



Understanding Fear and Unease in Open Domains: Toward a Typology for Deviant Behaviour in Public Space

Sunniva Frislid MEYER

Institute of Transport Economics, Norway; sfm@toi.no

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study described in this paper is to construct a typology for deviant behaviour that causes unpleasant incidents in public space. To investigate what sort of unpleasant incidents people might encounter, the study used a qualitative survey methodology whereby Norwegian respondents were asked to describe unpleasant incidents. Other studies often use data on criminal incidents that have been extracted from official records and thus ignore incidents that may cause fear without being serious enough to be reported. This study has demonstrated that to understand what makes people uncomfortable in public space we must study incidents that are deviant without breaking the law, as well as criminal behaviour. All types of deviance make people change their behaviour, but deviance motivated by sexual gratification seemingly makes people change their behaviour more frequently. Hence, policymakers should focus not only on preventing crime, but also on preventing deviant acts that create fear and thus restrict individual freedom.

KEYWORDS

deviance; public space; typology; signal crime; signal disorder

1 Introduction

People's welfare depends on their ability to carry out daily activities without having to worry about their own security. Many of these daily activities involve travelling through public space, whether travelling back and forth to work, to the shops, or to social occasions. Perceived risk of being the victim of criminal offences, violence, or threats influences people's behaviour, whether they choose an alternative walking route, avoid public transport in the evening, or end up staying behind locked doors (Fyhri, Hof, Simonova, & de Jong, 2010; Loukaitou-Sideris, 2006; Stangeby & Nossun, 2004). Innes (2004) argues that *signal crimes* and *signal disorders* influence this perceived risk. He defines such incidents as "acts that breach either the criminal law or situated conventions of social order and in the process function as warning signals about the presence of a risk to security to people" (Innes, 2005, p. 1206).

To better understand how signal crimes and signal disorders create fear and unease in open domains, and with that restrict people's behaviour, this study aims to construct a typology for deviant behaviour that causes unpleasant incidents in public space. To map such incidents, a qualitative survey was created. It asked respondents to describe unpleasant incidents that they have encountered in public space. The interpretation of what constitutes an unpleasant incident is, however, highly subjective. In this paper the term "unpleasant incident" refers to any incident that makes a stay in public space less agreeable by causing negative emotions, such as discomfort, unhappiness, or revulsion, in the victim/witness.

Section 2 examines relevant literature, and Section 3 presents this study's objective. Section 4 discusses the method employed in the study. Section 5 presents a typology based on the survey results, describes gender and age differences in reported incidents, and explains which types of incidents cause behavioural change. Section

6 discusses how the results relate to the literature and whether the typology fits the criteria for an efficient typology. Finally, Section 7 summarizes the results and infers some implications.

2 Literature

2.1 Fear of Crime

Wilson and Kelling's Broken Windows theory claims that small, nuisance crimes that are left unpunished breed more serious crimes (Hagan, 2013, p. 32). Untended disorderly behaviour can signal that nobody cares about the community and lead to more serious disorder and crime. Such signals both create fear in citizens and attract predators (Hagan, 2013, p. 406). Innes (2004, 2005) develops this argument further in his "signal crimes" perspective. Major crimes such as homicide can and do function as signals, but for most people, most of the time, less serious incidents influence their risk perception (Innes, 2005). Hence, when studying incidents that might influence people's risk perception we need to include all types of unpleasant incidents, not only the incidents that violate criminal law.

Studies of what makes people feel insecure in public space point to features of the physical environment, people, and actions (Meyer, 2016). Unknown people and persons that are perceived as being deviant may create insecurity among public-space users (Johansson, 1997). Actions that may create insecurity include sexual harassment (Gustafson, 1998; Johansson, LaFlamme, & Eliasson, 2012; Mehta, 1999), robbery (Van der Burgt, 2006), assault (Sundhage, 2005), graffiti (Doran & Lees, 2005), selling drugs (Brattbakk et al., 2015), drug abuse (Lewis & Maxfield, 1980), men that make sexual advances at inappropriate times and/or places (Sundhage, 2005), and many other forms of socially unacceptable behaviour (Sreetheran & van den Bosch, 2014).

However, fear in public space depends on many dimensions beyond the simple existence, possibility, or experience of unpleasant incidents. Koskela and Pain (2000) show how rumours and expectations influence women's interpretation of the physical environment experience of fear in different urban environments, and Tulumello (2015) shows how fear in the urban environment depends on a district's image outwards, which again depends on media discourses. Thus, the prevention of these events is not, per se, a guarantee that fears and anxieties will be overcome.

Personality is an important predictor of fear of crime. Research shows that the more emotionally stable a person is, the less that person thinks about the possibility of experiencing an accident or an unpleasant incident (Fyhri & Backer-Grøndahl, 2012; Sjöberg, 2003). Some population groups – either because of their physical inability to defend themselves or their social and economic position – may feel less safe than others (Pantazis, 2000). Pain (2010) shows that in the current geopolitical climate marginalized minority groups are most affected by fear. Women and the elderly tend to be more afraid of criminal victimization (Mark, 1984; Snedker, 2015). Gender is, furthermore, a significant predictor of behavioural adaptations, with women adapting their behaviour more than men. Women are more likely to avoid travelling at certain times, avoid travelling altogether, or choose another route et cetera due to fear than men (Fyhri & Backer-Grøndahl, 2012).

2.2 Deviance

Social norms specify what is acceptable and what is not in a society or group, defining both appropriate and non-appropriate behaviour (Becker, 1991; Bicchieri & Muldoon, 2011; Schiefloe, 2011). Deviance is "non-conformity to generally accepted rules and norms" (Giddens, 2010, p. 269), and thus relative to the norm. Social groups "create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance" (Becker, 1991, p. 9). Categorization of behaviours as deviant is a social, political, and cultural process depending on values, hegemonic beliefs, and power relationships among groups in a society (Bertrand, Mosher, & Brockman, 2010; Gusfield, 1984; Melossi, 2003). Some norms are, however, universal. The best-known universal norm is the taboo against incest (Schiefloe, 2011); parents are banned from having sexual relations with their children and siblings should not have sex with each other either. Other norms are culture-specific. Most norms about with whom and when one is allowed to have sex vary significantly between different cultures.

