean World? *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 8(1–2), 97–123. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.1987.9645879>
- Heller, H. (2019). Class and Class Struggle. In M. Vidal, T. Smith, T. Rotta, & P. Prew (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Karl Marx* (pp. 57–76). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Henig, J., & Maxfield, M. G. (2000). Reducing Fear of Crime: Strategies for Intervention. In Jason Ditton & S. Farral (Eds.), *The Fear of Crime* (pp. 489–506). London: Routledge.
- Henry, S., & Milovanovic, D. (2005). Postmodernism and Constitutive Theories of Criminal Behavior. In R. A. Wright & J. M. Miller (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Criminology* (pp. 1245–1249). New York: Routledge.
- Hilinski, C. M. (2009). Fear of Crime among College Students: A Test of the Shadow of Sexual Assault Hypothesis. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34, 84–102. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-008-9047-x>
- Hilinski, C. M., Neeson Pentecost, K. E., & Andrews, H. (2011). Explaining the Fear of Crime Among College Women, in their own Words. *The Southwest Journal of Criminal Justice*, 8(1), 122–127.
- Hille, K. (1999). ‘Gendered Exclusions’: women’s fear of violence and changing relations to space. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 81(2), 111–124.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0435-3684.1999.00052.x>

Ho, R. (2014). *Handbook of Univariate and Multivariate Data Analysis with IBM SPSS* (2nd ed.). Boca Raton: Taylor & Francis Group.

Hunter, L. M., Krannich, R. S., & Smith, M. D. (2009). Rural Migration, Rapid Growth, and Fear of Crime. *Rural Sociology*, 67(1), 71–89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1549-0831.2002.tb00094.x>

İslamoğlu, A. H. (2011). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri: SPSS Uygulamalı* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım.

Jackson, J. (2004). Experience and Expression: Social and Cultural Significance in the Fear of Crime. *British Journal of Criminology*, 44(6), 946–966. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azh048>

Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Hohl, K., & Farrall, S. (2009). Does the Fear of Crime Erode Public Confidence in Policing? *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 3(1), 100–111. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pan079>

Jackson, Jonathan, & Gouseti, I. (2014). Fear of Crime and the Psychology of Risk. In G. Bruinsma & D. Weisburd (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal justice* (pp. 1594–1603). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5690-2>

Jarjoura, G. R. (1993). Does Dropping out of School Enhance Delinquent Involvement? Results From a Large-Scale National Probability Sample. *Criminology*, 31(2), 149–172. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1993.tb01126.x>

Jenkins, P. (1984). Varieties of Enlightenment Criminology. *British Journal of Criminology*, 24(2), 112–130. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjc.a047435>

Jessop, B. (2008). Karl Marx. In R. Stones (Ed.), *Key Sociological Thinkers* (2nd ed., pp. 49–62). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., & Pal, D. K. (2015). Likert Scale Explored and Explained. *British Journal of Applied Science & Technology*, 7(4), 396–403. Retrieved from <https://journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/article/view/7498/13368>

Kaplan, H. B. (2003). Social Psychological Perspectives on Deviance. In J. Delamater (Ed.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 451–478). <https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387->

- Kaplan, H. B. (2006). Social Psychological Perspectives on Deviance. In J. Delamater (Ed.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 451–478). https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-36921-X_18
- Karakus, O., McGarrell, E. F., & Basibuyuk, O. (2010). Fear of crime among citizens of Turkey. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(2), 174–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.02.006>
- Karasu, M. A. (2018). Suç Korkusu, Göç ve Suriyeli Sığınmacılar: Şanlıurfa Örneği. *Uluslararası Yönetim Akademisi Dergisi*, 1(3), 332–347. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/mana/issue/42538/460287>
- Katz, C. M., Webb, V. J., & Armstrong, T. A. (2003). Fear of gangs: A test of alternative theoretical models. *Justice Quarterly*, 20(1), 95–130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820300095471>
- Keane, C. (1998). Evaluating the Influence of Fear of Crime as an Environmental Mobility Restrictor on Women's Routine Activities. *Environment and Behavior*, 30(1), 60–74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916598301003>
- Kennedy, L. W., & Silverman, R. A. (1985). Perception of Social Diversity and Fear of Crime. *Environment and Behavior*, 17(3), 275–295. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916585173001>
- Killias, M. (1990). New Methodological Perspectives for Victimization Surveys: The Potentials of Computer-Assisted Telephone Surveys and Some Related Innovations. *International Review of Victimology*, 1(2), 153–167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026975809000100203>
- Killias, M., & Clerici, C. (2000). Different Measures of Vulnerability in Their Relation to Different Dimensions of Fear of Crime. *British Journal of Criminology*, 40(3), 437–450.
- Kohm, S. A., Waid-Lindberg, C. A., Weinrath, M., Shelley, T. O., & Dobbs, R. R. (2012). The Impact of Media on Fear of Crime among University Students: A Cross-National Comparison. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*,

