

**‘I am not going to hurt you’:
On the Micro-Dynamics of Fear and
Violence**

Benjamin John Ellis

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of Doctor
of Philosophy

The University of Leeds

School of Law

September 2018

Declaration

All sentences or passages quoted in this dissertation from other people's work have been specifically acknowledged by clear cross-referencing to author, work and page(s). Any illustrations that are not the works of the author of this dissertation have been used with the explicit permission of the originator (where possible) and are specifically acknowledged. I understand that failure to do this amounts to plagiarism and will be considered grounds for failure in this dissertation and the degree examination as a whole.

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

© 2018 The University of Leeds and Benjamin John Ellis

The right of Benjamin John Ellis to be identified as Author of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

Name: Benjamin John Ellis

Signature:

Date:

Acknowledgements

There is an air of excitement and trepidation when one takes the step (or leap) and embarks on a PhD. The final goal stands before you like a distant beacon – its glow faint and vaguely unreal. The path toward it, lined with decisions, documents, dead ends and discovery. It is therefore not without surprise that such processes cannot be completed without the help of supervisors, peers, friends, family and a dollop of determination.

Firstly I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor Susanne Karstedt. She is both my fiercest supporter and my most ardent critic. The time, effort and energy she has taken to read and comment on my work are unsurpassed and I am so very grateful. She has supported me with laughter and lambasted me for lethargy. I will forever think of her commenting on my work and saying, “remove all hope.”

Secondly, I would like to thank my second supervisor Professor Stephen Farrall. Stephen has a calmness that can put a student at ease. I have enjoyed my trips to Sheffield and have appreciated our discussions over lunch at the pub. Your work on fear of crime has helped guide me to the point at which I now stand.

To my family, without your love, support and ever increasing badgering this would not be possible. It is difficult to articulate just how important you are. So, please know that you are important, really very, very important. Thank you with all my being. For those that are able, I hope we can celebrate together. For Granny Knight and Grandad Ellis, I will raise a glass – I got there in the end.

To my friends near and far, the last few months have not been my greatest as a friend to you. I can return to some form of normality from this point forward, I assure you. Your patience and understanding mean the world to me. Your desires to talk about topics other than Goffman’s dramaturgy are a blessing. To friends old, friends new and friends dearly departed, I have needed you from day one and this will never change. Thank you.

To my peers at all stages of your PhD journey, I wish you the best. The conversations, support, fun and friendship we share have made an immense impact on my time at the University of Leeds. From escaping the dungeon to the Liberty Building, I will always look back and smile.

To the participants, without whom this research would have very short and immensely dull, thank you. You gave up your time to talk to a person unknown to you. For your patience, time and willingness to share I am exceedingly grateful.

My list of thanks may be long but my gratitude is unending. My final thanks goes to the University of Leeds and the School of Law. I have been, and continue to be, proud of my association with the University. I have been lucky to attend a number of institutions and the University of Leeds offers a rare and privileged experience to all. Thank you.

Preface

A man in his 30s was sat at his office desk in the early evening. He liked to work beyond 5pm because it meant he could avoid the worst of the rush hour traffic. It was December and the winter freeze had taken hold. So when it came time to head home he put his hat and gloves on, along with his big winter coat and prepared to braved the sub-zero temperatures.

He worked in a large public sector organisation and there were always unfamiliar faces passing him in the corridors but a smile and a nod usually punctuated each encounter. He made his way to the exit of his building. As the automatic doors opened the cold air hitting his face was a shock. Yet with little hesitation he pressed his hands a little deeper into his pockets and stepped outside. As he made his way to the staff multi-storey car park it started to rain. He pulled the hood of his coat up and bowed his head slightly to stop the cold wind and rain getting to his face. He had to cross a number of roads and pass between several buildings to get to his car. There were many people walking around and going about their business but he kept his head down and made his way quietly.

There was a woman walking in front of him making her way similarly, he presumed, to her car and a journey home. She appeared to be cold. She was clutching her bag close to her with her arms folded. As the throng of people started to thin out he turned down the street on which the car park stood. The woman glanced behind and saw the man but continued to walk towards the entrance to the car park. She opened the door and entered. The man followed a few seconds later.

He opened the door and entered the room to pay his ticket for the car park barrier. He looked to his right and saw that the woman he had been walking behind was stood in the corner. She was staring back at him, eyes wide open, clearly flustered by something. She was visibly shaking. "I don't have any money! I don't have anything!" She shouted. "There is nothing in here!" She gestured towards her handbag without loosening her grip on it. She looked terrified.

The man was confused. He really didn't know what to think at first. He stood, unable to comprehend what the woman was talking about. The thought crossed his mind that there may be something wrong with her but it slowly started to dawn on him; She thought he had come to mug her. She thought he had followed her into the room to mug her! He didn't know what to say. He didn't know what to do. Should he be sympathetic and calm her down? Should he be annoyed? Should he be insulted? What is it about him that has caused this reaction? He just wanted to go home. The man had experienced this sort of thing before but never with this intensity.

“I am just going to pay for my parking ticket if that's OK?” He said. The tone of his voice was calm but he hoped it also conveyed his annoyance at being suspected of criminal intent. The woman, still standing in the corner, was clearly shaken. As the man put his money into the machine the woman's demeanour quickly changed. She was apologetic. She must have finally realised he was a member of staff but the impact of her initial impression and reaction left an awkward atmosphere as the machine approved the man's payment. He hurriedly took his ticket from the machine and went to his car without looking back at the woman or saying anything further. He had not meant to cause this impression but what could he do? He was making a journey he had made hundreds of times before. That woman had been deeply afraid of him and he knew it.

Abstract

This research explores the experience of being feared. In doing this, an under-researched and little understood perspective of fear of crime is addressed. The research investigated the phenomenon of being feared from a micro-sociological perspective and this focus has allowed a better understand the dynamics of fearful encounters. It highlights the intensions, actions and feelings of those who are perceived by the public and in communities as potential offenders, as ‘fearsome’ and ‘intimidating’. This thesis relies on qualitative interviews with police officers, soldiers, bouncers, gym-goers, students and young people. These strategically selected groups allow the research to understand a wide breadth of contexts in which being feared can be experienced. The unique elements of these groups are drawn out in addition to overarching thematic parallels. Alongside this methodology, a Goffmanian conceptual framework is used. This supports and highlights the importance symbolism, the giving and receiving of expressive information, and the expectations people have of the behaviour and intensions of others. The research also discusses the processes of learning to be feared and thus distils the ways in which fear is recognised in others. This research highlights the impact that appearance and corporeal aspects have on being feared. The research also introduces and develops four sides to the micro-dynamics of being feared. These four pillars of fear consider the purposeful causing or augmentation of fear in others within encounters, the accidental causing of fear, the dynamics of alleviating fear within an encounter and the competence of instilling fear in situations where it is not present.