2.3 Typologies

Classification is in group entities by similarity (Bailey, 1994, p. 4). Event analysis, for example, can be conducted by classifying events according to types that share a specified combination of factors (George & Bennett, 2005, pp. 237–238). A typology is a classification that is multidimensional and conceptual (Bailey, 1994, p. 4). Criminal typologies attempt to classify types of crimes and criminals. Such typologies can provide

a useful, illustrative device that enables us to simplify and make sense of complex realities (Hagan, 2013, p. 201).

Becker (1991) has created a typology that focuses on the social context of an act, but encompasses all types of deviant behaviour, whether defined as illegal or not. He first distinguishes between obedient behaviour and rule-breaking behaviour, and then discusses whether either of those behaviours is perceived as deviant. He ends up with four categories: falsely accused, conforming, pure deviant, and secret deviant. This typology adds depth to the understanding of the causes of deviant behaviour, but does not build on any empirical data (Becker, 1991). For this study, we need a more detailed typology, and to ensure that it still encompasses all types of deviant behaviour, it should build on empirical data.

The British Research Development and Statistics has created a typology of antisocial behaviour, drawing on the experiences of antisocial behaviour identified by respondents in the British Crime Survey (BCS). Antisocial behaviour is defined as acting “in a manner that cause[s] or [is] likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as (the defendant)” (Harradine, Kodz, Lemetti, & Jones, 2004). The typology distinguishes between misuse of public space (such as drug/substance misuse and dealing, begging, and sexual acts), disregard for community/personal well-being (such as noise and rowdy behaviour), acts directed at people (intimidation/harassment), and environmental damage (vandalism and littering) (Harradine et al., 2004). The typology is comprehensive, but excludes more serious crimes (such as rapes, violent fights, and robberies) that, even if rare, will cause fear in victims and/or witnesses.

An efficient typology is exhaustive, mutually exclusive, fertile, and pragmatic (Gundel, 2005). A typology is exhaustive (or comprehensive) if all units belong to at least one class, and it is mutually exclusive if none of the units fall into more than one class. Hence, for the typology to be mutually exclusive the distinctions between the various categories need to be so clear that it is reasonably easy to place each unit in one and only one category. A typology is fertile if it has practical utility, and it is pragmatic if it does not contain so many classes that it becomes difficult to use.

A typology of unpleasant incidents should ideally have similar properties. In addition to the above criteria, Meyer (2008) introduces the criterion comprehensible. Descriptions of dimensions, types, and classes must be understandable, so that other users (than the author) of the typology can also decide which class of unpleasant incidents an actual incident best fits.

3 Objective

The aim of this paper is to create a typology that encompasses all behaviour (both criminal and non-criminal) that might cause unpleasant incidents in public space. To ensure that the typology is comprehensive, it will build on empirical data collected about unpleasant incidents in public space. The purpose of the typology is to demonstrate the range of behaviour that can cause unpleasant incidents.

4 Method

4.1 Survey

To collect information about the types of deviant behaviour that cause unpleasant incidents in public space, a qualitative web survey with the purpose of catching the diversity of deviant behaviour was created. The survey starts by explaining the term *unpleasant incident*: “An unpleasant incident can be many things: serious crimes, unpleasant behaviour, annoying fundraisers, distress, etc. It is *you* who decides what is uncomfortable for you!” Next, respondents were asked to describe an incident: “Think of the most recent unpleasant incident you’ve experienced in public space. Can you, in your own words, describe this incident? Write as much detail as possible.” In addition, the survey asked about:

- date and time of the incident
- place of the incident (open-ended)
- offenders (number of offenders, gender, age, description (open-ended))
- whether the incident was reported to the police
- whether the respondent changed behaviour because of the incident, and if so, how (open-ended)
- personal characteristics of the respondent (gender, year of birth, work situation, residence (post code))

All quotes in this paper have been translated by the author from Norwegian into English.

4.2 Sampling

Since the goal of this study was to catch diversity to build a typology (rather than test it), it was not considered strictly necessary to provide a representative sample and a non-random sampling strategy was chosen for practical reasons. Accordingly, a combination of accidental sampling and self-selection was employed (Mordal, 2000). Respondents were recruited by (1) handing out flyers with a link to the survey on buses, trams, and metro carriages in Oslo city centre, (2) advertising the survey through Facebook, (3) promoting the survey through media coverage (web and newspaper), and (4) promoting the link through Institute of Transport Economics's web page. This wide-ranging promotion was employed to reach out to an extensive audience. The survey received 179 replies and a small majority (around 55%) of the respondents were women. The respondents varied in age from 18 to 68 years old, where the mean age was 36 and the median age 34. The survey covered neither minors nor seniors. As the survey was in Norwegian, immigrants are probably under-represented. Most respondents reported that they either worked (around 71%) or studied (around 21%). About 80% lived in either Oslo or Akershus, the county surrounding Oslo.

Three respondents submitted nonsensical descriptions (“fssgs”, “x”, and “a”) and two incidents evidently did not occur in public space. Hence, the data set contains 174 incidents out of 179 replies.

4.3 Limitations and Generalizability

Employing a survey methodology to map behaviour will always suffer from limitations. Although the survey asked explicitly about the last unpleasant incident the respondents had experienced, 38 respondents described incidents that reportedly occurred more than one year earlier and these incidents tended to be more “serious” in scope than the more recent incidents. The respondents might have remembered these older and more “serious” incidents better than more recent and less “serious” incidents. We must therefore expect there to be a certain over-representation of the more salient incidents in the data set.