- 54(1), 67–100. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2011.E.01>
- Krannich, R. S., Berry, E. H., & Greider, T. (1989). Fear of Crime in Rapidly Changing Rural Communities: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Rural Sociology*, 54(2), 195–212.
- Kristiansen, S. (2017). Studying Deviance. In S. E. Brown & O. Sefiha (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook on Deviance* (pp. 13–23). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315648057>
- Krohn, M., Akers, R. L., Radosevich, M. J., & Lanza-Kaduce, L. (1980). Social Status and Deviance: Class Context of School, Social Status, and Delinquent Behavior. *Criminology*, 18(3), 303–318. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1980.tb01367.x>
- Kubrin, C. E., Stucky, T. D., & Krohn, M. D. (2009). *Researching Theories of Crime and Deviance*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kul, M. (2009). *Toplumda Suça İlişkin Korkunun Yapılaşması*. Published Doctoral Thesis. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi: The Graduate School of Social Sciences.
- Kumar, R. (2019). *Research Methodology: a step-by-step guide for beginners* (5th ed.; A. Owen, Ed.). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- LaGrange, R. L., & Ferraro, K. F. (1987). The Elderly's Fear of Crime: A Critical Examination of the Research. *Research on Aging*, 9(3), 372–391. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0164027587093003>
- LaGrange, R. L., Ferraro, K. F., & Supancic, M. (1992). Perceived Risk and Fear of Crime: Role of Social and Physical Incivilities. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 29(3), 311–334. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427892029003004>
- Lalli, M., & Savitz, L. D. (1976). The Fear of Crime in The School Enterprise and its Consequences. *Education and Urban Society*, 8(4), 401–416. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001312457600800403>
- Lane, J., & Fisher, B. S. (2009). Unpacking the Relationship Between Gender and Fear of Crime. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 25(3), 260–263. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986209334986>
- Lane, J., & Meeker, J. W. (2000). Subcultural Diversity and the Fear of Crime and Gangs. *Crime & Delinquency*, 46(4), 497–521. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0011128700046004005>.

- Lane, J., & Meeker, J. W. (2003a). ethnicity, information sources, and fear of crime. *Deviant Behavior*, 24(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10639620390117165>
- Lane, J., & Meeker, J. W. (2003b). Fear of gang crime: A look at three theoretical models. *Law and Society Review*, 37(2), 425–456. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5893.3702008>
- Lauderdale, P. (2017). The Definitions of Deviance. In S. E. Brown & O. Sefiha (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook on Deviance* (pp. 3–12). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315648057>
- Lehmann, J. M. (1995). Durkheim's Theories of Deviance and Suicide: A Feminist Reconsideration. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100(4), 904–930. <https://doi.org/10.1086/230604>
- Liazos, A. (1978). School, Alienation, and Delinquency. *Crime & Delinquency*, 24(3), 355–370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001112877802400308>
- Lindström, M., Merlo, J., & Östergren, P.-O. (2003). Social capital and sense of insecurity in the neighbourhood: a population-based multilevel analysis in Malmö, Sweden. *Social Science & Medicine*, 56(5), 1111–1120. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(02\)00114-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(02)00114-4)
- Liu, J., Messner, S. F., Zhang, L., & Zhuo, Y. (2009). Socio-Demographic Correlates of Fear of Crime and the Social Context of Contemporary Urban China. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 44(1–2), 93–108. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-009-9255-7>
- Manders, D. (1975). Labelling Theory and Social Reality: a Marxist Critique. *Insurgent Sociologist*, 6(1), 53–66. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089692057500600104>
- Mann, S. A., & Huffman, D. J. (2005). The Decentering of Second Wave Feminism and the Rise of the Third Wave. *Science & Society*, 69(1), 56–91. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40404229>
- 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.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2001.tb00924.x>

- Marshall, G. (1999). *Sosyoloji Sözlüğü* (S. Akınhay & D. Kömürcü, Trans.). Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2008). *Komünist Manifesto* (C. Üster & N. Deriş, Trans.). İstanbul: Can Sanat Yayınları.
- Matsueda, R. L. (1982). Testing Control Theory and Differential Association: A Causal Modeling Approach. *American Sociological Review*, 47(4), 489–504. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095194>
- Matza, D., & Sykes, G. M. (1961). Juvenile Delinquency and Subterranean Values. *American Sociological Review*, 26(5), 712–719. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2090200>
- Mawby, R. I., Brunt, P., & Hambly, Z. (2000). Fear of Crime among British Holidaymakers. *British Journal of Criminology*, 40(3), 468–479. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/40.3.468>
- McCrea, R., Shyy, T.-K., Western, J., & Stimson, R. J. (2005). Fear of crime in Brisbane: Individual, social and neighbourhood factors in perspective. *Journal of Sociology*, 41(1), 7–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1440783305048381>
- McLaughlin, E. (2010). Critical Criminology. In E. McLaughlin & T. Newburn (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Criminological Theory* (pp. 153–174). London: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Mead, G. H. (2017). *Zihin, Benlik ve Toplum* (1st ed.; L. Ünsaldı, Trans.). Ankara: Heretik Basın Yayın.
- Mears, D. P., & Stewart, E. A. (2010). Interracial contact and fear of crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(1), 34–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2009.11.005>
- Mellgren, C., & Ivert, A.-K. (2019). Is Women's Fear of Crime Fear of Sexual Assault? A Test of the Shadow of Sexual Assault Hypothesis in a Sample of Swedish University Students. *Violence Against Women*, 25(5), 511–527. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801218793226>
- Merton, R. K. (1938). Social Structure and Anomie. *American Sociological Review*, 3(5), 672–682. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2084686>

- Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Enlarged). New York: The Free Press.
- Merton, R. K. (1997). On the Evolving Synthesis of Differential Association and Anomie Theory; A Perspective From the Sociology of Science. *Criminology*, 35(3), 517–525. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1997.tb01228.x>
- Mesch, G. S. (2000). Perceptions of risk, lifestyle activities, and fear of crime. *Deviant Behavior*, 21(1), 47–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/016396200266379>
- Messerschmidt, J. W. (2008). Structured action and gendered crime. In K. Evans & J. Jamieson (Eds.), *Gender and Crime: A Reader* (pp. 157–170). Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Miceli, R., Roccato, M., & Rosato, R. (2004). Fear of Crime in Italy: Spread and Determinants. *Environment and Behavior*, 36(6), 776–789. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916503261931>
- Mill, J. S. (2013). The Subjection of Women. In W. K. Kolmar & F. Bartkowski (Eds.), *Feminist Theory: A Reader* (4th ed., pp. 92–96). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mıstaçoğlu, R. S. (2021). *Eğitimin Suç Korkusu Üzerindeki Etkileri*. Published Master Thesis. İstanbul: Üsküdar Üniversitesi: Forensic Science.
- Mora, O. (2013). *Chicago Okulu: Pragmatik Sosyal Teoride İletişim Keşfi*. İstanbul: Doruk Yayıncılık.
- Morrall, P., Marshall, P., Pattison, S., & Macdonald, G. (2010). Crime and health: a preliminary study into the effects of crime on the mental health of UK university students. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 17(9), 821–828. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2850.2010.01594.x>
- Muncie, J. (2010). Labelling, Social Reaction and Social Constructionism. In E. McLaughlin & T. Newburn (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Criminological Theory* (pp. 139–152). <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446200926>
- Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (7th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
- Norris, F. H., & Kaniasty, K. (1994). Psychological distress following criminal

- victimization in the general population: Cross-sectional, longitudinal, and prospective analyses. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62(1), 111–123. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.62.1.111>
- Nwalozie, C. J. (2015). Rethinking Subculture and Subcultural Theory in the Study of Youth Crime – A Theoretical Discourse. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Criminology*, 7(2), 1–16. <http://www.jtpcrim.org/JAN2015/CNwalozie.pdf>
- Özascilar, M. (2013). Predicting fear of crime: A test of the shadow of sexual assault hypothesis. *International Review of Victimology*, 19(3), 269–284. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0269758013492754>
- Özaşçılar, M., & Ziyalar, N. (2017). Unraveling the Determinants of Fear of Crime Among Men and Women in Istanbul: Examining the Impact of Perceived Risk and Fear of Sexual Assault. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 61(9), 993–1010. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X15613334>
- Ozcurumez, S., & Mete, H. (2021). The afraid create the fear: perceptions of refugees by ‘gün’ groups in Turkey. *Identities*, 28(3), 361–379. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2020.1723311>
- Öztürk, M., Kocacık, F., & Gönültaş, M. B. (2016). Suç korkusu ve Risk Algısının Toplumsal Cinsiyet Açısından İncelenmesi. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 13(1), 1488–1502. Retrieved from <https://www.j-humansciences.com/ojs/index.php/IJHS/article/view/3691>
- Pantazis, C. (2000). “FEAR OF CRIME”, VULNERABILITY AND POVERTY: Evidence from the British Crime Survey. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 40(3), 414–436. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23638940?seq=1>
- Phillips, T., & Smith, P. (2003). Everyday Incivility: Towards a Benchmark. *The Sociological Review*, 51(1), 85–108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-954X.00409>
- Platt, T. (1982). CRIME AND PUNISHMENT IN THE UNITED STATES: IMMEDIATE AND LONG-TERM REFORMS FROM A MARXIST PERSPECTIVE. *Crime and Social Justice*, 18(Winter), 38–45. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29766165>