Table of Contents

Declaration.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Preface.....	v
Abstract.....	vii
Table of Contents.....	viii
Chapter 1	
Introduction.....	p. 1
Chapter 2	
Defining Fear of Crime.....	p. 13
A History of Fear of Crime.....	p. 14
Measuring Fear of Crime.....	p. 18
Conditions and Environments of Fear.....	p. 23
Who is Afraid and what are they Afraid of?.....	p. 23
Environments of Fear.....	p. 31
Fear: Emotions and Expressions.....	p. 32
Fear as an Emotion.....	p. 32
Expressions of Fear.....	p. 37
Towards an understanding of ‘Being Feared?’.....	p. 41
Chapter 3	
Setting the Scene with Goffman.....	p. 43
An Introduction to Goffman.....	p. 43
Encounters.....	p. 54
Performance and the Minutia of Interaction.....	p. 62
Goffman: From Situation to Structure.....	p. 66

Chapter 4	
Methodology.....	p. 77
Chapter 5	
Fear in A Work-Based Context: Threat, Fear, Violence and Order.....	p. 102
Gaining compliance and the Techniques for Causing fear.....	p. 105
Encountering and Recognising Fear in Others.....	p. 123
Chapter 6	
The Soldiers: From War to Civilisation and Back.....	p. 138
Fear in War: The extremes of experience.....	p. 141
War and Peace: The legacy of experience.....	p. 151
From Situation to Structure: Organising and understanding fear.....	p. 155
Chapter 7	
Bouncers: The Body in Control of Space.....	p. 159
Controlling Space Through the Body.....	p. 164
From Body to Skills: Learning to use the body.....	p. 175
Chapter 8	
The Body as Defensible Space.....	p. 193
Fear, Motivation and the Body.....	p. 196
Instilling Fear: ‘I look like I can take care of myself’.....	p. 202
Beyond the Body? Adapting to the presence of fear.....	p. 209
Chapter 9	
Students and Young People: Being Feared in Everyday Life.....	p. 217
Finding Their Place in the World.....	p. 219
Fear and Adaptations in Everyday Life.....	p. 233
Chapter 10	
Bringing it all Together: The Importance of the Body and Pillars of Fear.....	p. 256

The Importance of the Body – Presentation of Self.....	p. 257
The Micro-Dynamics of Being Feared – Pillars of Fear.....	p. 265
Chapter 11	
Conclusions.....	p. 286
Research Findings and Future Directions.....	p. 290
Appendices.....	
Appendices.....	p. 315
Bibliography.....	p. 331

Chapter 1) Introduction

The purpose of this Chapter is to provide a concise overview of this research. In doing so it considers the topic, aims and rationale of the work to follow. It introduces the background to the focus of this research and situates the thesis within the current perspectives of fear of crime. Shortfalls within the existing research literature are identified and this helps to provide the setting, rationale and context from which this research moves forward. Following sections specify the aims of the thesis, its originality, and introduce the data collection methods. This is followed by an introduction to some of the conceptual ideas that underpin the thesis and have guided this study. Finally, this Chapter introduces the structure of the thesis in brief.

Fear of Crime and Being Feared: A background

Researchers have long studied the negative impact of fear of crime and the people who experience it (see Farrall and Ditton, 2000; Hale, 1996). As a topic of public interest, policy study and academic research, the fear of crime has been with us since the 1960s. The origin of these fears, the reasons for their emergence, and an understanding of the processes associated with their emergence has ebbed and flowed since it was first discovered (Farrall and Lee, 2009). This is not to suggest that anxieties about crime had never surfaced prior to this point. Rather, from the 1960s and 1970s we have witnessed a massive growth in the efforts put into understanding and controlling such fears (Jackson, Farrall and Gray, 2006) in a more organised and academic fashion. This concerted interrogation has led to diverse areas of debate and understanding. This ranges from (but is not limited to) the understanding of vulnerability (see Goodey, 1997; LaGrange and Ferraro, 1987), the difficulties of definition (Ferraro and LaGrange, 1987; Croake and Hinke, 1976) and policies to combat fear of crime (Bennett, 1991; Henig and Maxfield, 1978). Despite the considerable attention given to this area of study, nearly all studies addressing the fear of crime to date have taken the perspectives of those who have had their own safety threatened and their own security jeopardised; the fearful. As a result, the experiences of *being* feared have been given far less attention. There have been some powerful individual accounts (see Ellis, 1995; Kelley, 1988) alongside the work of Day (2009),

which was the genesis for this research. The existing research into fear of crime offers little insight into this experience and represents a missing link in our understanding of how fear of crime is understood by *all* of those that experience it.

This research, therefore, turns to those who are perceived to be threatening, and to those groups that the public views as potential perpetrators of crime; the feared. The research focuses on the perceptions, emotions and ensuing actions of those who are perceived as a threat to security by others in mostly, fleeting encounters. It provides an in-depth analysis of the perception of fear in interactions, how this is recognised within an encounter, how these perceptions are attributed and reacted upon and how these experiences relate to particular situations and how they are structured in ongoing life experiences. All of this is taken from the perspective of being feared. As Day (2009) suggests, fear between people in public spaces is so universal as to almost pass without mention. Yet, for an experience with such universality, there is a dearth of understanding concerning the perspective of the feared. It is in an attempt to explore and redress this deficit to which this thesis is focused.

Turning the Tables on Fear of Crime: The aims and purpose of this research

In consideration of the perspective this study has taken towards fear of crime, the core purpose of the research is to explore and address the lack of understanding about the experience of being feared. The main aims and objectives of this study are:

1. To understand the micro-dynamics of fear from the perspective of those who are perceived by the public and in communities as objects of fear, potential offenders, as 'fearsome' and 'intimidating'.
2. To explore how being feared feeds into perceptions of identity, threat and fear and how these perceptions shape the actions of those that perceive themselves to be feared.

3. To understand how these actions and perceptions are shaped at the point of interaction as well as their possible long-term impacts.
4. To understand the role that fear plays in the production/maintenance of order within personal and/or work-based encounters.

Each of these aims and objectives are addressed within the chapters that follow. It is also important, at this point, to express explicitly what the original contribution to knowledge will be for this research. Taking the perspective of the feared is not an entirely new endeavour (see Day, 2009; Ellis, 1995; Kelley, 1988). This research contributes to the understanding of being feared in four distinct and original ways. First, the research takes a micro-sociological approach to the phenomenon of being feared. Micro-sociology is based on interpretative analysis rather than statistical or empirical observation, and shares close association with the philosophy of phenomenology (Goffman, 1974). It is focused on the nature of everyday human interaction and agency on a small scale (Goffman, 1974). This focus allows the research to understand the dynamics of fearful encounters in a way that has yet to be understood. Second, is the decision that was made to use a Goffmanian framework within the research. This follows on directly from the micro-sociological exploration and helps to situate and frame the area of research. By using Goffman the research is able to frame the moments when people meet face-to-face and define the context in which being feared is realised and understood. Third, the diversity of the experiences within the sample differs significantly from previous work concerning this perspective. Ellis (1995) and Kelly (1988) offer personal accounts of being feared. Day (2009) completed a qualitative study of university age males. This study has been designed to explore the experience of being feared from a wide range of contexts. This helps to examine the differences between unique groups but also explores the potential common threads that link the experience of being feared together. This study and its exploration makes no claim to be representative or generalisable to the groups sampled but does offer a wider range of experiences than has hitherto been undertaken. In doing so, it offers a wider starting point from which further research can follow. Fourth, the study considers the different contexts of being feared by understanding interactions from an everyday and work-based perspective. This contribution is very much linked to the broad range of contexts derived from the

sampling process within the research. Fear, within an interaction, can be exacerbated by deeper symbolic and social meanings as understood by those that experience it. By exploring a wider range of people and occupations, the study can understand the significance of these factors on the experience of being feared. In this sense, the research goes beyond an understanding of fearfulness and towards an understanding of being feared.

