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The research problem

The debate around the issue of fear of crime has become polarised between those suggesting that people’s levels of fear match their ‘objective’ risk of victimization (for example Young 1987) and those suggesting that fears are disproportionate (for example Hough and Mayhew 1985). This remains true despite the efforts of Lewis and Salem (1986) and Box et al (1988). Recently Sparks (1992) has suggested that a level of mismatch is perhaps inevitable given the subjective nature of the key concepts, risk and fear. What is needed, as he convincingly argues, is further conceptual development of the notions of risk and fear; in particular the need to problematise their relationship to rationality.

Anxiety has played a central role in major theories of psychopathology, but psychiatric approaches have been dominated by medical and pharmacological questions (Klein and Rabkin 1981; Roth, Noyes and Burrows 1988). However, the British Kleinian tradition, developed primarily at the Tavistock Institute in London, constitutes a valuable, but under-used resource for work in this area. Giddens suggests ‘anxiety is essentially fear which has lost its object ... an unconsciously organised state of fear’ (1991 p.44). Given that psychoanalysis is a body of existing theorisation which has some understanding of irrational fears, and given its well-developed concepts of anxiety, it can be of assistance in addressing the relationship between risk and fear of crime. Thus far, however, it has been left out of the account. This body of work must, we suggest, be incorporated into any attempt to reconceptualise fear of crime and risk.

In existing work, ‘fear’ has been largely taken for granted as a self-evident category which can provide a starting point for measuring meaningful differences between sub-populations (cf Gottfredson 1984). The difference in fear levels between different sub-populations, particularly the inverse relationship between victimisation and risk found among younger black males and older females (cf Lewis and Salem 1986) suggests that the meaning of fear varies, for example between women and men.
Existing surveys rarely use the notion of fear in relation to the private sphere - so-called domestic crime. Yet the significance of this for women can no longer be overlooked. To date, the finding that women and the elderly tend to be more fearful (than they 'ought' to be if objective risk is the criterion) has attracted more attention than the fact that young men tend to be less fearful (than the 'ought' to be on risk grounds). The paradox of the apparent low level of fear of high risk groups like young men promises to be an interesting avenue to explore, particularly the relationship between defences against anxiety and certain discourses of masculinity. This may offer an opening in thinking about men and crime more generally, as well as the more specific question of fear of crime.

A psychoanalytic approach to anxiety is premised on the notion of the need to defend against it. Defense mechanisms mean that anxiety manifest symptomatically, so that no simple reading suffices to account for the relationship between source of anxiety and its symptomatic manifestation. We suggest that both source and symptom are, to some extent, gender specific.

Psychoanalytic theorising has tended to produce accounts of individual behaviour which ignore social influences and to have been rejected by sociology on that account. However recent sociological analyses of the transformations in modern societies have raised the question of anxiety as a characteristic of 'late' modern social organisation (Giddens 1991). Giddens draws on two traditions of theorising anxiety, first the existential, where in circumstances of late modernity 'personal meaninglessness ... becomes a fundamental psychic problem' (1991 p.9), and second a psychodynamic account in which Giddens draws on Winnicott (1991 pp45-46). A gender analysis, absent from this treatment, appears in Giddens' later work (Giddens 1991). While these analyses provide useful precedents in sociology for including a psychodynamic theorisation of the self in late modern social forms, the resulting theory of subjectivity remains ultimately an example of what Connell would call 'embedding' (1987 p.201); that is, an explanation premised upon showing how social systems (like late modernity) can become linked to (or embedded in) unconscious psychic processes. Essentially this is because Giddens' notion that 'motives are essentially born of anxiety' (1991 p64) remains undeveloped. Giddens'
analyses do not draw on other developments in psychodynamic and post-structuralist theory which show how defences against anxiety operate, not primarily intra-psychically, but between people (Klein 1963, Menzies Lyth 1959). These developments address the missing issue, namely, how individuals are motivated to identify with particular discourses (Henriques et al 1984). The development of this work specifically into questions of gender has used psychoanalytic concepts of anxiety and defence, together with the idea of socially-produced meanings systematised in discourses, to show how emotional responses can become split between men and women (Hollway 1989). This approach therefore offers a framework to view fear of crime in which gender differences can be understood, which does not reduce to a complex combination of social determinants (as in Box et al 1988), nor does it assume a rational individual who calculates risk objectively, nor is it reliant on a social embedding account of subjectivity.

Methodology

Once the notion of fear is problematised through the introduction of the concept of anxiety, an in-depth interview method is necessary; designed to explore the issues in terms of signification and psychodynamics. A psychodynamic theorisation of anxiety means that responses, even to developed questions about fear of crime (the approach in existing surveys), are inadequate sources of data, since defences mean that anxiety has to be identified symptomatically, through a complex of meanings. For this reason only an interview method which is quasi-clinical will be adequate to uncover the complex relations among fear of crime, level of anxiety, social group membership and circumstances of risk. By quasi-clinical, we mean an interpretative method that does not take respondents' accounts at face value; which probes, using absences and avoidances in the narrative as much as what is said, to identify areas of significance (Devereux 1961). Questions and subsequent analysis are driven by the intention of establishing the complex circumstances of signification, in particular the way that this is
influenced by unconscious dynamics which operate inter- as well as intra-personally (Hollway 1989 chapter 3).

Anxiety may be displaced onto a range of apparently inappropriate objects, or it may be projected onto someone else. In both cases, we hypothesise, available discourses will affect how anxiety is experienced and articulated. Individuals will have different discourses through which to express anxiety depending on sex, age, ethnicity and class, as well as on their personal histories. Samples of interviewees will therefore be chosen on the basis of these theoretical criteria, in order to maximise the differences within the total sample; differences hypothesised to be relevant to the relation among anxiety, risk and fear of crime.

The principal variables will be those of level of anxiety and level of crime. Although anxiety cannot, and need not, be measured, interviewees will be sought from 'anxious' populations, such as those who are prescribed tranquillisers, and 'normal' populations (whom we nevertheless expect to be subject to some anxiety) from 'high' and 'low' crime areas (as measured by local statistics for recorded crime). Dimensions of social difference, such as gender (as discussed above), age, ethnicity and class, are expected to be relevant according to the fear of crime literature (cf Jones, MacLean and Young 1986).

A sample of fifty individuals can provide sufficient variation across the above variables, thus satisfying the criteria of 'theoretical sampling' (cf Hollway 1981, Grimshaw and Jefferson 1987). A small pilot study involving both researchers interviewing together will aim to establish the areas of key significance and the reliability of the interpretative frames being employed. Thereafter two interviews, averaging 90 minutes each, will be conducted with each interviewee and permission to record sessions will be sought. Approximately 150 hours of audio material will be generated and transcribed for analysis. Questions will be aimed to generate individual histories relating to crime, danger, safety, fear of crime and wider anxiety. They will ask for specific accounts, in detail, which will provide evidence of how interviewees position themselves, and their families and neighbours, in discourses of crime and protection from crime.
Research programme

Two researchers will be required half time each for a period of two years. An initial literature review is required to relate the psychoanalytic literature on anxiety with the criminological literature on fear of crime. This work has not been done and would require an estimated six months and the use of specialist London libraries, such as the Tavistock Institute and the Institute of Psychoanalysis. A six-month interviewing period will be followed by a six-month period for analysis of data. A final six-month period would complete the writing up.