Recollection is a further challenge. When asking people about experiences that might have happened several years ago, we cannot expect their recollection to be accurate. The actual experience of an event fades over time, and each time we recall some event we must reconstruct it (Stone, Bachrach, Jobe, Kurtzman, & Cain, 1999). With each reconstruction we ask ourselves what happened and how the event transpired, and our answer depends partly on memory and partly on our sense of what is plausible (Stone et al., 1999). Hence, for each reconstruction our memory can change to make the memory more plausible for the current self. The events reported in the survey will thus be biased towards what respondents currently think is a logical sequence of actions, and this bias increases the further back in time the respondent had the experience.

This bias can also have influenced replies to other questions, such as the “behavioural change” question. There exist, for example, many reasons why people might change their travel pattern, and these reasons might not always be so easy to remember later on. Responding to such a survey might make respondents believe that the incident made them change their behaviour, while other reasons actually prompted the behavioural change.

4.4 Analysis

To analyse the data collected, the researcher has read through descriptions of the incidents (at least) four times: first, with the purpose of getting to know the unpleasant incidents and looking for common themes; second, to distinguish between motivations behind the acts of the “offender(s)”; third, to distinguish between levels of deviance; and finally, after constructing the typology, the researcher read through descriptions of the incidents and classified them according to the typology.

The researcher was, of course, influenced by her pre-understanding as a scholar. With some background in environmental criminology and situational crime prevention, any feature relevant to preventing the incidents would be noticed more easily. In addition, the researcher could not avoid being influenced by her values, and, accordingly, her cultural context, when categorizing incidents. The researcher was born in Norway of Norwegian parents, is a city dweller, and culturally belongs to the majority group in Norway.

5 Results

5.1 A Typology of Unpleasant Incidents in Public Space

After carefully reading descriptions of the incidents, two dimensions that can be used to distinguish between the incidents were identified: the type of deviance and motivation for behaviour. The first type of deviance is

the violation of formally enacted laws and can be referred to as *formal deviance*. The second type of deviant behaviour is violation of informal norms, norms that have not been coded into law, and is referred to as *informal deviance*. In this typology, informal deviance is, furthermore, divided into *deliberate informal deviance* and *inadvertent informal deviance*. The first is characterized by the perpetrator's awareness of the norm and his or her deliberately choosing to deviate from this norm in his or her behaviour, and the second is characterized by the perpetrator's not being aware of breaking any norm. The fourth type of behaviour is *non-deviant behaviour*.

A young woman describes a case of formal deviance:

I was standing and waiting for the tram at Holberg's Place at 10 pm on a Sunday evening. I had just been to the store and therefore my bag with contents was open with wallet facing up, which I was fully aware of. There were few people at the bus stop and I reacted when I noticed that somebody touched me. Just as I turned around, two men of Eastern European origin also turned, still remaining in place. I looked into my handbag, saw that my wallet was gone, and grabbed hold of the nearest of the men. He turned around and started grinning at my face with my wallet in his hands. I grabbed my wallet and looked sternly at him while he continued to grin before he started to laugh (...) straight to my face! He stood like that for perhaps 20–30 seconds. I was lucky that I got the wallet back without any problem, even if it was because they understood that they had been caught in the act. The most unpleasant thing was that I was forced to stand by the thieves for several minutes afterwards at the bus stop, unable to do anything. It felt incredibly provocative that they continued to stand there after I had caught them in the act.

The above incident happened in the evening while it was probably quite dark, but the tram stop she mentions is very busy and she was probably not alone with the thieves while she was there. Not being alone with the thieves may have contributed to her description of the incident as unpleasant rather than frightening.

Many incident descriptions exhibit deviant behaviour that does not violate any formal rule. Begging, for example, is mentioned by 34 respondents, often because they feel that beggars behave aggressively or ask for money when the respondent cannot leave, such as when waiting for a bus. A man has described an incident where a money collector deliberately tried to play on his conscience:

I was stopped by a money collector, who worked for a humanitarian organization, on the way home from the store. It happens from time to time, but this was extra uncomfortable because he did not stop even though I said clearly that I was not interested. Instead he went on to ask how old my daughter was and tried to connect her age to the cause he collected money for, in a kind of attempt to give me a bad conscience. Because I'm far too polite, I answered his questions, and then we were really underway. I found it uncomfortable because of the seller's assertiveness and rudeness (it's rude to ask personal questions on public streets with the intention of selling people something, as I see it).

The above incident happened in the morning and the target seems to have experienced it as a disagreeable incident rather than an intimidating one.

In the above incidents, the "offenders" know or should know that they are acting against public norms. Sometimes people might behave deviantly and create anxiety without even knowing it. A young woman describes such a situation:

I was going to a concert and went from Stockfleths [cafe] in Schweigaardsgate to Grønland metro station. (...) After a little while I heard someone singing "Hello, is it me you're looking for?" on the other side of the road. First, I thought it was a funny way of getting in touch, but (...) [was unsure about whether it was me he was addressing]. I gave him a smile and he responded by expressing that my body was pleasing to him and that he wanted contact. The man did not speak Norwegian, so it was mostly in pointing and sounds. Therefore, it is somewhat unclear what he really meant, but I experienced his body language as uncomfortable. I became nervous because of his audacity and decided to go further in my direction with my eyes fixed forward. Then the man crossed the road and followed me while he sang. I walked very fast until I did not hear him behind me anymore.

This man was evidently quite new to Norwegian society (since he spoke neither Norwegian nor English) and might have believed that he was hitting on someone in an appropriate way, while the young woman experienced his behaviour as unnatural and worried that he might be willing to hurt her. She became anxious despite of her probably being in a busy area early on a Saturday evening (before sunset).