The Conceptual Approach to the Research

In order to understand the meaning and interpretations inherent in interpersonal communication a conceptual framework based on the work of Erving Goffman has been developed. As previously mentioned, this situates the research on a micro-analytical scale and places it within a symbolic interactionist tradition. The thesis explains and uses Goffman's overarching concept of dramaturgy. Alongside this, the thesis uses the insights from *Encounters* (1961), the concept of 'performance' from *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959) and *Frame Analysis* (1974) as well as drawing on additional elements from the work of Goffman. Dramaturgy makes it possible to identify that each aspect of a person's behaviour is essentially expressive in both the giving and the receiving of communicative information. This is essential in understanding the dynamics of fearful situations. Key thematic questions stem from this and will be explored throughout the thesis. This includes the ways in which people present different expressive identities in different contexts. This helps us to understand the front stage and backstage elements of Goffman's dramaturgy when looking into different fear contexts such as personal and work-based. By using *Encounters* (1961) the research is able to conceptualise an area of specific interaction that metaphorically frames a situation within which it is possible to analyse fleeting interaction. This is important in recognising that being feared requires an object of fear, a person. Goffman's exploration of the dynamics of encounters allows the research to situate the enquiry at the point where the fearful and the feared are in each other's presence.

Goffman's 'performance' allows the research to consider the 'ingredients' of each encounter and the expressive information given and received during an interaction. This allows the research to consider the expressive, physical and symbolic elements

of the individual or group that can contribute to being feared. By understanding performance, the feared person can divulge, as they see it, the reasons why they believe themselves to be feared. They can also, within this Goffmanian frame, describe the ways in which they observe and recognise fear in the people they interact with. *Frame Analysis* (1974) provides a schema that brings the aforementioned elements together to provide a metaphorical frame within which individuals can describe and structure their experiences of being feared. This helps to understand how the experience of being feared is organised over time and how it is given meaning by those that experience it. In light of this conceptual frame, the type of detail a micro-social analysis required meant that an appropriate research design was essential.

Methodology within the Research

This research has relied on a qualitative design to conduct the empirical research. A qualitative design is ideally suited for understanding the experience of being feared because it is able to provide the contextual understanding of individual and group experiences and how interaction is interpreted. It was considered the best method for allowing the research aims and objectives to be achieved and operationalised. A qualitative design allows for the study of a limited number of participants (Bachman and Schutt, 2007), which suited the timescale of this research. It allows for detailed understanding and description of complex phenomena, which is commensurate with the use of a Goffmanian conceptual frame. A qualitative design opens the possibility of inductive enquiry into a little-known experience. By doing so, it places the explanations and importance of events in the hands of those that have experienced them. It also, importantly for the experience of being feared, allows for idiographic causation. That is to say, it allows for the participant to determine the causes for the events that they have experienced. This is essential for understanding the experience of being feared and the dynamics therein. This allows for both narrow individual analysis and broad thematic analysis. It affords the researcher the ability to legitimise the individual experiences whilst being able to connect the larger themes and common threads within the data.

In order to achieve the aims and objectives of the research it was necessary to develop a sample from which the experience of being feared was likely. In addition to this,

there was a desire that the sample would offer a broad understanding of the experience of being feared. It was because of this that police officers, bouncers/door staff, gym-goers, young people and students were strategically selected for the sample. Due to the serendipitous recruitment of a soldier when hoping to talk to a gym goer, soldiers were added into the sample at a later point (this is discussed in detail in chapter four). It is also important at the introductory stage, to provide rationale for the groups that have been selected within this research. Police officers have been selected in order to provide an insight into fearful interactions from an occupational context. A police officer's day-to-day activity requires them to interact with people or communities that may fear them. By exercising their duty as police officers, they may be called upon to threaten the use of force. They also have the power to commit acts of violence. They may also be required to allay the fears of victims of crime in order to better investigate crimes. The management of fear is integral to the role of the police officer. Bouncers offer an insight into being feared from a less formal position of authority. Many bouncers are not employed full-time within the private security industry, and this was true of the sample collected for this research. Bouncers are required to manage specific activities in specific places so their powers and resources are more limited than that of the police. Despite this, bouncers are aware of and employ, techniques and tactics in order to obtain and maintain order. This may involve causing fear as well as threatening violence and, indeed, the use of violence. As Hobbs, Hadfield, Lister and Winlow (2002) describe, bouncers represent an important part of being feared in what can be called the 'economics of intimidation'.

Gym-goers have been selected to provide a specific insight into the role that the body plays in being feared. The role of the trained or muscular individual represents the embodiment of masculinity and these individuals may be aware that the appearance of their physique might cause fear (Fussell, 1991). An awareness of the body, the physical outward appearance and the reactions to this appearance represents an integral element of understanding the experience of being feared. The inclusion of this group allows for the research to investigate being feared from a context that centres on the very object of fear – the body. Understanding those that attribute fear directly

from this standpoint is a necessary platform from which the importance of the outward physical can be derived.

Young people and students have been selected for this research because the group falls within an age range that has often been described as the most likely to be the cause of interpersonal fear. It is critical for the research to understand the experiences of those deemed by others as the group most likely to be the objects of interpersonal fear (Pearce, Dixon, Reed & Margo, 2006; British Crime Survey, 2009/10). This is true both of individuals but also of groups. The point at which students and young people learn of this status, if at all, is important to understanding the experience of being feared. This is a group that have made or are making their transition from child to adult. In this sense, their understanding of their feared status is potentially in the earliest stages of formation.

Soldiers have also been included as a sample group within this research. The way in which their selection came to pass is explained in greater detail in Chapter 4. This being said, soldiers provide a chance to frame the extreme range of fear experienced by people. This is by understanding the experience of being feared in the most dangerous and life threatening situations it is possible to encounter. The powers that soldiers possess in the line of duty exceed that of any everyday situation. The resources and training received offers a valuable yard stick for the framing of fear provoking activity. The limits on their capacity for violence are derived from their given objectives in combat and as such, they can provide a unique insight into the experience of being feared from a context in which they can legally take life.

Specifically, data was collected from the strategically recruited sample via face-to-face semi-structured interviews. In total 32 interviews were used within this research from men and women from across the aforementioned groups. This approach meant that professional/personal experiences and perceptions could be gathered to develop a detailed picture of the issues surrounding the experience of being feared.