Administrative assistance for an average of two and a half days per week over eighteen months would cover setting up interviews, transcribing tapes and producing articles and reports. The theoretically innovative nature of the literature review and the critical importance of experience of in-depth interviewing requires that the researchers undertake all tasks themselves, rather than delegate them to a research assistant. Papers addressing the theoretical and methodological innovations will be produced and presented; orientated to the appropriate academic audiences (for example the British Criminology Conference, British Psychological Society, British Sociological Association and the American Society of Criminology).
1. SUMMARY OF RESEARCH RESULTS

Risk
We found no simple link between risk and fear of crime (low fear scores were more prevalent on the high-crime estate).

Anxiety and contingent biographical circumstances mediated people’s experiences and their reception of crime information.

People did not manage their lives utilising an objective calculation of risk.

Risk could not be operationalised unless ‘risk-taking’ was separated out from their being ‘at risk’. It was necessary to consider the effects of resources such as car ownership.

Age was an important risk factor, with the majority of the young scoring medium or high risk and practically all the old scoring low or very low. So too was the estate: more low-crime interviewees were judged low risk. Sex was insignificant.

Levels of criminal victimization were generally low, even on the high-crime estate. Most serious incidents occurred off the estate. Moreover, experiences of high victimization were often biographically- rather than estate-related. Consequently, the comparative estate-based risk of criminal victimization was difficult to determine. Much difference between estates was accounted for by far higher stranger violence - mostly young men fighting - on the high-crime estate. See Appendix 8.

Anxiety
Anxiety is a product of personal biography and not simply correlated with either of the two main variables, sex or high/low crime location.

Anxiety is more predictive of fear of crime than is risk.

Our narrative interviewing method produced rich accounts structured by the free associations of the interviewee, analysable through symptomatic traces of anxiety.

Since anxiety manifests through defensive symptoms, it is not synonymous with worry.

Defences against anxiety were often expressed through fear of crime, but also other channels, sometimes in addition.

Fear of crime
‘Fear of crime’ comprised two distinct elements: personal fear and the use of a public ‘fear of crime’ discourse. The latter could be variably invested, and could be more about crime than fear of crime. It was sometimes inflected more with anger. Some invested in other discourses, such as neighbourhood decline. Personal fears were of particular crimes, notably burglary or sexual assault, and could vary: inside and outside the home; and within and beyond familiar, local territory. Women were
more likely to express personal fear and men to reproduce the public discourse, especially older men.

Sex as such was not predictive of fear of crime, but the effects of gender increased fears of victimization among women and sense of safety among men.

Age was influential, especially for men. Anxieties about declining health and strength were sometimes expressed; in men, increasing fear of not being able to defend themselves.

**Risk/ fear/ anxiety profiles**
In 25 of 37 cases, fear and/or anxiety exceeded adjudged risk, albeit variably. Profiles of risk/ fear/ anxiety scores clustered into themes (which cut across demographic categories). However, the same or similar scores represented different meanings and generalizations had to be qualified in each individual case.

**‘Rationally anxious’ women and men**
Low fear generally corresponded to low anxiety as well as low risk. Well-established senses of self were the basis for these rational fear/anxiety or fear/risk relations. The particular combinations were explicable in terms of their unique biographies.

**Fear of crime ‘investors’**
Fear and anxiety were medium or high, but risk was low. In most cases (all high-crime), elements of persecutory anxiety were channelled into a fear of crime discourse (in two low-crime cases into specific fears, e.g. burglary; a neighbourhood dispute), displacing a loss, which could therefore remain hidden. Losses were gendered: for men, of patriarchal authority or masculinity; for women, of protection or respectability.

**‘Feminine’ fears**
In two groups of mostly local, young or middle-aged, low-crime women, levels of fear and anxiety exceeded very low risk.

a) Three (married with children) worried excessively about burglary, or physical and sexual assault, hence judged depressively anxious. Their anxieties centred on their children and then on their wider families, revealing a core anxiety expressed in traditional, caring femininity where lack of identity beyond that of wife/mother combines with projection of protective agency onto their menfolk, leaving them with excess vulnerability manifest in fears of burglary and/or assault.
b) For two, fear of crime centred on fear of male sexual violence linked to violent, alcoholic fathers.

**High anxiety across sex and age**

a) Three highly-anxious young men were variable in their particular patterns of risk, fear and anxiety. In both cases where persecutory anxiety was evident, the underlying anxiety was similar (fear of loss of self) but had different manifestations: excessive risk-taking and excessive protectiveness.
b) Two older high-crime women manifested high anxiety in idiosyncratic ways (agoraphobia, excessive concern for daughter) but rational risk-fear patterns.
Local identity and community safety investors
The importance of local identity as a mediator between anxiety and fear was evident in four high-crime cases. Various manifestations of anxiety exceeded the (mostly low) level of fear, because of investment in a belief that local identity would protect from criminal victimization. Two low-crime men whose medium anxiety exceeded their low risk and fear appeared to project their excess anxiety into concern about the safety of others in the community.

Containers for anxiety
Two high-crime men displayed low anxiety and low fear, in one case alongside high risk. Each had found 'resources' (religious belief, a deliberately constructed 'safe' life) for the effective containment of anxieties.

Respectability
Four low-crime cases showed profiles of excessive anxiety centred in loss of respectability in relation to fear and, especially, risk.

Two unique cases:
In one man's case, the anxiety precipitated by a traumatic event manifested directly, for example in panic attacks. One high-crime woman was judged to be high risk, medium fear and low anxiety. There was evidence of denial.
2. FULL REPORT OF ACTIVITIES AND RESEARCH RESULTS

Background
The research project arose out of three topical themes. First, the high-profile issue of fear of crime and its relation to risk of victimization produced a polarization of the criminological literature attempting to understand British Crime Survey results which found a ‘fear-risk paradox’, namely that high-risk groups, in particular young men, reported lower fear than low-risk groups, in particular older women. Second, the original prospectus for the Crime and Social Order Programme sought to situate the recent fear of crime ‘wave’ within broader sociological theories of late- or post-modernity which emphasise new insecurities using multidisciplinary insights. Third, the ‘fear-risk paradox’ provided a salient example of the importance of gender-based differences.

We hypothesised that anxiety - a central concept in the theoretical edifice of psychoanalysis - would be a mediating influence in the relationship between risk (of victimization) and fear of crime. Recent theoretical developments using psychoanalytic concepts have advanced understanding of gendered identities and gender relations, as well as late-modern insecurities. This hypothesis therefore also promised significant wider theoretical innovation (a promise we now think has been borne out).

In psychoanalytic theory, anxiety precipitates defences against the threats that it poses to the self, such that ideas and feelings which arouse anxiety are lost to conscious thought. This proposition has profound implications for method. We aimed to develop an appropriate interview method (which at the beginning we called ‘quasi-clinical’). Our development of the ‘narrative interview method’ is probably the most important outcome of this project, because of its widespread implications for social science research.

Objectives
i. To critique the ‘fear of crime’ literature and to retheorise ‘fear of crime’ in the light of psychodynamic understandings of anxiety and post-structuralist notions of gender difference.