Finally, a few respondents describe incidents where no one has violated any norm – non-deviant behaviour – but even then the behaviour creates an unpleasant incident. A few respondents mentioned incidents with cramped public transportation.

The second dimension is the motivation behind the deviant behaviour: *monetary gain, sexual gratification, need for aggressive outlet, and personal expression.*

The data set consists of many incidents that seemingly are motivated by the possibility of monetary gain. Harassment by prostitutes and drug dealers has been mentioned by several respondents. Here is a young man's account:

I work at one of the pubs in Karl Johan's gate. When I work nights, I finish work around 4:00/4:30 am, depending on how much tidying is needed before we close the pub. When I go up towards (...) to take the night bus home, (...) many prostitutes of African origin (...) walk up and down the main street and offer themselves to all who pass by. They are very pushy and annoying and if you try to ignore them or reply "no", ... they often get aggressive and reply with offensive comments. I have also sometimes been offered to buy drugs (marijuana or hashish) by African men walking down the main street. I rarely feel safe when I walk up the main street at night. I am often afraid of being robbed. Fortunately, it is usually pretty quiet at the bus stop.

Although selling sex is not illegal *per se*, this young man is explicit that both prostitution and drug dealing make him worry about being robbed. Prostitution and drug dealing thus function as signal crimes and disorders.

Many reported incidents are motivated by sexual gratification. A young woman provided one example from Oslo city centre on a weekend night below:

At Oslo City [Norway's most visited shopping centre] I sit down on a low window sill to find the bus stop on my mobile phone ... In my peripheral vision, I suddenly see a shoe on each side of my own. I look up at a guy who just stands astride me and grins as he asks if I have a boyfriend. I lie and say yes while I look back at my mobile. The guy bends down over me, still with a leg on each side, and asks if my boyfriend is strong and then I say yes. Then the guy asks whether my boyfriend is stronger than he is. "Yes, my boyfriend is stronger. Go away." He then stares at me and says, almost a little aggressively: "You must understand that I just want to tell you how pretty you are." I was very tired of hearing how damn pretty I am [*sic*] and I raise myself halfway up, succeed in creeping out between his legs and hurry off as he shouts after me: "I can be a much better boyfriend than the one you already have."

A later extract from the same description:

After much searching, I find the bus stop just too late to catch the bus. Twenty minutes to the next, I think as I discover a drunk guy ... that comes reeling toward me. He is together with what looks like a group of friends. The gang is left in the background while he sets himself up in front of me, blocking the way. He keeps his balance by waving in the air as he looks at me with blurry eyes, grinning, drooling a little, and asks me how old I think he is. The next second he becomes very indignant because (1) I do not think he is more than 18–19 years and (2) I do not want to have a chat with a "so alright and charming guy" who he claims he is. He takes hold of me and starts to hump me, probably convinced that we are both really enjoying ourselves. I push him away, yell out some expletives ... and proceed along the pavement in front of the bus stops.

In addition, the data set includes incidents that seemingly are motivated by the need for an aggressive outlet and personal expression. A young woman describes what seems to be an incident motivated by the need for an aggressive outlet:

I sat on the tram with some classmates when a lady who seemed highly intoxicated suddenly entered. She managed to overhear a conversation between me and my classmate that ultimately triggered something in her; she scolded me loudly on the tram. She chose to attack only me and she called me everything from "foreigner" to "black negro bitch". She said that even if I was adopted (which I am), I was no better than other immigrants here in Norway. She believed that a foreign pharmacist had tried to drug her and believed that this also was my fault. (...) This [scene] lasted approximately 10 minutes before she left. Many reacted with disgust and yelled that she should leave. For my part, I was so shocked that I could not react during the incident. Consequently, I have become too scared to take the tram, bus, and rail. I do not like it when I see drunken people who look a bit unstable...

This incident of aggressive expression of racist opinions occurred during the afternoon and frightened the young woman despite it happening in daytime with many people around.

An older woman has described some daytime incidents motivated by personal expression:

I live at (...) in the first area that has green spaces in the street between the houses. This is a pleasure and I try to make nice flower beds on the lawn for communal enjoyment. (...) there are many dogs at

(...) and it is clearly nice to walk past the site when they are out and taking the dog for a walk. I like dogs, but I find that many dog owners have an attitude about this fine area that is incomprehensible to me. This [area] is seen as a public pee place for their dogs, and daily the dog owners allow their dogs to defecate and urinate at the entrance. When I politely address them and inform them that you can just walk across the street where there is a lawn and no nice landscaped garden so no one will care, they don't understand. I'm trying to say it is not as pleasant to make this area nice when all the dogs are going to use it as a toilet. We have a low fence that suits the building and the original design of modernistic architecture. Now we are considering making a hedge to end this behaviour. I think it's a pity and wonder why they don't see that we tend gardens and flowers as they tend their dogs. Why don't they appreciate more thoughtfully the urban space we create? This is not a one-time event, but happens very often, if not daily. The last time this happened, I was yelled at and given a clear message that this is a public space and he let the dog dig up the lawn while I stood there and watched.

Combining these two dimensions, the typology ends up with 16 classes of unpleasant incidents. Table 1 illustrates this typology.

Type of deviance Motivation	Formal deviance	Deliberate informal deviance	Inadvertent informal deviance	Non-deviant behaviour
Monetary gain	Profit-seeking crime	Overstepping boundaries for monetary gain	Inappropriate profit-seeking behaviour	Appropriate profit-seeking behaviour
Sexual gratification	Sexual crime	Inappropriate sexual attention	Awkward sexual attention	Appropriate sexual attention
Aggressive outlet	Aggression crime	Abuse	Inappropriate demonstration of aggression	Appropriate demonstration of aggression
Personal expression	Victimless crime	Egoistic deviance	Ignorant deviance	Appropriate self-centred behaviour

Table 1: A typology of unpleasant incidents

Profit-seeking crime is the violation of formally enacted laws to obtain monetary profit. Examples include robbery and pickpocketing. *Overstepping boundaries for monetary gain* is deliberate violation of informal norms to obtain monetary profit, such as aggressive panhandling and prostitution. *Inappropriate profit-seeking behaviour* is violation of informal norms to gain profit without being aware of breaking any norm. One example is some forms of proactive street trading. *Appropriate profit-seeking behaviour* is profit-seeking behaviour without violating any norm, such as most street trading and money collection.