The Structure of the Thesis

Chapter 2 introduces the context which this research sits in within the fear of crime literature. This Chapter gives a brief overview of some of the key fear of crime debates and issues that have led the field towards this point. Chapter 2 explains some of the conceptual difficulties that have led fear of crime to its present point by looking towards a history of the concept and the methods of measuring the phenomenon. It also considers who is afraid, what exactly they are afraid of and under which circumstances. This has been important in guiding the methodology of this research and the type of sample required to understand being feared. Chapter 2 also considers the wider role of emotion and emotional recognition. This is necessary in order to understand how those people that are feared, recognise that they are so. This Chapter demonstrates that emotional recognition is reliable and, in doing so, legitimises the experiences of the feared.

Chapter 3 introduces the conceptual framework that underpins this research. It introduces the work of Erving Goffman. Goffman's work is dedicated to understanding human interaction. The signals, symbols and actions of every encounter give and receive meaning for each participant. Goffman's micro-sociological approach will be needed so that the research can consider an individual's sense of meaning in the minutia of interaction and a way of framing these experiences over a period of time. To do this, Chapter 3 engages in several of his sociological contributions as a way to begin to conceptualise the dynamics of being feared. This Goffmanian framework will use dramaturgy, encounters, performance and frame analysis. This Chapter helps to frame the specific area of research with encounters and gives the research a way of developing and understanding the interactions therein. Chapter 3 also considers the potential benefits and critiques of such an approach within the thesis.

Chapter 4 provides detail of the methodology of this research. The Chapter initially reiterates the research aims and objectives and links them with the rationale for the study. Following this, the choice of a qualitative design is explained and justified within the context of the research and its aims. Stating the process by which the research instruments were decided upon and designed follows this. The selection and

recruitment of research participants is discussed in detail thereafter. This helps to demonstrate the decisions that were made concerning the type of sample that the research required. These decisions were to ensure that an understanding of being feared was explored in addition to moving the research beyond the limitations of previous literature. Following this, the data collection process and the data analysis methods will be introduced and explained. In addition, a description of the total sample will be given, including an account of the process by which participants chose their alias within the research and the merits of this process. A further section is dedicated to the ethics and safeguards of the research. These processes will be discussed in detail. Finally, Chapter 4 discusses the challenges and limitations of the research and its design. This considers both methodological and conceptual limitations.

Chapter 5 is the first introduction of the empirical work. It is focused on being feared in an occupational context and centres on the experiences of police officers. This Chapter brings together two very different but related elements of the experience of being feared - causing fear and allaying fear. In doing so it lays the groundwork for key connecting themes within the research. Police officers are required to gain control of potentially dangerous situations with the minimum of force and disruption. This Chapter discusses the role that fear has to play in policing. The Chapter introduces the concept that police officers have to understand and interpret meaning within their professional encounters. This relies on the giving and receiving of expressive and communicative information (Goffman, 1959). Having done this, they are duty bound to manage these interactions to achieve a professional outcome. The management of fear in a work-based context is key to this Chapter.

Chapter 6 introduces the experience of being feared from the perspective of soldiers. This shows the dynamics of fear and being feared from the very extremes of human experience, the experiences of war. Chapter 6 also looks at the way being feared, and knowing how to cause fear, has a legacy beyond military service. In order to make sense of this the Chapter looks at the organising and structuring of experience for the individuals involved with reference to Goffman's *Frame Analysis* (1974). This means exploring the relationship between the experience of being feared and the vastly different settings the soldiers have found themselves in. Within this Chapter, the

experiences of fear cover the purposeful eliciting of fear for military advantage and are explored alongside the difficulty of allaying the fears of civilians who fear for their lives.

Chapter 7 explores the experience of being feared from the point of view of bouncers. For this, the research recruited bouncers/door staff from various pubs, clubs and bars across the country. This Chapter is focused on a group of people that allow the research to bridge the gap between formal and less formal authority. In doing so, it allows the research to understand the importance of symbolism in the establishment of order and the measures and techniques needed to instil fear and order in contexts where authority is weaker or assumed less readily. Bouncing, according to much of the research, is an occupation dominated by a hyper-masculine identity (muscular) and a violent potential (Hobbs, Hadfield, Lister and Winlow, 2003). Chapter 7 explores the importance of being feared and its apparent relationship with being a competent bouncer. Chapter 7 also introduces the idea that an increasing knowledge of fear allows bouncers to transition away from violence. The violent potential and masculine ideals are often, but not always (see O'Brien, Hobbs and Westmarland, 2007), prerequisites for becoming a bouncer. This Chapter explores the development of the professional skill of managing fear, beyond the use of violence.

Chapter 8 explores the explicit role that the body can play on being feared. The experience of being feared, beyond all spatial and temporal concerns, requires an object of fear. It requires a body. This Chapter explores the experiences of gym-goers. The ability of people to communicate goes beyond the expressions and mannerisms and extends to the impressions their outward physical appearance has on the reactions of others. Chapter 8 takes into account the awareness of the role the body plays in these fearful encounters. Unlike expressions or uniform, a person is incapable of changing their body in order to manage the impression they project towards others (Goffman, 1959). It is therefore important that Chapter 8 explores how being feared is perceived and how it is assuaged when it relates specifically to the body. This Chapter also explores the ways in which the body can be both an offensive and defensive tool in the process of managing the fear of others (Fussell, 1991).

Chapter 9 introduces the experience of being feared from the perspective of young people and students. Existing research suggests that those most likely to be instilling fear in others will be young people aged between 16 and 24 (see Taylor and Covington, 1993). Importantly, within Chapter 9, the notion of race is addressed more specifically and its importance (or not) in the experience of being feared. This Chapter also addresses the process the students go through growing up, adapting and learning their place in the world. Being feared is closely related to an increasing wariness and distrust in the interactions they experience. This Chapter draws upon these experiences and explores the relationship between being feared by others and how this is related to a perceived sense of suspicion amongst the people students and young people interact with. This Chapter allows the research to explore a wider range of reasons and attributions of the fear in others. In doing so, it forces the findings into making more nuanced assumptions about being feared.

Chapter 10 connects and draws out explicitly the common thematic connections between the strategically selected groups. This brings the common narratives and experiences together and presents a more unified set of findings from within the data. In doing so, this Chapter introduces the importance of context, the body and the four pillars of fear. Chapter 10 shows that these core elements of fearful interaction, whilst exemplified by the groups, do not exist independently and in doing so explore the overlapping nature of the experience of being feared. This is done in this Chapter by considering that where contexts differ, the way that fear is recognised and acted upon is closely related.