Following our six-month literature review period, a joint paper ‘The risk society in an age of anxiety: situating fear of crime’ related fear of crime, not just to neighbourhood crime rates, incivilities and so on (the predominant concerns in the fear of crime literature). but to a changing, historical, socio-political formation in which questions of order and control are central, and in which, therefore, ‘crime’ and ‘fear of crime’ are always politically constructed. We applied this perspective to two individual biographies; the results of some of our earliest interviews. We concluded that fear of crime was an apt discourse within the modernist quest for order, since the risks it signifies, unlike other late modern risks, are knowable, decisionable (actionable) and potentially controllable. A fear of crime discourse can provide a more satisfying and less threatening location for anxieties generated more widely. However, there is great variability, depending on people’s unique biographies. This theme has repeatedly emerged from our data: factors such as location on a high-crime estate, past victimization, age and sex cannot explain fear of crime.

---

1 See Outputs: b.
2 See Outputs: f.
connection of people's unique biographies to their fear of crime can be preserved in a case-study method. When moving from a survey-type question which assumes 'fear of crime' as a unitary concept, to listening to people's testimony about their experiences of criminal victimization, it became clear that using 'fear of crime' as a unitary concept is unhelpful.

ii. To integrate psychodynamic approaches to subjectivity into sociological perspectives on contemporary social changes, especially as these relate to questions concerning fear of crime.
In addition to the above, we have used the interview transcripts from three members of one family to address the question of cultural reproduction across generations. We illustrated this through the (gendered) themes of respect and respectability and also showed how particular defences against anxiety have reproduced themselves (across sex) between generations. Although this idea is inherent in clinical case material, it constitutes an innovation in social science research: one beyond our initial predictions.

iii. To develop interview methods and theoretical methodology consistent with a psychodynamic understanding of individuals
Having piloted a detailed interview schedule based on the principles of a 'quasi-clinical' interviewing method, we were not satisfied with the level of responses we were getting (although some interesting information was produced). Attendance at a training workshop in the 'biographical-interpretive method' (which originates in the oral history tradition in Germany) gave us a valuable lead in shifting to an interview method based on eliciting stories. Modification of this method resulted in our 'narrative interview method' (see Methods: the interviews) which has succeeded in producing the richest data that either of us has ever achieved as researchers. A further paper uses our interviews with one young criminal to illustrate a discourse analysis informed by the psychodynamic principles of our theoretical methodology.

iv. To explore the paradox of the apparent low level of fear in high risk groups, for example, young black males, through developing an understanding of the relationship between masculinity and anxiety.
The differences between men and women, especially before old age, have been salient throughout and it has been possible to understand these, not only through differences in biographies, structural factors and cultural meanings, but also through habitual defences against anxiety. This complexity has also meant that gender differences did not collapse into sex differences; that is that there were many similarities across men and women, as well as differences among and between them. As for the relationship between masculinity and anxiety, our interviews with two young male criminals in particular posed some interesting questions about their

---

3 See Outputs: e.
4 See Outputs: c.
5 See Outputs: d.
6 In the course of designing our sample (see Methods: Design) and deciding on our locations, we opted not to include 'race' among our main variables. This was primarily a result of our decision to interview on two estates which, historically-speaking, were white working-class and the need to hold the total number of interviewees to 50. In the event, three ethnic minority interviewees formed part of our sample: only one a young man.
handling of (high) anxiety, especially its relation to (high) risk-taking. Bion's theories about the emotional basis of thinking cast light on understanding one young man's case (output: d) where thinking about a risky action paralyzed him, hence his need to act without thinking (take risks) in order to assuage anxiety. This insight appears to have profound implications for thinking about young men and high (often criminal) risk-taking, and we intend to follow it up in subsequent work.

v. To explain differences in fear of crime among different social groups in ways which reduce neither to levels of risk, to rational, calculating individuals, nor to an array of social determinants.

While our sample was based on the variables of age and sex normally theorised as accounting for differences in reported fear of crime, our method ensured that the pathways of anxiety in a person's biography, and specifically in their history and fear of victimization, informed our analysis of the relationship between risk and fear of crime.

**Methods**

**Piloting**

Five pilot interviews (three men and two women of varying ages and in urban and rural locations) were conducted using an interview schedule in three parts which reflected our tripartite theorisation: fear of crime/victimization, anxiety/worry, risk/safety (see appendix one). The questions were devised with the aim of eliciting concrete information about relevant aspects of present and past lives from our interviewees, using follow-up questions for each event reported. Some of the specific questions were generated in an initial intensive exploration/co-interview between the two researchers to explore our own relations to crime and fear of crime; others emanated from the literature. In the follow-up questions to reports of specific incidents of criminal victimization, we specifically asked what did they do, feel and with what effects. This was based on our wish to anchor responses to actual experience, in order to ensure that the interviewees' talk did not remain at the level of well-rehearsed public discourses about crime and fear of crime; talk which illustrates (and reproduces or modifies) a 'law and order' crime discourse but rarely gives any insight into a person's actual fear of crime.

Based on our hypothesis that fear of crime is not stably located in individuals but may unconscious be shared out, or split, among household members, we asked all the questions for relevant others as well as self. We included questions which were designed to find out what relation respondents' fear of crime had to crime reports in the media and in local networks and made sure we included questions which were sensitive to domestic, as well as public, crime.

These were the emphases which we retained and strengthened in our subsequent developments of two interview schedules (see Appendices 4 and 5). The first was changed dramatically - and with dramatic effects (output: e) - to be based on only seven questions designed to elicit the telling of a narrative which could freely reflect the 'gestalt' of the teller, rather than that of the researcher. A further pilot interview - this time of the final interview one schedule - was conducted by our consultant, after providing him with an account of the principles of narrative interviewing, who then commented on the schedule and provided us with his tape.

---

Design
Our research design was based on identifying a high-crime and a low-crime council housing estate, based on police statistics. The high-crime estate had the advantage that previous ethnographic work had been conducted and written up, providing historical information. The two estates provided our independent variable, controlling for 'risk of victimization' (although, of course, patterns of risk varied within, as well as between, the two estates) and we aimed to fill each of our 12 cells with three cases (each interviewed twice): in the event 37 people were interviewed, one more (middle-aged man) on the high-crime than on the low-crime estate and one extra middle-aged, rather than old, woman, also on the high-crime estate (see table one).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE ONE</th>
<th>Young (11-29)</th>
<th>Middle (30-54)</th>
<th>Old (55+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high-crime</td>
<td>low-crime</td>
<td>high-crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access
Interviewees were recruited by knocking on doors, during daylight hours, and, with whoever replied, covering certain points of information in a systematic way from a prompt sheet (see appendix 2), with a view to arranging interview times in advance (one week apart). All agreed in advance to our use of a tape-recorder. Three principles governed which doors we knocked on and who we recruited within the household: geographical coverage (this was especially important on the high-crime estate, where one area had a much higher crime rate than the rest); filling each cell in our sample design, and following up family connections. Because of our interest in family dynamics with regard to anxiety, where possible we recruited spouses (in five cases) and other relatives, if 17 or over (in three cases). A set question on the biodata form was filled in on each doorstep meeting (see appendix 3) asking if other relatives lived on the estate, recording their address and/or phone number. In four cases, family connections beyond the household were followed up within the estate. Overall, more of our interviewees were connected than solo (25 of 37).

Our success rate in recruiting interviewees was high: only four people declined to be interviewed (though we knocked on several doors where no-one was in). An undoubtedly significant factor in this success was our offer of ‘a small fee’ in our introduction, namely £15 for the two interviews (which averaged 90 minutes each). We did not find that financial motivations led to an unserious approach to interviews, but we did feel comfortable with the fact that we were respecting the value of people’s time, especially when so many of the residents were hard up. In only two cases did it prove impossible to get the second interview. One was an individual with a chaotic life; the other turned out to have Alzheimer's disease.