- Platt, T. (1984). Criminology in the 1980s: Progressive Alternatives to “Law and Order.” *Crime and Social Justice*, 21(22), 191–199. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/29766238#metadata_info_tab_contents
- Poloma, M. M. (2010). *Çağdaş Sosyoloji Kuramları* (H. Erbaş, Trans.). Ankara: Gündoğan Yayınları.
- Quinney, R. (1965). Is criminal behaviour deviant behaviour. *British Journal of Criminology*, 5(2), 132–142. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjc.a048824>
- Quinney, R. (1973). There Are A Lot of Folks Grateful To the Longe Ranger: With Some Notes On The Rise And Fall Of American Criminology. *Insurgent Sociologist*, 4(1), 56–64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089692057300400105>
- Quinney, R. (1977). *Class, State, and Crime: On The Theory and Practice of Criminal Justice*. New York: David McKay Company.
- Rader, N. E., Cossman, J. S., & Porter, J. R. (2012). Fear of crime and vulnerability: Using a national sample of Americans to examine two competing paradigms. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40(2), 134–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2012.02.003>
- Radosh, P. F. (1990). Women and crime in the United States: A Marxian explanation. *Sociological Spectrum*, 10(1), 105–131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02732173.1990.9981914>
- Rea, L. M., & Parker, R. A. (2005). *Desining & Conducting Survey Research: A Comprehensive Guide* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Reiss, A. J., & Rhodes, A. L. (1963). Status Deprivation and Delinquent Behavior. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 4(2), 135–149. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4104827>
- Renzetti, C. M. (2013). *Feminist Criminology*. London: Routledge.
- Ritzer, G. (2011). *Sosyoloji Kuramları* (8th ed.; H. Hülür, Trans.). Ankara: De Ki Basım Yayım.
- Ritzer, G., & Stepnisky, J. (2014). *Sociological Theory* (9th ed.). Singapore: McGraw-Hill Education.

- Robinson, J. B., Lawton, B. A., & Taylor, R. B. (2003). Multilevel Longitudinal Impacts of Incivilities: Fear of Crime, Expected Safety, and Block Satisfaction. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 19, 237–274. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024956925170>
- Roccato, M., Russo, S., & Vieno, A. (2011). Perceived community disorder moderates the relation between victimization and fear of crime. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 39(7), 884–888. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20470>
- Romer, D., Jamieson, K. H., & Aday, S. (2003). Television News and the Cultivation of Fear of Crime. *Journal of Communication*, 53(1), 88–104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2003.tb03007.x>
- Ross, C. E., & Mirowsky, J. (1999). Disorder and Decay: The Concept and Measurement of Perceived Neighborhood Disorder. *Urban Affairs Review*, 34(3), 412–432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107808749903400304>
- Ross, C. E., & Mirowsky, J. (2001). Neighborhood Disadvantage, Disorder, and Health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 42(3), 258. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3090214>
- Rountree, P. W., & Land, K. C. (1996). Perceived Risk versus Fear of Crime: Empirical Evidence of Conceptually Distinct Reactions in Survey Data. *Social Forces*, 74(4), 1353–1376. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2580354>
- Russo, S., & Roccato, M. (2010). How long does victimization foster fear of crime? A longitudinal study. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 38(8), 960–974. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20408>
- Sacco, V. F. (1995). Media Constructions of Crime. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 539(1), 141–154. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716295539001011>
- Sacco, V. F., & Glackman, W. (1987). Vulnerability, Locus of Control, and Worry About Crime. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health*, 6(1), 99–111. <https://doi.org/10.7870/cjcmh-1987-0007>
- Salkind, N. J. (2012). *Exploring Research* (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- Sanders, V. (2001). First Wave Feminism. In S. Gamble (Ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Feminism and Postfeminism* (2nd ed., pp. 15–24). London: Routledge.

- Scarborough, B. K., Like-Haislip, T. Z., Novak, K. J., Lucas, W. L., & Alarid, L. F. (2010). Assessing the relationship between individual characteristics, neighborhood context, and fear of crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(4), 819–826. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.05.010>
- Schneider, A. L. (1981). Methodological Problems in Victim Surveys and Their Implications for Research in Victimology. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 72(2), 818–838.
- Schwartz, R. D., & Skolnick, J. H. (1962). Two Studies of Legal Stigma. *Social Problems*, 10(2), 133–142. <https://doi.org/10.2307/799046>
- Semyonov, M., Gorodzeisky, A., & Glikman, A. (2012). Neighborhood Ethnic Composition and Resident Perceptions of Safety in European Countries. *Social Problems*, 59(1), 117–135. <https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2012.59.1.117>
- Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1998). *The Robbers Cave Experiment: Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation* (1st Wesley). Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press.
- Sherman, L. (2008). The Use and Usefulness of Criminology, 1751-2005: Enlightened Justice and Its Failures. In A. Walsh & C. Hemmens (Eds.), *Introduction to Criminology: A Text/Reader* (pp. 24–32). California: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Shoemaker, D. J. (2010). *Theories of Delinquency: An Examination of Explanations of Delinquent Behavior* (6th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Short, J. F., Rivera, R., & Tennyson, R. A. (1965). Perceived Opportunities, Gang Membership, and Delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 30(1), 56–67. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2091773>
- Siegel, L. J. (2013). *Criminology: Theories, Patterns & Typologies* (11th ed.). California: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Singh, A. S., & Masuku, M. B. (2014). Sampling Techniques and Determination of Sample Size in Applied Statistics Research: An Overview. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 2(11), 1–22. <https://ijecm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/21131.pdf>