Chapter 11 concludes this thesis. The Chapter revisits the main aims and objectives of this study and demonstrates how they have been achieved. Following this, the Chapter also restates the original contribution to knowledge that this research has proffered. This is followed by underlining the 3 main areas of findings stemming from the empirical research. Firstly, the importance of context, the self, desire, and duty is drawn together. This theme addresses the connection between fear and underlying contexts within which the feared are placed. This conclusion brings together the findings concerning symbolism and duties of work-based roles alongside the expectations people have of the behaviour and intentions of others. Following this, the conclusion discusses the processes of learning to be feared and how this is

embodied. This concluding theme distils the ways in which fear is recognised in others and how this is reflected in the self. Alongside this, the findings concerning the impact the body has on fearful encounters is better understood. The final finding considers the micro-dynamics of fear across the groups within the study and the themes that connect the experience of being feared together across contexts. This Chapter highlights the findings concerning the four pillars of being feared as borne out within the data. The Chapter concludes by explaining the successes of the research process, including the specific parts of the methodology. Finally, Chapter 11 addresses in detail the areas for further investigation following the findings of this research.

Chapter 2) Fear of Crime: A Review of the Literature

Part 1) Defining Fear of Crime

The purpose of this Chapter is to provide an outline of where fear of crime research has been and what it has told us. This will help to show where this research is situated within the field. In doing so, this Chapter will be able to engage critically with the existing literature and demonstrate the necessity of a new perspective. The Chapter starts with a discussion about the definition of fear of crime. This includes a brief review of the history of fear of crime as an academic discipline. It then goes on to look into the difficulties inherent in measuring what is essentially a contested phenomenon. The Chapter then critically explores the environments of fear, looking at who and what people are afraid of. This includes understanding the limitations of existent approaches and where this research has the potential to add. The Chapter then looks at fear and emotional expression. This is particularly important in understanding and legitimising the Goffmanian concepts introduced later in Chapter 3. Finally, the Chapter will critically introduce the concept of being feared and how exploring this ‘inside out’ view of fear of crime can help to expand understanding within the field.

To echo the sentiments of Farrall and Lee (2009:1), when starting a review on the fear of crime there are two questions that are immediately apparent: ‘Where to begin?’ and ‘is there anything left to say?’ Deciding where to begin requires a balance between ‘setting the scene’ within the field and the level of specific detail that should be included in an ongoing discussion. A full review of the field will not be conducted here (see for a detailed example Hale, 1996) but a certain broad introduction is needed and that is where this Chapter starts. However, it is to the latter question that the major thoughts should eventually turn. To do this there are certain aspects of the literature on fear of crime that must be explored and questions that need to be addressed. Among these is the way in which fear is conceptualised and measured. More specifically, in order to better understand the experience of being feared, it is important to know who fears whom, under what circumstances and conditions people are fearful and what types of behaviour people fear. Understanding this can lead to a better realisation of the direction most fear of crime research has taken and the

perspectives that it has, hitherto, dedicated its efforts into understanding. Following this a clearer idea can be formed about the way in which an understanding of the experience of being feared can move the fear of crime literature forward and add a considerable dimension that has, thus far, been missing.

a) A History of Fear of Crime

In the latter half of the 20th century, criminologists, sociologists, psychologists and geographers (to name some) became increasingly concerned about 'fear of crime.' Within the media too, images of an old couple looking fearfully over their shoulders while scuttling to and from a barricaded store in a windswept and vandalised shopping centre, or securing an excessive number of bolts on a front door as they thankfully retreat from the violent world outside, are familiar to us all. However, this image of fear lacks the particulars to adequately demonstrate the physiological complexity of fear itself, the impact that crime can have on individuals and communities, how people react to fear of crime and the policies employed to combat fear of crime.

There is little doubt, within the many hundreds of articles dedicated to fear of crime, as to where the genesis of modern understanding stems. Farrall *et al.* (2009:23) suggest that the contemporary manifestation of public attitudes and responses to crime, as an object of study, as a category of description, and as a topic of considerable political salience was the US President's Crime Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice (1967). This report commented (President's Commission, 1967:49):

"A chief reason that this commission was organised was that there is widespread public anxiety about crime... the commission has tried to find out precisely what aspects of crime Americans are anxious about, whether their anxiety is a realistic response to actual danger, how anxiety affects the daily life of Americans, what actions against crime by the criminal justice system and the government as a whole might best allay public anxiety."

One of the reasons for studying fear of crime in its own right, according to Hale (1996:4), are the consequences it has, particularly its impact on quality of life, or what Conklin (1975) calls the indirect costs of crime for society. All of this stems from the early work in the U.S.A of, for example, Biderman *et al.* (1967), Ennis (1967), and Reiss (1967). Their main goal was to count unrecorded victimisation, but all three also included novel questions relating to the degree of public alarm about crime in general (Ditton and Farrall, 2000). For the first time these reports contained questions regarding the public's attitude towards crime and perceptions of their own safety (Farrall *et al.*, 2009). Biderman *et al.* (1967) designed measures that were employed to elicit unstructured responses concerned with attitudes, behavioural intentions, beliefs, and evaluations that were directed towards crime, safety, disorder, and moral characteristics (Farrall *et al.*, 2009:24). Some important findings were made in these early reports centred around a comparison of public perceptions of the crime problem that used an 'index of anxiety' (Biderman *et al.*, 1967:121) that was based on five questions. They found that anxiety did not mirror risk profiles that were statistically formed using police recorded crime statistics and crime experienced by the survey respondents (Farrall *et al.*, 2009). This led to the conclusion that the gravity of the crime problem and its dangers to individuals was based on factors other than their [people's] own circumstances and experiences (Biderman *et al.*, 1967:122). This is a point that can be returned to when considering being feared. The report also concluded that when respondents were asked to comment on the increase of violent crime, perceptions were 'disproportionate to the relatively low objective probability of these dangers in comparison with other perils to life and property' (Biderman *et al.*, 1967:122). It can therefore be suggested that there were three key concepts that emerged from the earliest work on fear of crime. First and most simply, was the concept of fear of crime as a specific research term. Prior to the report of Biderman *et al.* (1967) the recording of crime, other than by official statistics, had little to do with victimisation or, more importantly, the perceived chances of victimisation within criminological research. Second, was the implicit realisation that fear of crime was, as a concept, not restricted solely to studying 'fear' specifically. There was a conceptual acceptance that fear of crime included ongoing or non-situation general anxiety about crime. This was evident in Biderman *et al.* (1967) with their index of anxiety and the inclusion of respondent's experiences within the research. Third, was the inclusion of an evaluation of personal safety (Biderman *et al.*, 1967) with regards to respondent's

perception of violent crime and victimisation. By doing so, Biderman *et al.* (1967) introduced, at the very outset of the study into fear of crime, the concept of perceived risk of victimisation (aside from actual victimisation) from the perspective of personal safety and from the perspective of loss or damage of property.