---

8 To preserve the anonymity of this estate, and therefore of the interviewees, we are not including references to this material.
The interviews
The first interview consisted of seven questions, each designed to elicit narrative answers, rather than explanations or descriptions (see appendix 4). Questions followed the tripartite structure of criminal victimization/ fear of crime; risk/safety; anxiety/worry. They began with factual issues (history of criminal victimization) and ended with a neutral question relating to their arrival on the estate (to pick up any contrast effects with where they’d moved from). This order was designed to ‘top and tail’ the interview with the most emotionally neutral subject matters.

We conducted a second interview, one week later, based on follow-up questions resulting from listening symptomatically to the first interview on audiotape, in order to identify areas where anxiety was obtruding in the account; for example, through hesitations, avoidances, changes of tack, changes in emotional tone or contradictions. During the first interview, information was being received at many levels and the interviewer was managing the usual issues of attention, rapport and holding on to all important information for follow-up. It was therefore extremely useful to listen to the interview outside the face-to-face setting, with an ear focused on another level of meaning through these symptoms of anxiety. We strengthened this procedure further by both listening to each first interview tape, so that, as well as the ‘insider’ insights (from the researcher who conducted the interview), an ‘outsider’ insight was also provided, and contributed to devising the narrative questions for the second interview. A further benefit of a second interview was, we found, that the relationship was no longer a stranger one, because, on second meeting, so much had passed between interviewer and interviewee, that a certain familiarity, even intimacy, had developed.

As part of the second interview, following the questions that were devised to follow up symptomatic issues from interview one, a standard set of questions was asked to each interviewee (see appendix 5) in order to ensure comparability of information across respondents, which cannot be guaranteed using only a narrative interview format. These were derived from the pilot schedule.

Immediately after the first doorstep meeting and after both interviews, the researchers made notes of their impressions. As well as the usual observations, we recorded what clinical psychoanalysts call the ‘countertransference’; that is the researcher’s emotional responses to the interviewee and their story. The purpose of this is to provide further information about unconscious communications. For example, one man’s interviews revolved around the story of a major injustice at work. The interviewer’s powerful emotions of anger pointed to the significance of the interviewee’s lack of emotion. However, this aspect was not strongly developed and we hope to work on it more systematically in subsequent work.

Data analysis
Transcripts were made of all taped interviews. After reading the transcripts and all back-up information and making extensive notes, a case summary form was filled in for each interviewee (appendix 6). This form was tested by sending two sets of transcript (one by each interviewer) to our consultant who filled it in. The themes picked up were reassuringly similar.

Data analysis took two forms, nomothetic and idiographic. The purpose of nomothetic analysis was to assess patterns across the whole sample in order to answer such central questions as ‘was there a disjunction between fear of crime and risk of victimization?’, ‘did the sex and age pattern reflect the findings of the British
Crime Survey? This involved coding each interviewee on 34 categories which covered biographical details, history of victimization and a number of measures concerning fear, risk and anxiety derived theoretically (see appendix 7, i-iv). These were also summarised in tabular form (see table 2) to show the different profiles of risk, fear of crime and anxiety and how these are affected by types of anxiety, mediations of fear of crime and key resources9. The purpose of idiographic analysis was to preserve the complex relationships among biography, victimization, anxiety and fear of crime in each individual case. Case analyses rely on a constant interaction between case evidence and theoretical analysis, as in ‘grounded theory’. As experienced researchers, our familiarity with the interviewees, having conducted the entire field work ourselves, and been through every stage of the analysis, has certainly enhanced our capacity to use these data analytically.

Results
Appendix 8 shows experiences of criminal victimization, broken down by estate, sex and type of crime demonstrating the differences between the estates is largely accounted for by far higher stranger violence (mostly young men fighting), on the high-crime estate. [table 2 here]. Table two provides a summary of the comparative results, focusing on each interviewee’s relationships among risk, fear of crime and anxiety. An account of the categories is given below.

Risk and fear of crime
There is no simple link between risk and fear of crime, in ways that would be predictable by an assumption of the rational, objectively risk-calculating subject. However, the (emotional) effect of risk (subjectively experienced) figured prominently in people’s accounts of their fear of crime and their previous victimization history. Stories about these events achieved their meaning within the unique gestalt of somebody’s relevant experiences, both past and present. The people we were communicating with were people who made a complex web of meanings out of their experiences and anticipation of risk (including risk of criminal victimization) and these sets of meanings were suffused with emotional significance. They not only positioned themselves as more or less at risk (of burglary, car theft or attack, for example) but more actively were recurrently engaged in more or less ‘risky’ practices, from leaving the house unoccupied to travelling home alone after dark; from regularly going out stealing metal for scrap to informing to the police. Although these experiences of being at risk and taking risks varied with both age and sex, as did people’s reception of crime information, their contingent biographical circumstances were highly influential in the significance of risk and these therefore cut across the effects of demographic categories. Risk was also affected by ‘resources’ both of a material kind (car ownership, for example) and a psychological kind; for example religious belief or a dependable family or local identification) (column 4). The composite risk score (see column 1) is a measure of being at risk which also takes into account a person’s risk-taking.

As with risk, different aspects of fear of crime had to be distinguished in order to reflect people’s usages and experiences. ‘Fear of crime’ had two distinct elements: personal fear and the use of a public discourse. The use of a public

---
9 An account of these results was given at the Crime and Social Order in Europe Conference, Manchester, 7th-10th September 1996, sponsored by the ESRC programme: ‘Anxiety, fear of crime, risk and difference: exploring the connections’, which will form a chapter in the planned book from the programme. See Outputs: g.
discourse varied also according to the amount of energy or ‘investment’ in it. Some interviewees invested in other discourses, such as neighbourhood decline or incivilities. In the case of personal fear, expressions of fear were not ‘of crime’ in general but of particular crimes, notably burglary or assault, and varied between fear of crime inside and outside the home and within and outside familiar, local territory. The public discourse could be more about crime than fear of crime and was sometimes inflected more with anger than fear (column 11).

Men and women often talked about different crimes and different fears. For example, many women across the three age groups were afraid of assault in public places after dark if they were alone. Some men in each age group were similarly fearful, but more so in late middle- and old-age. Yet these were not the same fears with the same meanings, because, for women, they were strongly inflected with fears of sexual assault, though its significance varied also among women. Therefore it is questionable to talk of ‘fear of crime’ as a unitary concept. Again we arrived at a composite score (column 2). However, these scores represent, not so much a fixed, numerical value for the purposes of statistical treatment, but one term in the triangulation of risk, fear of crime and anxiety, which helped us to define patterns within our interviewee group and thus to cluster them (see section 1). We modified these scores in the light of the whole risk-fear-anxiety profile that we had built up for each person, again for purposes of analytical comparison and clustering of profiles.