- Sipahi, E. B. (2016). Türkiye’de Kent Sakinlerinin Suç Korkuları Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 9(43), 2158–2169. <https://doi.org/10.17719/jisr.20164317781>
- Skogan, W. G. (1987). The Impact of Victimization on Fear. *Crime & Delinquency*, 33(1), 135–154. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128787033001008>
- Skogan, W. G., & Maxfield, M. G. (1981). *Coping with Crime: Individual and Neighborhood Reactions*. http://www.skogan.org/files/Coping_With_Crime.pdf
- Slattery, M. (2014). *Sosyolojide Temel Fikirler* (6th ed.; Ü. Tatlıcan, Trans.). İstanbul: Sentez Yayıncılık.
- Smart, C. (1979). The new Female Criminal: Reality or Myth. *British Journal of Criminology*, 19(1), 50–59. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjc.a046960>
- Smart, C. (1995). *Law, Crime and Sexuality. Essays in Feminism*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Snyder, R. C. (2008). What Is Third-Wave Feminism? A New Directions Essay. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 34(1), 175–196. <https://doi.org/10.1086/588436>
- Sutherland, E. H. (1947). *Principles of Criminology* (4th ed.). Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.34192/page/n23/mode/2up>
- Sutherland, E. H. (1972). The Theory of Differential Association. In D. Dressler (Ed.), *Readings in Criminology and Penology* (2nd ed., pp. 365–371). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sutherland, E. H., Cressey, D. R., & Luckenbill, D. F. (1992). *Principles of Criminology* (11th ed.). Boston: Rowman&Littfield Publishers, Inc.
- Sykes, G. M., & Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 22(6), 664–670. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2089195>
- Taherdoost, H. (2016). Sampling Methods in Research Methodology; How to Choose a Sampling Technique for Research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 5(2), 18–27. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3205035>

- Taşçı, N. (2020). *Toplumsal Cinsiyet Algısı İle Suç Korkusu Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi*. Published Master Thesis. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, Institute of Forensic Sciences and Legal Medicine.
- Taylor, B. R., & Hale, M. (1986). Testing alternative models of fear of crime. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 77(1), 151–189. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1143593>
- Taylor, R. B., & Covington, J. (1993). Community Structural Change and Fear of Crime. *Social Problems*, 40(3), 374–397. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3096886>
- Thio, A. (1975). A Critical Look at Merton's Anomie Theory. *The Pacific Sociological Review*, 18(2), 139–158. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1388629>
- Thornham, S. (2001). Second Wave Feminism. In S. Gamble (Ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Feminism and Postfeminism* (2nd ed., pp. 25–35). London: Routledge.
- Tierney, J. (2009). *Key Perspectives in Criminology*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Tittle, C. R., Burke, M. J., & Jackson, E. F. (1986). Modeling Sutherland's Theory of Differential Association: Toward an Empirical Clarification. *Social Forces*, 65(2), 405–432. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2578680>
- Toseland, R. W. (1982). Fear of crime: Who is most vulnerable? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 10(3), 199–209. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352\(82\)90040-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352(82)90040-X)
- TÜİK. (2021). *İBBS 3. Düzeyde, Daimi İkametgah ve Suç Türüne Göre Ceza İnfaz Kurumuna Giren Hükümlüler*. Retrieved from <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/DownloadIstatistikselTablo?p=55Tx2mazzMZOAHYDADntk/Ejcxwxr8QOiek8porotvZR4s9Mca0wik8M6Hp08ZAz>
- TÜİK. (2022a). *Belediye, Köy ve Mahalle Nüfusları Ölçüm Bazında*. <https://biruni.tuik.gov.tr/medas/?kn=95&locale=tr>
- TÜİK. (2022b). *İkamet edilen il ve doğum yerine göre nüfus, 2014-2022*. <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/DownloadIstatistikselTablo?p=1R71lQAcs0LztgV0cHBQHi7P5KFkkzBycGBBkxIVQWJhWscal5U1SKOYluCtCEq>
- TÜİK. (2023). *İl ve cinsiyete göre il/ilçe merkezi, belde/köy nüfusu ve nüfus yoğunluğu*,

2007-2022.

<https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/DownloadIstatistikselTablo?p=cK9WyyCukJN2sVaBtrwYOkXhekRIIfcDPLibiGiZSqZkClyKDHGbPQKBfbmL8vWE>

Turk, A. T. (1964). Prospects for Theories of Criminal Behavior. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 55(4), 454-461. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1140896>

Turk, A. T. (1966). Conflict and Criminality. *American Sociological Review*, 31(3), 338–352. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2090822>

Turk, A. T. (1976). Law as a Weapon in Social Conflict. *Social Problems*, 23(3), 276–291. <https://doi.org/10.2307/799774>

Turk, A. T. (2002). Political Violence: Patterns and Trends. In R. A. Silverman, T. P. Thornberry, B. Cohen, & B. Krisberg (Eds.), *Crime and Justice at the Millennium* (pp. 31–44). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-4883-3_3

Turner, B. S. (2006). *The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turner, J. H. (2013). *Contemporary Sociological Theory*. California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Uludağ, Ş. (2010). Vatandaşların suç korku (Güvenlik endişesi) seviyesine etki eden faktörler ve alınabilecek önlemler: Malatya örneği. *Polis Bilimleri Dergisi*, 12(1), 1–28. <https://search.trdizin.gov.tr/yayin/detay/103302>

Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Eskişehir Valiliği. (2022). Eskişehir. Retrieved December 1, 2022, from <http://www.eskisehir.gov.tr/ilcelerimiz>

Van Gundy, A. (2014). *Feminist Theory, Crime, and Social Justice* (V. E. Kappeler, Ed.). Amsterdam: Anderson Publishing.