Although a common understanding of ‘fear of crime’ was taken for granted in early research (Pain, 2000), different researchers and respondents (as well as others who employ fear discourses) may mean very different things when using the term. For example, an ethologist would naturally study fear from a biological perspective whilst a victim of crime would perceive and understand fear of crime from a far more personal, experiential perspective. Smith (1987b: 2) alluded to this complexity, suggesting that “broadly, what is being tapped is an emotional response to a threat: an admission to self and others that crime is intimidating; and an expression of one’s sense of danger and anxiety at the prospect of being harmed” (cited in Pain, 2000:367) and noting importantly, that fear may be intermittent or, indeed, constant. However, the generic ‘fear of (all) crime’ has indistinct meaning, as reactions to burglary, car theft and sexual assault may be as disparate as the crimes themselves (Warr, 1985; Gordon and Riger, 1989) and thus demand sensitivity to different experiences, issues and conceptualisation (Pain, 2000). Indeed, Farrall *et al.* (2009:79) suggest “fear of crime is a continuum of feeling, which is distributed along a spectrum between two distinctly different ideal typical emotional reactions. At one end, the most emotive aspect is the experience(s) of having felt fearful in a specific situation. The other is a set of attitudes or opinions, which are brought forth when people are asked to discuss their feelings about crime.” By introducing this spectrum Farrall *et al.* (2009) suggest that there are two dimensions from which fear of crime needs to be understood; first, it is an ‘expressive’ dimension that refers to the attitudes that are invited and measured through surveys. This is in contrast to an ‘experiential’ dimension that refers to the experience of fear as based in specific situations. Further, ‘fear’ is often unreflective of the broad range of reactions to crime of many people (Kinsey and Anderson, 1992) and, especially when applied to certain social groups, such as the elderly, may be interpreted as implying weakness and vulnerability rather than the commonplace resistance with which many people respond (Pain, 2000). In relation to being feared, it is both the expressive and experiential dimensions that can be specifically added to. The specific focus on the fearful does not allow for a full

understanding of fear of crime in its most basic sense. As the discussions within Kinsey and Anderson (1992) allude, the broad range of reactions to crime (and non-crime) should include those that form the object of fear. Much can be made about the objective vulnerability of certain groups. It should perhaps be considered that the vulnerability of those people that are regularly misidentified as potential perpetrators of crime holds as much academic merit for investigation. For example, there are stark social connotations for people that have ongoing and unwarranted contact with the police.

Growing attention is being given to ‘fear discourses’ – the notion that not only is the problem of fear of crime frequently used for political ends by certain groups and individuals (Sasson, 1995; Garland, 1996; Pain, 2000), but also that its very existence may have been misunderstood, misrepresented or overstated (Farrall *et al.*, 1997). Based on their own investigation into the unreliability of survey questions, Farrall *et al.* (1997: 676) have indeed asserted that ‘levels of fear of crime...have been hugely overestimated’, even that ‘there was no ‘fear’ of crime in Britain until it was discovered in 1982’ (Ditton *et al.*, 1998: 10). Pain (2000:366) suggests that, “increasingly, fear of crime is seen as inseparable not only from crime and disorder in western cities, but also from a range of other social and economic problems concerned with housing, employment, environmental planning and social exclusion (relating to poverty, gender, race and so on).” Likewise, in the policy arena strategies are shifting from fear reduction via specific local or ‘situational’ measures towards holistic approaches (Pain, 2000). Smith’s (1987b: 17) conclusion that fear of crime “impinges on a wide range of urban affairs, and as such, is particularly suited to scrutiny by the diverse expertise and undervalued eclecticism found within human geography” is just as relevant more than a decade later (Pain, 2000) and arguably just as relevant to each research discipline that has an interest in the fear of crime. The implications for this research are various. If Farrall *et al.* (1997: 676) are correct in their summation that fear of crime is over stated, then this should be reflected in the experiences of those that are considered an object of fear. Most illuminatingly, Pain’s (2000:366) key contribution assists in justifying a concerted exploration of the impact that those wider social and economic problems can have on all that experience fear of crime. This must, from now on, include those that are feared.

b) Measuring Fear of Crime

A conceptual debate about fear of crime cannot be fully appreciated without a concerted look at the way in which the phenomenon is measured and the way in which this impacts on the way fear of crime is defined, the way it is tackled and the way it is reported. It is therefore important to understand the landscape of the fear of crime literature, what the findings give us, what they do not give us and where we can go from here and what connotations this will have for being feared.

There is considerable theoretical confusion concerning the meaning and measurement of fear of crime (Hale, 1996; Farrall *et al.*, 2009). Further, Hale (1996:6) considers a long-standing lack of clarity within the literature on the subject to adequately distinguish between risk evaluation, worry and fear. Further still, the question remains as to whether fear of crime is simply measuring fear of crime or whether there are additional concerns or characteristics that are not separated. For example, could fear of crime include ‘insecurity with modern living’, ‘quality of life’, perception of disorder’, or ‘urban unease’ (Hale, 1996). Fear of crime has, from the outset, relied heavily upon quantitative surveys, which have indicated the prevalence of fear of crime as a social problem (Farrall *et al.*, 1997). However in a major review of the prevailing methodological approach to the study of fear of crime Farrall *et al.* (1997) question the instruments used to investigate this phenomenon and alongside supportive commentary, suggest that fear of crime has been significantly misrepresented. This misrepresentation has contributed, in part, to considerable theoretical confusion concerning the measurement and meaning of the fear of crime, not least in a failure to distinguish between risk evaluation, worry and fear (Hale, 1996).

Hale (1996:6) suggests that before considering the various indicators used within the literature it is useful to consider general issues. Fattah and Sacco (1989) outline some key concerns with the measurement of fear of crime. First, criminology tends to focus, as a field, upon ‘ordinary’ street crime rather than corporate or white collar crime. Fattah and Sacco (1989 cited in Farrall *et al.*, 1997:657) suggest that research into fear of crime is no exception to this focus. Secondly, fear has been conceptualised as an enduring trait “as an emotional or psychological property which

some people have and others do not. We are then encouraged to ask: who is fearful and who is not fearful? Such a viewpoint precludes a detailed consideration of the ephemeral, transitory and situational nature of fear” (Fattah and Sacco, 1989:211). It is the temporary and situation specific elements of fear that the standard measures of fear do not adequately assess (Farrall *et al.*, 2009). Thirdly, fear of crime has relied almost exclusively on quantitative techniques related to the use of population surveys (Farrell *et al.*, 2009; Hale, 1996; Fattah and Sacco, 1989). According to Fattah and Sacco (1989) this has led to fear being treated as a concrete attribute of individuals rather than as “...a hazy and problematic social construction.” This focus on the survey, according to Hale (1996:6), has hindered an understanding of fear in terms of it being a process that changes and develops. Fourthly, Fattah and Sacco (1989) note that while most research treats fear of crime as a predominant social problem, and as such a condition which is destructive to psychological and social well being, again this conceptualisation has limitations (Hale, 1996:7). Caution is prudent in many of the situations that life in the modern world presents (Hale, 1996). What Fattah and Sacco (1989) are suggesting is that a clarification of the concepts that allow for a distinction between individuals who report being fearful when they mean they take care or make risk assessments and those for whom fear is actually or potentially debilitating (Hale, 1996:7). Finally, notwithstanding the various conceptual and methodological concerns that have been outlined so far, and will be discussed in more detail hence, the study of the fear of crime has considered almost exclusively one dimension of the fear of crime process. The experiences and concerns of the fearful have dominated the field of research with little exception. If fear of crime is a problematic social construction (Fattah and Sacco, 1989) then it is ever more prudent to consider the perspective of the feared and the ensuing motivations, advantages, interpretations and practices of those that are deemed as a threat to individuals and communities. As has been outlined, fear of crime is not limited solely to experience. So being a victim or a genuine perpetrator does not exclude people from experiencing this complex, socially constructed (Fattah and Sacco, 1989) phenomena.