Column 5, risk-fear conjunction, checks those cases (n=13) where the risk and fear scores fall into the same category of low (1 or 2), medium (3) or high (4 or 5). These are the cases that could be explained without using the concept of anxiety (and could be claimed for a realist theory that argues that people’s fear of crime is predictable according to their risk of criminal victimization). However, analysis of particular individual cases (see, for example, Phil, below) strongly implied anxiety, which made sense of the data in a way that the realist argument could not. A risk-fear conjunction could, therefore, mean that the defences against anxiety which a given individual had constructed and which explained her or his experiences of fear, were functional. Where there was a conjunction of risk, fear and anxiety (column 6), this strongly suggested what we called a ‘rational’ relation to fear, which we found in seven cases. Because this indicated that there was no ‘surplus’ anxiety to account for, for these people columns 12 and 13 are blank. (In one further case, that of Dick, the function of religion as a container for his anxiety meant that no other account of anxiety (in columns 12 and 13) was needed. Significantly, two of the ‘rationally anxious’ were old women (the same number as of young men), which suggests that the tendency to stereotype older women as irrationally fearful is the result of overgeneralising from statistically-based survey results. The availability of resources (car, husband, close family ties) were significant for these women’s ‘rational’ relation to fear, but it was also clear that their low anxiety was a long-term biographical feature.

Anxiety
Although we arrived at a composite score for anxiety also, we understood anxiety along three dimensions: expressions (columns 6 to 11), mediations (column12) and core (column13). Expressions of anxiety can usefully be categorised under three headings (deriving from Kleinian theory): ‘rational anxiety’, ‘depressive anxiety’ and ‘persecutory anxiety’. Anxiety is a feature of the human condition but, when rational, involves facing ‘reality’, even when uncomfortable or threatening. In acutely
threatening circumstances, however, and particularly when life circumstances have never enabled trust, reality can be too threatening and adults resort to defences against this persecutory anxiety (column 9) which are based on denying (column 8) or distorting reality. The difference between rational (column 6) and depressive (column 7) anxiety is that depressive anxiety is still excessive. Depressive anxiety is characteristic of those who are anxious, aware of it, who can acknowledge reality, but whose anxiety is excessive in relation to the threat. While individuals manifest characteristic patterns of anxiety, this may be a mixture and change over time. Ten of the men and only four of the women were checked under persecutory anxiety, while depressive anxiety was much more even (several of the men were checked on both). In a few cases, people’s defences against anxiety had broken down and acute anxiety manifested directly (column 10), as for example in panic attacks, agoraphobia or breakdown for which tranquillisers were taken on a long-term basis.

Mediations of anxiety refer to the contents in which anxiety is located. If anxiety is understood as a fluid emotional process which must find expression through the fears which it inhabits, fear of crime proved to be one - salient - location for anxiety; readily available through dominant discourses which were endlessly reproduced in neighbourhood talk, in local news stories and in national media. Core anxiety refers to what, in our view, was the underlying anxiety, biographically established for each individual, which made sense of their mediations of anxiety in terms of fear of (some specific) crime or other concern such as respect. The categories used in these two columns are the highly condensed summing up of some complex analyses of individual cases and they require much explication, some of which is provided in the cluster summaries (section 1).

Phil, for example, threw himself into community safety activities, being so vigilant on behalf of others that he even campaigned for all the mature broadleaf trees on the estate to be felled because they were a danger, in the autumn, to old people who might slip on the fallen leaves. His interview was characterised by a constant tendency to slide from talking about himself to talking about vulnerable (often old) people on the estate. His own health was poor and he had suffered a series of accidents which left him disabled. Moreover his father had been disabled in a work-site accident when Phil was young. His core anxiety (personal ill-health and unsafety) manifest in the very salient mediation of his current anxieties into community safety, which functioned to project some of his own anxieties onto others on the estate. Fran had recently separated from her husband and found herself, a single mother, looking after her two children in council housing, having had to move from an expensive private property. She became extremely scared of the risk of male sexual violence in public places, something which she had never experienced as a married woman, despite having an active social life separate from her husband. Her mother had left her father when she was young on account of his alcoholism and physical violence to the mother. In places, the story slipped from fear of what men might do (notably rape) to fear of what people might say (which expressed her core anxiety about feminine respectability following her change in status).

Similar vignettes could be given for each interviewee, which together provide evidence of the unique complexity of each person’s relation to risk and fear, understood with reference, not just to a global concept of anxiety, but characteristic variations in modes and expressions of anxiety. Our central contention, resulting from our findings, is that the relations between risk and fear of crime cannot be understood without theorising the multiple meanings attaching to a person’s identity
which become invested with anxiety. These biographies interweave the important effects of demographic characteristics such as sex, age and local status with the meanings that these individuals have constructed, often unconsciously but manifest through their practices and relationships as these are told through their stories. These meanings, for example of community safety or male sexual violence are not a direct reflection of risks but derive surplus significance from the necessity of coping with anxiety, both historical and contemporary.

Activities

ESRC Crime and Social Order Programme meetings:
- Theorising Risk and Safety Meeting. 4 April 1995, Keele. Presentation ‘Gender difference, anxiety and the fear of crime - introduction’
- Qualitative Research Methodologies Meeting. 18-19 September 1995, Manchester. Presentation: ‘Eliciting narrative through the in-depth interview’.

Several meetings with Dr Stephen Frosh, consultant. Also:
- 9/3/95. Discussions on method with Professor Michael Rustin

Conference presentations and talks on the project topic:
(all jointly presented by Wendy Hollway and Tony Jefferson)
- ‘The relation between anxiety and fear of crime; three case studies’, University of Cork, Department of Law, April 26th 1996.
- ‘Methodology, narrative and the defended subject’, IXth International Oral History conference, University of Goteborg, Sweden, June 13-16 1996
- ‘Eliciting narrative through the in-depth interview’, Fourth International conference on Social Science Methodology, University of Essex, July 1-4 1996

Conference presentations on theoretically related topics:
(all jointly presented by Wendy Hollway and Tony Jefferson)
- ‘Explorations in the psychodynamics of vigilantism’, 7th Annual Psychoanalysis and the Public Sphere conference, 12-13 November 1993, University of East London. Also presented at Centre for Psychotherapeutic Studies Seminar Series, University of Sheffield, 7 June 1994
• “A kiss is just a kiss”: date rape, gender and contradictory subjectivities’. American Society of Criminology, annual conference, Miami, 9-12 November 1994,
• also presented at Department of Feminist Studies, University of Goteborg, Sweden. June 12th 1996
• and University of California, Davis (sociology and women’s studies) November 18 1996
• and San Francisco State University (anthropology) November 19 1996

Meetings with South Yorkshire Police:
Two meetings enabled the sharing of statistical information and discussion of prevention projects on the high-crime estate. In addition to acquiring detailed, street by street, statistical breakdowns of crime on both estates, we were able to share more qualitative findings, given the current involvement of the SYP on one of the estates.

Outputs

c) Hollway, W and Jefferson, T 'Eliciting narrative through the in-depth interview'. Conditionally accepted for Qualitative Inquiry 3(1), March 1997
e) Hollway, W and Jefferson, T 'Gender, generation and anxiety: the reproduction of culture in one family on a high-crime housing estate in Northern England'. Submitted to Critique of Anthropology
f) Hollway, W and Jefferson, T 'The relation between anxiety and fear of crime: three case studies'. Submitted to Victimology
g) A chapter entitled 'Anxiety, fear of crime, risk and difference: exploring the connections' is in preparation for a planned book emanating from the programme, High Anxiety?: Worries and insecurities about Crime and Social Order.

Discussions are under way for a book based on the project.

Datasets
Discussions have taken place with the Qualidata archive based at Essex University who wish to take the collection. For reasons of confidentiality, copies of the audiotapes will not be lodged there, only discs containing interview transcripts, from which names and other identifying references can be easily removed.