Sexual crime is the violation of formally enacted laws to obtain sexual gratification, such as sexual harassment. *Inappropriate sexual attention* is deliberate violation of informal norms to obtain sexual gratification, such as hitting on someone in a degrading way (degrading compliments et cetera). *Awkward sexual attention* is violation of informal norms to obtain sexual gratification without being aware of breaking any norm. One example is hitting on lone women in desolate streets after dark. *Appropriate sexual attention* is any act motivated by sexual gratification without violating any norm, such as asking a stranger to join you for a coffee in broad daylight.

Aggression crime is expressing aggression in a way that violates formally enacted laws, such as violent assault. *Abuse* is the expression of aggression in a way that the perpetrator knows is violating informal norms. Many types of verbal abuse are not serious enough to be considered a violation of formally enacted laws, but are still violation of informal norms of behaviour in public space. *Inappropriate demonstration of aggression* is expressing anger in a way that violates the informal norms for behaviour in public space without being aware of breaking the norms. One example is a noisy quarrel in public. *Appropriate demonstration of aggression* is any expression of aggression that is a reaction to some immediate transgression and is proportionate to the transgression. Parents that reprimand their children will usually fit into appropriate demonstration of aggression.

Victimless crime is self-centred behaviour that violates formally enacted laws. Taking drugs in public and painting graffiti are examples of victimless crime. *Egoistic deviance* is self-centred behaviour where the perpetrator deliberately violates informal norms, such as putting one's feet on passenger seats. *Ignorant deviance* is self-centred behaviour where the perpetrator is unaware of violating a norm. Groups of people, particularly groups of drunken people, can often create serious amounts of noise without being aware that they

are bothering bystanders. *Appropriate self-centred behaviour* is self-centred behaviour that does not violate any norm. Too many people in a small space might cause discomfort even if none of the people has violated any norm.

All classes in the typology of unpleasant incidents are (as evaluated by the researcher in light of her cultural background) covered by data collected through the survey (even though one class only contains one incident: appropriate sexual attention). Incidents motivated by monetary gain or the need for an aggressive outlet are, furthermore, much more common in the data set than incidents motivated by sexual gratification or personal expression. Fifty-five incidents can be coded as motivated by monetary gain, 29 as motivated by sexual gratification, 56 as motivated by the need for an aggressive outlet, and 34 as motivated by personal expression.

The data collected through this study were used to build the above typology and further analysis should therefore ideally use new and independent data. The typology could, however, be useful for conducting quantitative analyses, for example when investigating further what sorts of incidents frighten people and/or make them change behaviour.

Table 2 shows the number of incidents from the data set that match each class in the typology and Table 3 provides examples for each class of unpleasant incident.

Type of deviance Motivation	Formal deviance	Deliberate informal deviance	Inadvertent informal deviance	Non-deviant behaviour	Sum
Monetary gain	17	17	18	3	55
Sexual gratification	10	12	6	1	29
Aggressive outlet	29	18	5	4	56
Personal expression	8	8	11	7	34
Sum	64	55	40	15	174

Table 2: The number of incidents from the data set that match each class

Type of deviance Motivation	Formal deviance	Deliberate informal deviance	Inadvertent informal deviance	Non-deviant behaviour
Monetary gain	Robbery	Aggressive panhandling	Proactive street trading	Ticket inspection
Sexual gratification	Sexual harassment	Hitting on someone in a degrading way	Hitting on someone in an untimely way	Flirting
Aggressive outlet	Violent assault	Harassment	Loudly arguing in public space	Speaking out about a grievance
Personal expression	Taking drugs in public	Putting feet on the passenger seat	Group of drunken people talking loudly in a bus	Crowding

Table 3: Examples of incidents for each class of unpleasant incident

5.2 Gender and Age Differences

The differences between the sorts of incidents women and men report are small with one major exception: 23 out of 24 incidents motivated by sexual gratification are reported by women. There is also a small majority of men reporting incidents motivated by personal expression. For types of deviance there seem to be no significant differences between the genders.

The relationship between age and incidents motivated by sexual gratification is strong. Among the youngest respondents (up to 24) the rate of incidents reported that are motivated by sexual gratification is 26% (among younger female respondents, 39% of report incidents are motivated by sexual gratification). A high rate of such incidents, 23%, is also reported by 25- to 34-year-olds, while among 35- to 44-year-olds only 13% of report

incidents are motivated by sexual gratification. A 47-year-old woman is the oldest respondent reporting an incident motivated by sexual gratification.

There is also a relationship between age and the rate of incidents motivated by aggression. Among the youngest respondents (up to 24), the rate of reported incidents motivated by aggression is 40%. This rate decreases to around 30% among respondents between 25 and 54 years old and around 20% among respondents aged 55 years and older.

Finally, there is a tendency for respondents of older ages to report a higher rate of incidents motivated by personal expression.

The youngest respondents (up to 24) report a higher rate of incidents of formal deviance. Some 59% of the incidents they report are cases of formal deviance, while 39% of the incidents reported by respondents aged between 25- and 34 are cases of formal deviance. For older age groups the rate of formal deviance is lower.