VandenBos, G. R. (2007). *APA Dictionary of Psychology*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Wacquant, L. (2015). *Kent Paryaları: İleri Marjinalliğin Karşılaştırmalı Sosyolojisi* (2nd ed.; M. Doğan, Trans.). İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi.

- Walsh, A. (2011). *Feminist Criminology Through a Biosocial Lens*. North Carolina: Carolina Academic Press.
- Warr, M. (1984). Fear of Victimization - Why Are Women and the Elderly More Afraid? *Social Science Quarterly*, 65(3), 681–702.
- Warr, M. (1996). Organization and Instigation In Delinquent Groups. *Criminology*, 34(1), 11–37. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1996.tb01193.x>
- Warr, M. (2000). Fear of Crime in the United States: Avenues for Research and Policy. In D. Duffee (Ed.), *Measurement and Analysis of Crime and Justice: Criminal Justice 2000* (pp. 451–489). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Warr, M., & Stafford, M. (1983). Fear of Victimization: A Look at the Proximate Causes. *Social Forces*, 61(4), 1033–1043. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2578277>
- Weitzer, R., & Kubrin, C. E. (2004). Breaking news: How local TV news and real-world conditions affect fear of crime. *Justice Quarterly*, 21(3), 497–520. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820400095881>
- Wharton, A. S. (2005). *The Sociology of Gender: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Whiteley, K. M. (2014). Feminist theories of criminal behavior. In J. S. Albanese (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice* (pp. 1–5). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118517383.wbeccj400>
- Williams, F. P., & McShane, M. D. (2018). *Criminological Theory* (7th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Williams, J. P. (2011). *Subcultural Theory: Traditions and Concepts*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Wollstonecraft, M. (2013). A Vindication of the Rights of Woman. In W. K. Kolmar & F. Bartkowski (Eds.), *Feminist Theory: A Reader* (4th ed., pp. 76–80). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Xie, M., & McDowall, D. (2008). ESCAPING CRIME: THE EFFECTS OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT VICTIMIZATION ON MOVING*. *Criminology*, 46(4), 809–

840. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2008.00133.x>

Yin, P. P. (1980). Fear of Crime among the Elderly: Some Issues and Suggestions. *Social Problems*, 27(4), 492–504. <https://doi.org/10.2307/800177>

Young, J. (1988). Radical Criminology in Britain: The Emergence of Competing Paradigm. *British Journal of Criminology*, 28(2), 159–184. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjc.a047723>

Young, J. (1999). *The Exclusive Society: Social Exclusion, Crime and Difference in Late Modernity*. London: SAGE Publications Inc.

http-1: https://www.ntv.com.tr/galeri/dunya/dunyanin-en-guvenli-sehirleri-aciklandi-eskisehir-ilk10da-istanbul-parisin-onunde,lVyBA15M9UWs8_ELALd_Mw/-TDWoYissk--J1kWQGEkjA

(Date Accessed: 03.01.2023)

http-2: <https://www.haberturk.com/eskisehir-dunyada-en-guvenli-10-sehir-3557309>

(Date Accessed: 03.01.2023)

http-3: <https://www.endeksa.com/tr/analiz/eskisehir/endeks>

(Date Accessed: 02.03.2023)

http-4: <https://www.danielsoper.com/statcalc/calculator.aspx?id=1>

(Date Accessed: 10.03.2023)

http-5: <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Isgucu-Istatistikleri-Ocak-2023-49386#:~:text=TÜİK%20Kurumsal&text=Hanehalkı%20İşgücü%20Araştırması%20sonuçlarına%20göre,%259%2C7%20seviyesinde%20gerçekleşti.>

(Date Accessed: 02.06.2023)

APPENDIX

Demographic questions:

1-) How do you define your own gender?

- a) Women b) Men c) Other

2-) Can you mark your age range?

- a) 18-26 b) 27-35 c) 36-44
d) 45-53 e) 54-62 d) 63-71
e) 72+

3-) What is your marital status?

- a) Single b) Married c) Divorced
d) Widow e) In a relationship

4-) What is your level of education?

- a) I did not graduate from any educational institution.
b) Primary school
c) Secondary school
d) High school
e) Associate or bachelor's degree.
f) Master's or doctorate degree.
g) I don't know.

5-) How do you describe your occupational status? (More than one option can be marked)

- a) Student b) I have a job c) Retired
d) Unemployed but actively looking for a job e) Unemployed and not looking for job
f) Taking care of household chores g) Other

6-) Could you please indicate the net income of your household?

- a) 0-5.500 b) 5.501-11.000 c) 11.001-16.501
d) 16.502-22.502 e) 22.503-28.003 f) 28.004-33.504 e) 33.505+

7-) With whom you share the household/house you live in?

- a) With my family b) With my friend(s) c) I live alone at home
d) Residing in a dormitory e) With my relatives

If you live at home

How many people live in the household you are currently living in?