Impacts
As befits the objectives of this project, our main channels of dissemination, and thus our main impacts, are through academic networks. We achieve wide dissemination through our multidisciplinary outlooks and our work attracts huge interest at conferences and in other academic settings. This is illustrated by the variety of disciplinary journals and conferences in which we have already disseminated our
work, with more planned. Since our introduction of the concept of anxiety into the British fear of crime debate, there is evidence of its take-up in other influential work, for example Hough (1995)\textsuperscript{10} in his analysis of the 1994 British Crime Survey and several programme teams, notably Sparks et al and Walklate et al.

**Future research priorities**

We believe that the implications for research methodology of theorising anxiety are profound: when research topics concern a whole range of sensitive or complex issues involving, for example, anxiety, fear, self-identity, intimate relationships, conflict, emotion, it is important not to assume that the overt accounts provided in standard forms of self-report methods including surveys and interviews are sufficient, because they assume rational self-knowledge on the part of the respondent. We believe we have found a way of going beyond this assumption without straying into clinical terrain.

In fear of crime research, while survey methods have set a relevant agenda, we have found that the complex mediations involved in all individual cases require a case study approach, from which nonetheless commonalities within and across social groups can be found.

Our data have raised many other themes which we wish to pursue concerning identity and moral development; themes which are salient at a time of political debate about declining moral standards and their causes. 14 sub-themes have been identified from the transcript analyses, which we have clustered into three areas focussing on identity and morality at different, though overlapping, life stages: early anxiety and the development of an integrated identity; heterosexuality and gender relations; respect and respectability.

**Ethics**

Because of the proximity of our concerns to psychotherapeutic problems, we have been sensitive to ethical issues during the field work. While we took precautions such as being prepared with local Victim Support phone numbers, we found that our interviewees responded overwhelmingly positively to the opportunity to talk. Often we heard comments like, 'I'd have done it for free, it's been so interesting' and once 'I think I might go and talk to a counsellor after all, this has been really good!'

A different set of ethical issues is raised in the context of preserving the integrity of a case study in work destined for publication: while identifying features are, of course, changed, the correct details of a person's history add up to a complex whole on which an analysis is built. For example, it is obvious to us that these (idiographic) data cannot be fed back into the communities where we did our field work, where people would be instantly recognisable. The probability of one of our interviewees recognising themselves (duly camouflaged) in an academic journal is minute but not non-existent. These issues gave rise to a lively debate at an international 'new psychologies' conference\textsuperscript{11} which will influence the ethics debate in psychology. Similarly, our "A kiss is just a kiss" paper, based on an actual date-rape case, posed similar, ethical issues on the use of psychoanalytic ideas in potentially identifiable cases which we followed up by collecting responses from a


\textsuperscript{11} Tarbert, Scotland, June 28-30 1996, where Wendy Hollway was an invited discussant. It will form part of an invited chapter contribution to the subsequent book.
variety of academics and clinical practitioners. We intend to pursue this issue, given its centrality to our case-based form of enquiry.
APPENDIX ONE

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE - THIRD DRAFT

FEAR OF CRIME / VICTIMISATION

What's the crime you most fear?
   Has it ever happened to you?
If yes: What did you do?
   How did it affect you? (at the time/ subsequently/ permanently?)
Ask same for relevant others.

If no: Do you think it's likely to happen to you?
If yes: Why do you think that?
   Do you worry about it happening to you?
   What would you do?
   What do you feel would be the consequences?
Ask same for relevant others.

If no: Why do you fear it?
   Where does the fear come from?
   Local crime talk?
      what sort do you take notice of?
      effects on you?
      does it set of worries about you in a similar sit'n?
Media (specify)?
   (same)
What (other) crime(s) have you most been a victim of?
If yes: Take one incident
   What did you do?
   How did it affect you? (at the time, subsequently)
Ask same for relevant others.

If no: What's the crime most likely to happen to you?
   Why do you think that?
   Do you worry about that happening to you?
   What would you do?
   What do you feel would be the consequences for you?
Ask same for relevant others

Why do you think that that crime is the most likely to happen to you?
Local crime talk?
Media? (specify)

If answer to above all 'public' crimes
Have you ever been victim of crime committed by someone you've known?
If no:
   Do you worry about that possibility?
      If yes: why?
      If no: why not?
What would you do?
What do you feel would be the consequences?
Ask same for relevant others

If yes:
  What did you do?
  How did it affect you? (at the time, subsequently)
Ask same for relevant others.

If property crime:
  Has anyone you've known ever physically hurt you?
If no:
  Do you worry about it happening to you?
    If yes, why?
    If no, why not?
  What would you do?
  What do you feel would be the consequences for you?
Ask same for relevant others.

What do you feel when you read/hear about stories of vigilantism?
Would you join such a group/ encourage a relevant other to do so?

Has anyone ever physically hurt you?
ANXIETY / WORRY

Have you been worried about anything recently?
If yes: What was it?
   What did you do?
   Why did you do that?
   How did that make you feel?
Ask same for relevant others?
If no: Do you ever worry about anything?
If yes: What do you tend to worry about?
   What do you do about it?
   Why do you do that
   How does that tend to make you feel?
Ask same for relevant others.
Both: Would you describe yourself generally as a worrier?
If yes: What do you do to cope with such worrying?
   Why do you do that?
   How does that tend to make you feel?
Ask same for relevant others.
If no: How do you cope with problems?
   Why do you do that?
   How does that tend to make you feel?
Ask same for relevant others.
Does someone else do the worrying in your household/ relationship?
   Who?
   Does it affect what you do? How you feel?
if in a household/relationship:
Do you do the worrying for someone in your household?
Would you say you shared the worrying?
Would you say that anyone relied on you?
Do you ever spend time apart?
If yes: Does that affect your activities?
   If yes: What do you do differently?
      How does that make you feel?
   Does spending time apart make you feel different?
   If yes: In what way?
      Does it mean you do things differently?
   If no: Why is that?
      If you did, what do you think you would do differently?
         how do you think you would feel differently?
if not in a household relationship:
Have you always been on your own (mainly single)?
   If no: What do you do differently now, compared with when you
      were not alone?
      How different does it feel?
   If yes: How do you feel about being alone?
      What's the most troublesome/difficult/worrying part of being
         on your own?
      How do you cope with that?
Have you been moved by anything recently?
   If yes: What? How did it affect you?
      How did you respond?
Are you often moved by this or similar things?
Would you always respond in the same way?

Ask same for relevant others:
  If not moved:  What does tend to move you?
              How does it affect you?
              How do you tend to respond?

Ask same for relevant others.

For those with children:
At home:    Do you worry about things you never used to (before the kids)?
            What sort of things?
            How do you respond?
            How do you tend to feel?
Left home:  Did you used to worry more (when the kids were at home)?
            What sort of things?
            How did you respond?
            How did you used to feel?

All:
Is your health generally good?
If yes:    What sort of health problems have you suffered?
            Have you had problems with any of the things you've worried about?
If no:     What sort of health problems?
            What do you think the reasons are for your poor health?
            Has any of this been connected with your worrying?

RISK / SAFETY

Where do you feel most safe? Why?
  least safe? Why?
  do you avoid such situations? How?
Are you a risk-taker?
  Outline a recent risky situation.
      How did it feel (before/ at the time/ afterwards)

Work:  hours/ travel to and fro
        public transport
        private
        walking
        Have you ever felt unsafe at work?

Leisure:  hours/travel to and fro
         public transport
         private
         walking
         Have you ever felt unsafe in a leisure context?