5.3 Behavioural Change

More than half of the respondents, 51.7%, replied positively to the question “Has this unpleasant incident led you to change behaviour to avoid ending up in similar situations?” The young woman in the “sexual gratification” example says that she has “become more aware of being clear in language and behaviour if I end up in similar situations – not allowing for misunderstandings or misinterpretation when it comes to drunk people – be crystal clear” Many respondents say that they avoid being outside at certain hours, avoid certain areas, or avoid public transport altogether. Women report behavioural change more often than men: 60% versus 49%. Age, however, does not seem to influence the rate of behavioural change.

Furthermore, a relationship between behavioural change and type of motivation seems to exist: among respondents reporting incidents motivated by sexual gratification, 69% also reported that they had changed their behaviour, while incidents motivated by monetary gain and personal expression allegedly resulted in changed behaviour in 53% and 56% of cases, respectively. For incidents motivated by an aggressive outlet, only 39% of respondents reported any change in behaviour.

There might also be a relationship between type of deviance and behavioural change: respondents describing incidents of formal deviance report a higher rate of behavioural change than respondents describing incidents of informal deviance – 55% versus 47% and 45%. Respondents describing incidents caused by non-deviant behaviour actually report an even higher rate of behavioural change, 73%, but the small number of incidents (15) makes it difficult to interpret the high percentage.

Table 4 shows the percentage of respondents reporting behavioural change for each class of incidents. The percentages should, however, be interpreted with care. The number of incidents in each class is small as can be seen in the N’s in the parentheses after the percentages.

Type of deviance Motivation	Formal deviance	Deliberate informal deviance	Inadvertent informal deviance	Non-deviant behaviour	All
Monetary gain	59% (17)	47% (17)	50% (18)	67% (3)	53% (55)
Sexual gratification	90% (10)	50% (12)	67% (6)	100% (1)	69% (29)
Aggressive outlet	41% (29)	33% (18)	20% (5)	75% (4)	39% (56)
Personal expression	50% (8)	75% (8)	36% (11)	71% (7)	56% (34)
All	55% (64)	47% (55)	45% (40)	73% (15)	52% (174)

Table 4: Percentage of respondents reporting behavioural change for each class of incidents (with number of respondents per class in parenthesis)

6 Discussion

6.1 Fear in Public Space

Innes (2004, 2005) defines signal crimes and signal disorders as “acts that breach either the criminal law or situated conventions of social order and in the process function as warning signals about the presence of a risk to security to people” (Innes, 2005, p. 1206). Major crimes such as homicide can and do function as signals, but

for most people, most of the time, less serious incidents influence their risk perception (Innes, 2005). This study supports Innes's assumption about less serious incidents influencing people's risk perception. The respondents mention incidents of informal deviance more often than incidents of formal deviance (95 versus 64 incidents), and they report change in behaviour nearly as often when faced with informal deviance as when faced with formal deviance (45–47 % versus 55%). Furthermore, of the 64 incidents of formal deviance only seven had been reported to police. Hence, when studying incidents that might influence people's risk perception, we should include all types of unpleasant incidents, not only the incidents that violate criminal law.

It is nearly only women who report incidents motivated by sexual gratification. These incidents are predominately reported by younger women and nearly 70% of incidents cause the respondent to change behaviour. Previous studies have already shown that unwanted sexual attention (whether it is a criminal offence or not) causes worry among women (Gustafson, 1998; Johansson et al., 2012; Mehta, 1999; Sundhage, 2005), and how young women develop coping strategies for handling such threats (Johansson et al., 2012; Sundhage, 2005). Behavioural change to prevent unpleasant incidents need not be negative, but this extremely high rate of behaviour change is an indication that young women have less freedom than their counterparts, which should be a worry for a modern Western society (or any society).

Young people also experience more incidents motivated by an aggressive outlet. Such incidents are only to a limited extent covered by the literature, and then the incidents are nearly always so serious that they can be categorized as criminal offences. In this survey, respondents have reported many unpleasant incidents motivated by an aggressive outlet that cannot be characterized as formal deviance. Fortunately, these incidents do not provoke behavioural change as often as other types of incidents (only 39%). Even then, incidents motivated by an aggressive outlet should not be ignored when studying or preventing incidents that create fear in public space.

Norway is a relatively safe society. Furthermore, the amount of emotions that it is appropriate to show in public space is more restricted than in many other societies. Public displays of aggression are particularly frowned upon in Norwegian society. Incidents that are considered to be deviant in Norway may therefore not be considered deviant in other societies. Equally, other societies may consider what is considered non-deviant behaviour in Norway to be unacceptable. One such example is the acceptance of public drunkenness in Western countries.

6.2 The Typology

Does the typology for deviant behaviour in public space fit the criteria for an efficient typology (Gundel, 2005, 2008)? Comparing the typology's categories with the literature on what makes people feel insecure in public space shows that the typology covers deviant behaviour that creates insecurity: sexual crime covers sexual harassment (Gustafson, 1998; Johansson et al., 2012; Mehta, 1999). Profit-seeking crime covers robbery (Van der Burgt, 2006) and selling drugs (Brattbakk et al., 2015). Aggression crime covers assault (Sundhage, 2005). Victimless crime covers graffiti (Doran & Lees, 2005) and drug abuse (Lewis & Maxfield, 1980). Moreover, Inappropriate sexual attention and awkward sexual attention cover men that hit on women at the wrong time and place (Sundhage, 2005). Furthermore, as judged by the researcher, all the incidents collected through the survey fit at least one type of unpleasant incident. Hence, the typology seems to be *exhaustive*.

Sometimes, however, it is difficult to determine which class each type of unpleasant incident best fits. For some incidents the motivation behind the act can be mixed, e.g. sexual harassment might be motivated by both the desire for sexual gratification and the need for an aggressive outlet. In addition, in many situations, whether the perpetrator knows that he or she is violating a norm might be very unclear. Hence, the typology is not strictly *mutually exclusive*. However, most unpleasant incidents fit one class better than the others, so the typology is probably *mutually exclusive* enough.