Answer:

8-) Who owns the house you are living in?

a) Rented b) I am the owner c) Belongs to my family d) Other

9-) Do you have a burglary insurance for the house you live in?

a) Evet b) No c) I don't know

10-) Can you tell me how often you go out at night?

a) Everyday b) Every other day c) 2-3 times a week

d) Once a week e) 1 every two weeks or less

11-) Do you follow Turkiye's agenda on social media??

a) Evet b) No

If yes: How often?

a) Everyday b) Every other day c) 2-3 times a week

d) Once a week e) 1 every two weeks or less

12-) Do you watch the news on television?

a) Evet b) No

If yes: How often?

a) Everyday b) Every other day c) 2-3 times a week

d) Once a week e) 1 every two weeks or less

13-) Can you write the name of the neighbourhood you live in?

Answer:

14-) How long have you been living in this neighbourhood?

Answer:

Neighbourhood Cohesion

The questions in this section are intended to measure your perceptions about yourself and your environment. There is no right answer to the questions, so please choose the option that comes closest to you.

[illegible]

Incivilities

In this section, you are asked to indicate to what extent some of the following situations are currently problematic in your neighbourhood. There are no right answers to the questions, please select the option that comes closest to you.

[illegible]

Confidence in police force

This section lists some of the services that law enforcement agencies are responsible for providing. For each service, please indicate to what extent, in your opinion, the police forces fulfil their duties.

[illegible]

Questions on Past Victimizations

Below are 10 different questions to determine whether you have been a victim of a crime in the past year. Please answer the questions by simply checking yes or no. If you answer yes, please answer the two questions in the box on the far right. Your answers to the questions will not be used against you in any way. You can end the test at any time or leave the questions blank.

Has anyone broken into your home and stolen anything in the last 12 months?	Yes ☐	No ☐	If yes; How many times has this happened to you? Answer: (.....) -Where or where did such an action take place? a) At home b) On the street c) At work d) In public transportation e) Other:
Have you had any money or property stolen from outside your home in the last 12 months?	Yes ☐	No ☐	If yes; How many times has this happened to you? Answer: (.....) -Where or where did such an action take place? a) At home b) On the street c) At work d) In public transportation e) Other:
Has any of your property been damaged in the last 12 months?	Yes ☐	No ☐	If yes; How many times has this happened to you? Answer: (.....) -Where or where did such an action take place? a) At home b) On the street c) At work d) In public transportation e) Other:
Has anyone threatened you in the last 12 months?	Yes ☐	No ☐	If yes; How many times has this happened to you? Answer: (.....) -Where or where did such an action take place? a) At home b) On the street c) At work d) In public transportation e) Other:
Has anyone deceived you and taken your money or belongings in the last 12 months?	Yes ☐	No ☐	If yes; How many times has this happened to you? Answer: (.....) -Where or where did such an action take place? a) At home b) On the street

			c) At work d) In public transportation e) Other:
Has anyone taken money or property from you by using force and/or threats in the last 12 months?	Yes ☐	No ☐	If yes; How many times has this happened to you? Answer: (.....) -Where or where did such an action take place? a) At home b) On the street c) At work d) In public transportation e) Other:
Has anyone injured you with their hands or by using a tool in the last 12 months?	Yes ☐	No ☐	If yes; How many times has this happened to you? Answer: (.....) -Where or where did such an action take place? a) At home b) On the street c) At work d) In public transportation e) Other:
Has anyone deliberately tried to kill you in the last 12 months?	Yes ☐	No ☐	If yes; How many times has this happened to you? Answer: (.....) -Where or where did such an action take place? a) At home b) On the street c) At work d) In public transportation e) Other:
Has anyone sexually harassed you in the last 12 months, including verbal, written or bodily gestures without physical contact?	Yes ☐	No ☐	If yes; How many times has this happened to you? Answer: (.....) -Where or where did such an action take place? a) At home b) On the street c) At work d) In public transportation e) Other:
In the last 12 months, has anyone touched you sexually without your consent and/or forced you to have sexual intercourse?	Yes ☐	No ☐	If yes; How many times has this happened to you? Answer: (.....) -Where or where did such an action take place? a) At home b) On the street c) At work d) In public transportation e) Other:

Fear of Crime Measurement

Emotional Measurement

This section deals with how afraid you are of being a victim of different types of crime in your daily life. Please rate your fear for each type of crime below on a scale of 1 to 10. A score of 1 means I am not afraid at all and a score of 10 means I am very afraid.

1. How afraid are you that someone might break into your home and steal something in your daily life? (Burglary)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) How many times have you felt such fear in the past 12 months?

Answer:

- b) Where do you feel fear? (More than one option can be marked)

a) At home b) When I'm outside

-
2. How afraid are you of having your money or property stolen outside your home in your daily life? (Theft)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) How many times have you felt such fear in the past 12 months?

Answer:

- b) Where do you feel fear?

a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation

e) Other:

-
3. How afraid are you of someone damaging any of your property in your daily life? (Property damage)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) How many times have you felt such fear in the past 12 months?

Answer:

- b) Where do you feel fear?

a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation

e) Other:

4. How afraid are you of being threatened by someone in your daily life? (Threat)
Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) How many times have you felt such fear in the past 12 months?