Attention can now turn to two useful reviews of fear of crime methodology by Farrall *et al.* (1997) and Farrall *et al.* (2009) in order to tease out the complexity in measuring fear of crime and why this is important to this research. First, Farrall *et al.* (1997) conduct a methodological critique outlining fundamental areas (epistemological,

conceptual, operational and technical critiques of quantitative surveys and fear of crime surveys in particular) of contention within the fear of crime field. An overview of this can help to show the strengths of Farrall *et al.*'s (2009) ongoing discussion about fear of crime and their suggestions of how to move away from global measures of fear to more specific investigation. This being so, it is Farrall *et al.*'s (1997, 2009) succinct lead that we can now follow. Farrall *et al.* (1997) suggest that there are problems when attempting to translate social processes into quantifiable events. Bowling (1993) suggests that crime survey methodology makes efforts to convert social processes into a series of quantifiable 'moments' that are unable to adequately reflect the experiences or feelings of those interviewed (Farrall, 1997). Surveys, in this sense can be described as 'static' and of reducing experience to a 'decontextualised snapshot' (Bowling, 1993:232 cited in Farrall *et al.*, 1997:659). Importantly, for understanding how fear of crime is experienced, Bowling (1993) and Farrall *et al.*'s (1997) assertions suggest that, with surveys, ongoing experiences or variation in the range and strengths of emotion experienced are rarely adequately captured by the survey tool.

It is for this reason that Farrall *et al.*'s (2009; see also Gray *et al.*, 2008) development of survey questions, to explore the frequency and intensity of fearful events, is important. The British Crime Survey (BCS) has asked questions exploring worry about crime and victimisation in England and Wales since 1982. In the 2003/2004 sweep of the BCS new questions were added to explore the frequency and intensity of fearful events. Farrall *et al.* (2009) findings showed that few people experience specific events of worry on a frequent basis, and that 'old' style questions magnify the everyday experience of fear. Farrall *et al.* (2009) proposed that 'worry about crime' is often best seen as a diffuse anxiety about risk, rather than any pattern of everyday concerns over personal safety.

Efforts to conceptualise the fear of crime cannot be completely removed from the operational concerns (Farrall *et al.*, 1997). These concerns, as alluded to above, are diffuse but can include defining what fear is, its nature and its occurrence within individuals' everyday lives (Farrall, 1997; see also Farrall *et al.*, 2009). As of writing their conceptual review in 1997, Farrall *et al.* suggest many of these conceptual issues have not been successfully resolved. Ferraro and LaGrange (1987: 71) also note "the

phrase ‘fear of crime’ has acquired so many divergent meanings that its current utility is negligible” (cited in Farrall, 1997:661). Ferraro and LaGrange (1987) make a distinction between ‘formless’ and ‘concrete’ fears in an attempt to structure the operationalisation of the fear of crime concept. ‘Concrete’ fears relate to particular offences, for example, burglaries. ‘Formless’ fears do not refer to any particular crime, but instead ask, for example, more generally ‘How safe do you feel walking around alone in this area after dark?’ (Farrall *et al.*, 1997:661). This can be said to reflect the difficulty in being able to operationally separate fear and anxiety. This discussion is addressed in more detail later in relation to a neurological definition of fear and anxiety. Here a distinction is made between fears as a ‘post-stimuli’ emotion, relating to specific and immediately threatening events, and anxiety as a ‘pre-stimuli’ relating to the anticipatory reaction to threatening stimuli (Öhman, 2008). Hale (1996) shares an operational uneasiness with the use of ‘global’ measures of fear of crime in which there is no mention of a specific crime or, in the case of Gray *et al.* (2008) and Farrall *et al.* (2009) concern, this concern includes frequency, location of the victim and direct experience. Farrall *et al.* (1997) point out that where a crime is specifically mentioned the operationalisation remains incomplete. This is due to the fact that the temporal, spatial and social contexts are not adequately addressed. “ ‘Where’ the respondent is, ‘when’ the respondent is there, and with ‘whom’ they are with is rarely addressed” (Farrall *et al.*, 1997:661). Indeed, it is important to see in which circumstance people are feared. Clearly, with time, space and social context playing such key roles in the realisation of specific fears of crime (Bannister, 1993), to leave aside these issues is seriously to damage our understanding of the fear of crime (Farrall *et al.*, 1997). With regards to understanding the experience of being feared, the ‘where’ and ‘when’ are key considerations. Indeed, with Gray *et al.* (2008) and Farrall *et al.*’s. (2009) insights this, too, is central to their exploration. Importantly, the where, when and whom of being feared is given a structure within the work of Goffman as outlined later in Chapter 3.

Few studies have examined the actual frequency and intensity of such ‘feelings’ about the fear of crime (Farrall *et al.*, 2009). Respondents have been typically asked only whether they are ‘very’, ‘fairly’, ‘not very’ or ‘not at all’ worried (or afraid) about becoming a crime victim. According to Gray *et al.* (2008:363) large-scale cross-national European surveys like the International Crime Victim Survey and European

Social Survey do not even ask directly about crime when measuring 'fear', enquiring instead how safe respondents feel when walking alone in their area after dark.

Respondents are therefore not asked how often they worry, or when they worry, or what effects these worries have on their lives (Gray *et al.*, 2008:364). Consequently, instead of data on the patterning and the way people interact with the environment during fearful events, we are left with only vague 'global' summaries of intensity of worry or feelings of unsafety (Gray *et al.*, 2008). Crucially, these vague summaries may diverge from the reality of everyday emotions that affect people's lives. Instead, research typically evokes generalised beliefs about emotion (Gray *et al.*, 2008:364).

In light of this, there are difficulties in operationalising fear of crime quantitatively. Farrall *et al.* (1997:661) suggest "quantitative tools, which require easy to follow, short questions with precise predefined reference points...hence do not take into account the temporal, spatial and social contexts, has seriously limited both the conceptual development of this field and the quality of the data generated." One of the major difficulties with using quantitative tools (such as the Likert scale) is the way in which such tools made it hard for respondents to make qualitative distinctions between their feeling on particular crime at particular times and places (Farrall *et al.*, 1997). This also adds to a lack of clarity between feelings that are generated at specific moments or more lingering feelings of insecurity more generally. Farrall *et al.* (1997) suggest that this may lead to respondents describing more generalised levels of fear of crime, which does not adequately represent their emotion. "Even where just one crime is concerned, a respondent's feelings about that crime may vary greatly with numerous other variables, none of which is addressed" Farrall *et al.* (1997:661). Therefore, Farrall *et al.* (1997) suggest that a simplistic, numerical, answer to a general closed question cannot hope to represent the breadth of experience and feelings about crime experienced by most people.