The typology demonstrates the comprehensiveness of incidents that may cause unpleasant incidents in public space and, thus, provoke behavioural change. If the police and other public guardians want to reduce fear, they should therefore also concentrate on preventing informal deviance. Examples of possible prevention strategies include asking people to calm down, being present where they discover deviant behaviour, contacting potential victims and asking them how they are doing et cetera.

This typology also shows that differences in awareness about norms for behaviour in public space can create fear. The incidents reported in the above survey are mostly reported by members of the majority group in Norway and thus mention inappropriate behaviour by minorities, often newly arrived in Norway. They may, therefore, not be aware of breaking any norms. Studies show, however, that members of minority groups tend to experience more fear than majority groups (Pain, 2010). The lack of incidents where newly arrived people

report deviant behaviour therefore probably only reflects the fact that most of the respondents represent the majority group in Norway. One way to alleviate this problem is to educate newly arrived people about the behaviour norms in public space. This can help them both avoid creating fear and make them less afraid when faced with behaviour that they experience as deviant. By demonstrating to practitioners the need to prevent informal deviant behaviour, this typology can be considered *fertile* (has practical utility).

The typology contains 16 classes, which is more than many other typologies (many typologies have only four classes), but is still a manageable number. Merging the categories in the motivation dimension would, however, make the typology too crude. But merging the two types of informal deviance would be possible and would reduce the number of classes to 12. The benefit of reducing the number of classes to 12 has, however, been judged to be less than the disadvantage with a cruder typology. Hence, the typology is *pragmatic* enough. The above descriptions of the dimensions and the categories are hopefully so clear that the typology can be called *comprehensible*.

Is this typology better than the alternative typologies described in the literature section? Which typology is best depends on the study's purpose. Most typologies cover either criminal acts or less serious disorder. This typology is more comprehensive and thus better at showing the wide variety of motivations that can cause unpleasant incidents among victims and witnesses. It also demonstrates that to reduce fear and unpleasantness in public space we cannot rely only on law enforcement. However, more specific typologies can be more useful depending on the purpose of the study.

Becker's (1991) typology is at least as comprehensive as this study's typology, but it has a different purpose; it adds depth to the understanding of the causes of deviant behaviour. This study's typology is more practical in the sense that it demonstrates the wide array of incidents we need to prevent to reduce fear and limitations on people's movements in public space.

7 Conclusion

The study survey asked Norwegian respondents to describe unpleasant incidents that they have encountered in public space. Other studies of criminal incidents often use data extracted from official records and thus ignore incidents that may cause fear without being serious enough to be reported. The study attempted to bridge this gap by asking respondents to describe all types of unpleasant incidents. In the data set, of the 64 incidents of formal deviance only seven had been reported to police.

The study concludes with a new typology consisting of two dimensions: the type of deviance and the motivation behind the act. The type of deviance can be either formal deviance, deliberate informal deviance, inadvertent informal deviance, or non-deviant behaviour. The motivation can be either monetary gain, sexual satisfaction, an aggressive outlet, or personal expression. The study ended up with 16 classes with all classes being covered by the survey.

An important implication of the study is that to understand what makes people uncomfortable in public space we must study incidents that are deviant without breaking the law, as well as criminal behaviour. All types of deviance make people change their behaviour to avoid experiencing another incident, but deviance motivated by sexual gratification seemingly makes people change their behaviour more frequently. Hence, policymakers should focus not only on preventing crime, but also on preventing deviant acts that create fear and thus restrict individual freedom.

Since the study has used non-probability sampling, the incidents should not be interpreted as a representative sample of unpleasant incidents in public space in Norway. The results thus have limited generalizability and are probably also heavily influenced by the fact that the unpleasant incidents have been reported from a relatively safe society and respondents therefore have a lower level of tolerance towards unpleasant behaviour than people living in tougher societies do.

References

- Bailey, K. D. (1994). *Typologies and taxonomies: An introduction to classification techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Becker, H. S. (1991). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bertrand, M. A., Mosher, J., & Brockman, J. (2010). *Constructing crime: Contemporary processes of criminalization*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