Answer:

- b) Where do you feel fear?

a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation

e) Other:

5. How much are you afraid that someone will deceive you and take your money or things in your daily life? (Fraud)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) How many times have you felt such fear in the past 12 months?

Answer:

- b) Where do you feel fear?

a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation

e) Other:

6. How afraid are you of someone taking your money or property by using force or threats in your daily life? (Extortion)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) How many times have you felt such fear in the past 12 months?

Answer:

- b) Where do you feel fear?

a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation

e) Other:

7. How afraid are you of someone hitting you with their hands or using a tool in your daily life? (Injury)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) How many times have you felt such fear in the past 12 months?

Answer:

- b) Where do you feel fear?

a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation

e) Other:

8. How afraid are you of someone deliberately trying to kill you in your daily life? (Homicide)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) How many times have you felt such fear in the past 12 months?

Answer:

- b) Where do you feel fear?

a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation

e) Other:

9. How afraid are you that someone will sexually abuse you, including verbal, written or bodily gestures towards you without physical contact in your daily life? (Sexual harassment)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) How many times have you felt such fear in the past 12 months?

Answer:

- b) Where do you feel fear?

a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation

e) Other:

10. How afraid are you of someone touching you sexually and/or forcing you to have sexual intercourse without your consent in your daily life?? (Sexual assault)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) How many times have you felt such fear in the past 12 months?

Answer:

- b) Where do you feel fear?

a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation

e) Other:

Cognitive Measurement

In this section, you are asked to rate the likelihood of the specific types of crime mentioned above happening to you in the next one year. For each question, please give a score between 1 and 10. On a scale of 1 to 10, a score of 1 means very unlikely and a score of 10 means highly likely.

- 1) How likely do you think it is that someone will break into your home and steal something in the next year? (Burglary)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) Where is it possible for something like this to happen to you? (More than one option can be marked)
a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation
e) Other:
-

- 2) How likely do you think it is that money or property will be stolen from outside your home in the next year? (Theft)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) Where is it possible for something like this to happen to you?
a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation
e) Other:
-

- 3) How likely do you think it is that any of your property will be damaged by someone in the next year? (Property damage)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) Where is it possible for something like this to happen to you?
a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation
e) Other:
-

- 4) How likely do you think it is that someone will threaten you in the next year? (Threat)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) Where is it possible for something like this to happen to you?
a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation
e) Other:
-

- 5) 5) How likely do you think it is that someone will deceive you and take your money or property in the next year? (Fraud)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) Where is it possible for something like this to happen to you?
a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation
e) Other:
-

- 6) How likely do you think it is that someone will take your money or property by force and/or threats in the next year? (Extortion)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) Where is it possible for something like this to happen to you?
a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation
e) Other:
-

- 7) How likely do you think it is that someone will injure you with their hands or with a tool in the next year? (Injury)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) Where is it possible for something like this to happen to you?
a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation
e) Other:
-

- 8) How likely do you think it is that someone will deliberately try to kill you in the next year? (Homicide)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) Where is it possible for something like this to happen to you??
a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation
e) Other:
-

- 9) How likely do you think it is that someone will sexually harass you in the next year, including verbal, written bodily gestures without physical contact? (Sexual harassment)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) Where is it possible for something like this to happen to you?
a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation
e) Other:

-
- 10) How likely do you think it is that someone will touch you sexually and/or force you to have sexual intercourse without your consent in the next year? (Sexual assault)

Answer:

If your answer is higher than 1;

- a) Where is it possible for something like this to happen to you?
a) At home b) On the streets c) At work d) In public transportation
e) Other:
-

Behavioural Questions

The questions in this section relate to your adopted behaviour in response to potential or actual criminal behaviour.

Have you installed extra locks on windows and/or doors?	Yes ☐	No ☐
Have you installed an alarm in your house?	Yes ☐	No ☐
Have you installed extra lighting outside your house?	Yes ☐	No ☐
Do you keep weapons (pistols, sticks, knives, etc.) at home for protection?	Yes ☐	No ☐
Did you get a dog for protection?	Yes ☐	No ☐
Do you carry a defence tool such as pepper spray, knife, etc. in your daily life?	Yes ☐	No ☐
Have you tried to learn martial arts for protection?	Yes ☐	No ☐
Have you limited or changed your daily activities because you could be harmed by a criminal offence?	Yes ☐	No ☐
In your daily life, do you avoid certain areas during the daytime because you might be harmed by a criminal offence?	Yes ☐	No ☐
In your daily life, do you avoid certain areas during the night-time because you might be harmed by a criminal offence?	Yes ☐	No ☐
In your daily life, have you ever asked someone you know to accompany you from one place to another because you could be harmed by a crime?	Yes ☐	No ☐

CIRCULUM VIATE

Name Surname: Alper ERDEM

Foreign Language: English

Educational background:

- 2013-2016, Ege Üniversitesi, Mühendislik Fakültesi, Bilgisayar Mühendisliği
- 2016-2020, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Açıköğretim Fakültesi, Sosyoloji