Social:  Do you go out alone?
        after dark/ in strange areas/ in risky areas?
        if not, why not?
        would you?
        Do you go to - pub/cinema/theatre/night club alone?
if not, why not
would you?
Have you ever accepted coffee from a comparative stranger?
Have you ever offered coffee to a comparative stranger?
Have you ever hitch-hiked?
Offered a lift to a hitch-hiker?
-alone? with another?
if not, why not?
would you?
Have you ever intervened in a fight?
-circumstances
if not, why not?
would you?
Have you ever gone to an event (demo/picket line/football match) where violence was predicted?
if not, why not?
would you?

Are you a risk-taker?
Eg?
Afterwards?
1. We are researchers attached to the University of Sheffield.

2. We are conducting research into people's feelings about crime, about risk, and generally about safety and we are interested in people's experiences in these sorts of areas.

3. We want to talk to different people and wondered if the people in your household might be appropriate to talk to. Would you mind telling us a few basic details about the people living here, to see if you might.

........(fill in proforma)......................

4. We would like to talk some more to you and some, or maybe all, of the other adults. Is anyone else in? Could we speak to you all?

5. What we want to do is to come round and hear about your experiences of what it's like, living here, when it comes to crime, risk, safety and so on.

6. It would involve two sessions of perhaps an hour and a half each time.

7. We will pay a small fee - £15 - at the end of the second session.

8. Would you like to know anything more about the research?

9. Would you be willing to be involved? (each)

.........................................................

10. Can we arrange a time now, for both sessions. We will need one week between sessions (see proforma).

Tony Jefferson
Wendy Hollway
Who lives in this house?

1. (yourself) : sex: age:

2. (relation, if any, to you) : sex: age:

3. 

4. 

5. 

6. 

other

Do you have other relatives on the estate?

Who:

1. (relation to you) : sex age:

2. : sex age:

other

Session one: date - time -

session two: date - time -

Name:

Address:

*Phone no: [give our contact details: Dawn: and ask to let us know if the meeting needs to be changed]
APPENDIX FOUR

Interview One Questions.

1a. Can you tell me about how crime has impacted on your life since you've been living here?

1b. [follow up in terms of detail and time periods, following order of narrative]

2a. Can you tell me about unsafe situations in your life since you've been living here?

2b. [as 1b]

3a. Can you think of something that you've read, seen or heard about recently that makes you fearful? Anything [not necessarily about crime].

3b. [as 1b]

4a. Can you tell me about risky situations in your life since you've been living here?

4b. [as 1b]

5a. Can you tell me about times in your life recently when you've been anxious?

5b. [as 1b]

6a. Can you tell me about earlier times in your life when you've been anxious?

6b. [as 1b]

7. Can you tell me what it was like moving to this area?
APPENDIX FIVE

Interview Two Questions

1. CRIME / VICTIMIZATION

Commonest in your area?
   - happened to you? Responses?
   - not happened to you? How did you come to think this?

Most likely to happen to you?
   - happened to you? Responses?
   - not happened to you? How did you come to think this?

One you most fear?
   - happened to you? Responses?
   - not happened to you? How did you come to think this?

Involving non-strangers?
   - happened to you? Responses?
   - not happened to you?

2. VULNERABILITY/ RISK

Have you ever felt unsafe:
   - at home?
   - at work?
   - travelling [to and from work]??
   - in a leisure context?

Do you go out alone:
   - after dark?
   - in strange areas?
   - in 'risky' areas?

Do you go out alone to:
   - pub/ club?
   - cinema/ theatre?

Where do you feel most safe?

Where do you feel least safe?
   do you avoid?
   strategy if unavoidable?

Have you ever accepted an invitation to 'go back' from a comparative stranger?
   - would you?

Have you ever offered such an invitation?
   - would you?
Have you ever:
  hitch-hiked?
    - would you?
  offered a lift to a hitch-hiker
    - would you?
  ever intervened in a fight?
    - would you?
  gone to an event (demo/football match) where violence predicted?
    - would you?
Would you describe yourself as a risk-taker?

3. ANXIETY

Would you describe yourself generally as a worrier?
  - are significant others worriers?
  - coping mechanisms?

Who worries more in your relationship/household?

Do you worry more:
  - alone?
  - with significant others? Examples?

Did having children affect how worried you got?

Have you been moved by something recently?
Has your partner?

How's your health?
Any connection with things you worry about?

How do you sleep?
CASE SUMMARY
1. Interviewer
2. Location
3. Age
4. Sex
5. Race
6. Employ't

7. Marital status (history)

8. Family (history)

9. Children / grandchildren

10. Health (history)

11. Criminal victimization (history)

12. Fear of crime (history)
13. At risk/ risk-taking (history)   [self report

14. Anxiety/ worry/traumatic events (history)   [self report:

15. Interviewer/interviewee relationship

16. Other comments/ themes/ summary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young 16-29</th>
<th>Middle-aged 30-54</th>
<th>Old 55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>16 24 24</td>
<td>38 42 47</td>
<td>57 58 68 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td>W W W</td>
<td>W W W</td>
<td>EM W EM W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td>M M M</td>
<td>M M M</td>
<td>M M M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td>U U U</td>
<td>U/PT U W/P Rd/sk Dis Rd/sk OAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redundancy</strong></td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>HC HC HC HC</td>
<td>HC HC HC HC</td>
<td>HC HC HC HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area (Rough/Resp.)</strong></td>
<td>Ro Ro Re Re Re Re Re Re Re</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moves within estate</strong></td>
<td>N Y Y N Y Y N Y Y N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9 Years Residence</strong></td>
<td>9 22 21 9 33 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local/Non local</strong></td>
<td>L L L L N N L N N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship status</strong></td>
<td>P S M DM PP M DPM M DS S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children</strong></td>
<td>0 0 1 1-4 3-3 2 5-1-1 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grandchildren</strong></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Y 11 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family of Origin:size</strong></td>
<td>2 3 2-2 9-2 8 3-8 5 5 3 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health(OK,Poor,VP)</strong></td>
<td>OK OK OK OK OK OK VP VP VP VP OK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CV: Burglary</strong></td>
<td>L 0 0 0 0 0 0 M 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other prop./Car crime</strong></td>
<td>0 0 0 L L H 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stranger violence</strong></td>
<td>H H H (H)* 0 L L 0 M 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non stranger crime</strong></td>
<td>0 0 0 L 0 0 L 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non stranger violence</strong></td>
<td>B(H) (H) B(H) 0 M 0 0 0 0 (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incivilities(mention)</strong></td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violent in F O</strong></td>
<td>other s/o self s/o self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Commission</strong></td>
<td>v/nv v/nv v/nv v/nv v/nv v/nv v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FoC: Inside</strong></td>
<td>U U U U C U U F F U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FoC: Outside</strong></td>
<td>U U U C C U U C F U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FoC: Discourse FA/I</strong></td>
<td>GA GA GA/I GA/I GA/I GA/I GA/I GA/I GA/I GA/I GA/I GA/I GA/I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk:precn(dog/other)</strong></td>
<td>dog other d/o d/o d/o d/o dog/other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk-taking(self report)</strong></td>
<td>N Y M N N N N N N N M M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk-taking(int. assess)</strong></td>
<td>Y Y Y Y N M M N M N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At risk</strong></td>
<td>H H H H H H M L M L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anxiety(self report)</strong></td>
<td>N Y Y N N N M M M N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anxiety(int. assess)</strong></td>
<td>N Y Y N M N M Y M N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worries most</strong></td>
<td>na na S P S/P P S/P na na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traumatic Events</strong></td>
<td>M H H H H H H H M L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