- Bicchieri, C., & Muldoon, R. (2011). Social Norms. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Vol. Spring 2011 Edition).
- Brattbakk, I., Hagen, A. L., Rosten, M. G., Sæter, O., Osuldsen, J., Andersen, B., . . . Bratseth, K. (2015). *Hva nå, Tøyen? Sosiokulturell stedsanalyse av Tøyen i Bydel Gamle Oslo* (AFI rapport 8:2015). Retrieved from https://stedsanalysetoyen.files.wordpress.com/2015/09/r2015-8_stedsanalysetc3b8ven_oppdaterert-utgave.pdf
- Doran, B. J., & Lees, B. G. (2005). Investigating the spatiotemporal links between disorder, crime, and the fear of crime. *The Professional Geographer*, 57(1), 1–12. doi:10.1111/j.0033-0124.2005.00454.x
- Fyhri, A., & Backer-Grøndahl, A. (2012). Personality and risk perception in transport. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 49, 470–475. doi:10.1016/j.aap.2012.03.017
- Fyhri, A., Hof, T., Simonova, Z., & de Jong, M. (2010). The influence of perceived safety and security on walking. In R. Methorst (Ed.), *Pedestrians' quality needs. Perceived needs. PQN Final Report – Part B2 Documentation. Final Report of the COST project 358*. Cheltenham: Walk21.
- George, A. L., & Bennett, A. (2005). *Case studies and theory development in the social sciences*. Cambridge, MA: Mit Press.
- Giddens, A. (2010). *Sociology: Introductory readings*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Gundel, S. (2005). Towards a new typology of crises. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 13(3), 106–115. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5973.2005.00465.x
- Gusfield, J. R. (1984). *The culture of public problems: Drinking-driving and the symbolic order*. University of Chicago Press.
- Gustafson, P. (1998). Gender differences in risk perception: Theoretical and methodological perspectives. *Risk Analysis*, 18(6), 805–811. doi:10.1023/B:RIAN.0000005926.03250.c0
- Hagan, F. E. (2013). *Introduction to criminology. Theories, methods and criminal behavior* (8th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Harradine, S., Kodz, J., Lemetti, F., & Jones, B. (2004). Defining and measuring anti-social behaviour. London: Home Office, Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- Innes, M. (2004). Signal crimes and signal disorders: Notes on deviance as communicative action 1. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 55(3), 335–355. doi:10.1111/j.1468-4446.2004.00023.x
- Innes, M. (2005). What's your problem? Signal crimes and citizen-focused problem solving. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 4(2), 187–200. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9133.2005.00015.x
- Johansson, K., Laflamme, L., & Eliasson, M. (2012). Adolescents' perceived safety and security in public space – A Swedish focus group study with a gender perspective. *Young*, 20(1), 69–88. doi:10.1177/110330881102000104
- Johansson, M. (1997). *Rädsla för brott – En kvalitativ studie om rädsla för brott och undvikandet av risk*. Lund: Network for research in criminology and deviant behaviour at Lund University.
- Koskela, H., & Pain, R. (2000). Revisiting fear and place: Women's fear of attack and the built environment. *Geoforum*, 31(2), 269–280. doi:10.1016/S0016-7185(99)00033-0
- Lewis, D. A., & Maxfield, M. G. (1980). Fear in the neighborhoods: An investigation of the impact of crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 17(2), 160–189. doi:10.1177/002242788001700203
- Loukaitou-Sideris, A. (2006). Is it safe to walk? Neighborhood safety and security considerations and their effects on walking. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 20(3), 219–232. doi:10.1177/0885412205282770
- Mark, W. (1984). Fear of victimization: Why are women and the elderly more afraid? *Social Science Quarterly*, 65(3), 681.
- Mehta, A. (1999). Embodied discourse: On gender and fear of violence. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 6(1), 67–84. doi:10.1080/09663699925150
- Melossi, D. (2003). 'In a peaceful life': Migration and the crime of modernity in Europe/Italy. *Punishment & Society*, 5(4), 371–397. doi:10.1177/14624745030054001
- Meyer, S. (2008). *Typologi over uønskede hendelser*. Retrieved from <http://www.ffi.no/no/Rapporter/09-00447.pdf>
- Meyer, S. (2016). *Trygghet i det offentlige rom – en litteraturoversikt*. Transportøkonomisk institutt. Oslo.
- Mordal, T. L. (2000). *Som man spør, får man svar. Arbeid med survey-opplegg*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Pain, R. (2010). The new geopolitics of fear. *Geography Compass*, 4(3), 226–240. doi:10.1111/j.1749-8198.2009.00295.x
- Pantazis, C. (2000). 'Fear of crime', vulnerability and poverty. *British Journal of Criminology*, 40(3), 414–436. doi:10.1093/bjc/40.3.414
- Schiefloe, P. M. (2011). *Mennesker og samfunn: innføring i sosiologisk forståelse*: Fagbokforl.
- Sjöberg, L. (2003). Distal factors in risk perception. *Journal of Risk Research*, 6(3), 187–211. doi:10.1080/1366987032000088847
- Snedker, K. A. (2015). Neighborhood conditions and fear of crime: A reconsideration of sex differences. *Crime & Delinquency*, 61(1), 45–70. doi:10.1177/0011128710389587
- Sreetheran, M., & van den Bosch, C. C. K. (2014). A socio-ecological exploration of fear of crime in urban green spaces – A systematic review. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 13(1), 1–18. doi:10.1016/j.ufug.2013.11.006

- Stangeby, I., & Nossum, Å. (2004). *Trygg kollektivtransport. Trafikanterers opplevelse av kollektivreiser og tiltak for å øke tryggheten. Dokumentasjonsrapport (704A/2004)*. Retrieved from <https://www.toi.no/getfile.php?mmfileid=5575>
- Stone, A. A., Bachrach, C. A., Jobe, J. B., Kurtzman, H. S., & Cain, V. S. (1999). *The science of self-report: Implications for research and practice*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Sundhage, C. (2005). "Jag vägrar låta mig begränsas bara för jag är orolig". *Unga kvinnors berättelser om hur de skapar trygghet genom riskreducerande strategier*. Stockholm Universitet, Stockholm. Retrieved from http://www.criminology.su.se/polopoly_fs/1.66399.1323954798!/2005d_Carin_Sundhage.pdf
- Tulumello, S. (2015). Fear and urban planning in ordinary cities: From theory to practice. *Planning Practice & Research*, 30(5), 477–496. doi:10.1080/02697459.2015.1025677
- Van der Burgt, D. (2006). "Där man bor tycker man det är bra": *Barns geografier i en segregerad stadsmiljö*. Uppsala Universitet, Uppsala. Retrieved from <http://uu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:169422/FULLTEXT01.pdf>

Sunniva Frislid Meyer is Senior Research Political Scientist at the Department of Safety, Security and Environment at Institute of Transport Economics, Norway. She holds a PhD degree in Political Science from University of Oslo in Norway (2012). Sunniva's research concentrates on security, safety and well-being in public space. It addresses many themes and topics, including mapping of crime and disorder, perceived security, confidence-building measures, well-being in public space and tradeoffs between security and other urban values such as accessibility, aesthetics and conservation.

How to cite this article (APA): Meyer, S. F. (2018). Understanding fear and unease in open domains: Toward a typology for deviant behaviour in public space. *Criminological Encounters*, 1(1), 31-43. doi:10.26395/CE18010104