* Not on estate
(..) 3 or more years ago
B Bullying
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Young 16-29</th>
<th>Middle-aged 30-54</th>
<th>Old 55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>Cher 17</td>
<td>Jane 19</td>
<td>Rachel 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (Rough/Respect)</td>
<td>Re  Re Re</td>
<td>Re  Re Re Re Re Re</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moves within estate</td>
<td>Y N Y N Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y N N N Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Residence</td>
<td>17 1 16</td>
<td>7 25 9 26 20 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/Non local</td>
<td>L N L</td>
<td>N L L L L L N</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship status</td>
<td>P PS PP PM DPM WM DP DW W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>0 2 0</td>
<td>1 2-1 3-1 4 8-1 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchildren</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>Y 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family of Origin: size</td>
<td>0 5 2 0 5 4 8 9 9 15 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (OK,Poor,VP)</td>
<td>OK OK OK</td>
<td>Poor OK OK OK</td>
<td>Poor OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV: Burglary</td>
<td>(M) L</td>
<td>M O L 0 (M) (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other prop./car crime</td>
<td>M 0 L 0</td>
<td>L M M 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger violence</td>
<td>M O 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>M O M O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non stranger crime</td>
<td>M 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>M 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non stranger violence</td>
<td>BL[pv][pv] B[pv][pv] [pv] pv 0 [pv]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incivilities (mention)</td>
<td>Y YY YY YY YY YY YY YY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence in F of O</td>
<td>s/o</td>
<td>self other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Commission</td>
<td>v v v v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoC: Inside</td>
<td>C F U</td>
<td>F C U U U C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoC: Outside</td>
<td>U U U</td>
<td>F F C C F F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoC: Discourse GA/I</td>
<td>GA/I GA/I GA/I GA/I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk:precn(dog/other)</td>
<td>dog d/o d/o</td>
<td>dog d/o d/o</td>
<td>d/o d/o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-taking(self report)</td>
<td>Y Y M Y N Y N N N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-taking(int.assess)</td>
<td>Y Y M M N Y M M N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety(self report)</td>
<td>N N Y Y M M Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety(int.assess)</td>
<td>Y N N Y M M N M Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worries most</td>
<td>O na O</td>
<td>S P nk S S/O na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Events</td>
<td>H H H</td>
<td>H H H L H H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- Not on estate
- (...) 3 or more years ago
- B Bullying
- [ ] ex-partner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young (16-29)</th>
<th>M-aged (30-54)</th>
<th>Old (55+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>Win.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Age</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Race</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>EM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sex</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Employment</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Redundancy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Location</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Area (Rough/Respect)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Moves within estate</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Years Residence</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Local/Non local</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Relationship status</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Grandchildren</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Family of Origin: size</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Health (OK, Poor, VP)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 CV: Burglary</td>
<td>M*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Other prop./car crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Stranger violence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(L)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Non stranger crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Non stranger violence</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Incivilities (mention)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Violence in F of O</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Criminal Commission</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 FoC: Inside</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 FoC: Outside</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 FoC: Discourse GA/I</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>GA/I</td>
<td>GA/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Risk: prec'n(dog/other)</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Risk-taking(self report)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Risk-taking(int. assess)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 At risk</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Anxiety (self report)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Anxious (int. assess)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Worries most</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Traumatic Events</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- Not on estate
- (.) 3 or more years ago
# LC Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young 16-29</th>
<th>Middle-aged 30-54</th>
<th>Old 55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lin Jul't Ann Fran Jac'y Dawn Dot Barb Bren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>17 25 28</td>
<td>35 39 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>W W W</td>
<td>W W W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>F F F</td>
<td>F F F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>S/PT E PT U U PT</td>
<td>OAP OAP OAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Redundancy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>LC LC LC</td>
<td>LC LC LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Area (Rough/Resp.)</td>
<td>na na na na na na na na na na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Moves within estate</td>
<td>N N Y N N N N N N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Years Residence</td>
<td>9 20 26 1 3 19</td>
<td>30 33 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Local/Non local</td>
<td>L L L N L L L L N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Relationship status</td>
<td>P M M D M M M W M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>0 0 2 2 2 2 6 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grandchildren</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 1 Y 1 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Family of Origin: size</td>
<td>2 2 5 5 4 2</td>
<td>3-1 3-1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Health (OK,Poor,VP)</td>
<td>OK OK OK OK OK VP Poor OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>CV: Burglary</td>
<td>0 0 L 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Other prop./car crime</td>
<td>0 H (M) 0 L (M) 0 L 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Stranger violence</td>
<td>0 L 0 0 (M)* 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Non stranger crime</td>
<td>0 L 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Non stranger violence</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 M(pv) 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Incivilities</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Violence in F of O</td>
<td>other self other other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Criminal Commission</td>
<td>nv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>FoC: Inside</td>
<td>C U F F C U C C C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>FoC: Outside</td>
<td>F C F F F F F F F F U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>FoC: Discourse</td>
<td>GA/I GA GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Risk:prec'n(dog/other)</td>
<td>other dog dog dog other other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Risk-taking(self report)</td>
<td>N N M M N N N N N N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Risk-taking(int.assess)</td>
<td>N N N N N N N M M M M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>At risk</td>
<td>L L L L L L L L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Anxiety (self report)</td>
<td>Y Y Y N Y Y Y M N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Anxiety (int.assess.)</td>
<td>Y Y Y N N M Y N N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Worries most</td>
<td>S S S S P S S</td>
<td>na P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Traumatic Events</td>
<td>M M L L L M L</td>
<td>H L L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Key**

- * Not on estate
- (...) 3 or more years ago
Gender difference, anxiety and the fear of crime

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Fear of crime is a high profile current issue, bordering on a moral panic. What makes people fearful of crime and what accounts for differences among them?

Recent critiques of the fear of crime literature suggest that the notion of fear needs to be altered from the assumption that people’s fear can be accounted for, rationally, simply by the objective risks they face. For example, there is a paradox to be understood in the apparent low level of fear in high-risk groups, notably young men, both black and white. This research hypothesises that fear is complexly related to anxiety. It will aim to explore the relationship between masculinity and anxiety through the idea of defences against anxiety which operate between people according to gender and other social dimensions of difference such as class, ethnicity and age.

METHODOLOGY

Once the notion of fear is problematised, through the introduction of the concept of anxiety, an in-depth interview method is necessary, designed to explore the issues in terms of signification and psychodynamics. A psychodynamic theorisation of anxiety means that questionnaire-style responses are an inadequate source of data, since defences mean that anxiety has to be identified symptomatically, through a complex of meanings. Therefore the study will use a quasi-clinical interview method to uncover the complex relations among fear of crime, level of anxiety, social group membership and circumstances of risk. Quasi-clinical is an interpretative method that does not take respondents’ accounts at face value; which probes, using absences and avoidances in the narrative as much as what is said, to identify areas of significance.

ACADEMIC AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The primary purposes of this project are theoretical and methodological. The project will seek to generate a new conceptual framework in which to understand the relationships among fear (of crime), risk and anxiety. For this purpose it is necessary to move beyond the limitations of a survey-based approach to fear of crime.

The assumption that risk and fear are simply related has led to oversimplified policy formulations, eg. getting the media to be more responsible in the reporting of crime. This work should suggest a more complex approach to the causes of fear of crime.