It is this generalised aspect of the critique from Farrall *et al.* (1997) and subsequent developments (Farrall *et al.*, 2009) that can relate to the research into the experience of being feared. Understandably, a focus on the experience of being feared is not concerned with a general understanding of the fear of crime in the same way that Furedi (1997) is with his research on the culture of fear, for example. Or, more broadly, what might be found within the BCS with its recording of the degree to

which people have a general fear of crime. Farrall *et al.* (2009) suggest fear of crime, as a concept, covers a wide range of different experiences, attitudes, and vulnerabilities. Questionnaires, unsurprisingly struggle to capture its entirety (Farrall *et al.*, 2009). This survey research is not so useful here because of the more standardised outlook. Indeed, Farrall *et al.* (2009:81) suggest, “it is even possible that standard approaches inadvertently exaggerated the fear of crime problem (Lee, 1999); Farrall and Gadd, 2004); distorted the nature of fear as it is experienced in everyday life (Gabriel and Greve, 2003); (Farrall *et al.*, 1997); and failed to recognise the functional as well as expressive aspects of the language of crime fears (Jackson, 2006).”

Capturing the entirety of fear of crime is perhaps the golden goose of the field. The language of crime fears needs to better understand both sides of the human interaction specifically. This can serve both the functional and the expressive aspects of fear of crime but must include a concerted exploration of the experiences, attitudes, and vulnerabilities of those that are feared. It is perhaps not the role of this research to shed light on the extent to which fear of crime is exaggerated or indeed add any deeper context to the ways in which it is or can be quantified. Instead, the ways in which it is perceived and experienced will have a hitherto unused dialect to add to the language of crime fears.

Part 2) Conditions and Environments of Fear

a) Who is Afraid and What are they Afraid of?

There has been a wealth of conclusions based on the impact of fear of crime from a range of social, geographical, behavioural and psychological perspectives, to name some. It is therefore important to briefly introduce some key concepts within the fear of crime literature – who is fearful, of whom are they fearful and under what conditions and circumstances they are fearful.

Much of the early work surrounding fear of crime has focused on criminal victimisation and fear. Therefore it is important to map this landscape with an

understanding of fear in a concerted way. Williams *et al.* (2000, cited in Lee, 2007: 4) suggest that criminologists have long recognised that victimisation is an important element within the understanding of crime and the experiences of fear therein. Regardless of whether or not an individual has been a victim of crime, fear of crime can have severe implications; including decreased social integration, out-migration, restriction of activities, added security costs and avoidance behaviours (Ferraro, 1995). Indeed, Warr (2000:451) suggests “fear of crime affects far more people in the United States than crime itself and there are sound reasons for treating crime and fear of crime as distinct social problems.” This being so, it would seem that an understanding of fear of crime needs to be able to conceptually recognise that victimisation itself is not a prerequisite of this fear.

Following on from the early works on fear of crime, in the US Presidents’ Commission, a greater understanding of fear of crime and victimisation could be formed. Vanderveen (2006:11) suggested that since people constrain their daily activity patterns, fear of crime influences the quality of life. Beyond these disruptive patterns Vanderveen (2006) also suggests that those who have a fear of crime are more likely to be socially isolated or excluded. Further still there are arguments to suggest that fear of crime can also have an adverse affect on health (a discussion of the psychophysiological impact of fear follows shortly). Anxiety (physiologically similar to fear in its neurological process) can harm a shared sense of trust, cohesion and social control within a community, and contributes to the incidence of crime (Jackson, 2006). In England and Wales the first survey of this type (British Crime Survey – now called the Crime Survey of England and Wales) was conducted in 1981 and is now completed quarterly. Australia and Canada have similar data sources whereas much of Europe, apart from their involvement in the International Criminal Victimization Survey, first conducted in 1989, has resisted the move towards creating national databases of this kind (Walklate, 2007:58). This can make cross-jurisdictional comparisons difficult notwithstanding what Walklate (2007) calls the inherent limitations in what victimisation surveys can tell us.

Moore and Shepherd (2007) suggest that there has been a shift in the recent findings about fear and age, claiming that while previous research highlighted elderly people as the most fearful in society (for example Lebowitz, 1975), more recent studies have

reported the opposite (LaGrange and Ferraro, 1992; Ditton *et al.*, 1999; Chadee and Ditton, 2003). Over the course of research into fear of crime, the theme that the elderly are the most fearful of crime is pervasive (LaGrange and Ferraro, 1987) despite the seemingly paradoxical relationship between age and the likelihood of criminal victimisation (Kershaw *et al.*, 2001). Fear of crime in relation to age is undoubtedly an important element of understanding fear of crime from a personal or social perspective. Ramsay (1989), for example, found a correlation between feelings of vulnerability and fear levels. Ramsey (1989:4) suggested that although older interviewees were less frequently victimised, respondents over 60 were significantly more fearful of stranger assaults and muggings. Older women were less fearful of sexual attacks than younger women, and were only marginally more fearful of being assaulted. Ramsay (1989) argues that the anxieties of the elderly were tempered by a degree of awareness, that both assaults and sexual attacks typically involve comparatively youthful victims. Further, Ramsay (1989) also suggests that elderly people are not so much at risk from crime as younger people.

Moore and Shepherd's (2007) research (using data from the British Crime Survey) indicates that there is an important distinction that should be made between the fear of personal loss and the fear of personal harm in relation to an age based relationship with fear of crime. Moore and Shepherd (2007) suggest that fear of personal harm was greatest between the ages of 16 and 25. However, fear of personal loss was greatest amongst those aged between 45 and 60. Ramsey (1989) noted that there were differences in the behaviours and methods used to avoid fearful areas or situations. It was discovered that older people were more likely to avoid city-centre areas altogether, however, once in a city-centre, older people were less likely than younger people to adopt any of the other crime prevention strategies despite being more fearful (Ramsey, 1989). Ferraro (1995) argues that despite a reduced ability (in comparison to younger people) to defend themselves, older people are less fearful than younger people by virtue of the fact that going out less at night means they are less exposed to potential victimisation. Young people, in contrast, spend more time outdoors and are more likely to be fearful of assault (Ferraro, 1995). This portrays fear as something experienced when beyond one's territory (Ferraro, 1995:11). Feelings of isolation and vulnerability are key factors that are likely to influence fear of crime (Skogan, 1987). Skogan (1987: 141) argues that surveys indicate that socially isolated people are more

fearful which can help to explain why elderly people, particularly those living alone, may have stronger feelings of fear with regard to crime and victimisation.

Additionally, older people who are wheelchair-bound or disabled may be fearful knowing they are powerless to retaliate and as such the environment, or the context in which one finds oneself, can play a large part in determining levels of vulnerability (Goodey, 2005: 74) and therefore, according to Skogan (1987), fear of crime.

Killias (1990, 1991) present a theoretical model of fear of crime that distinguished between personal, social and situational aspects of vulnerability (such as gender, age, living in certain areas, and neighbourhood characteristics) (see Vrij and Winkel, 1991) and several dimensions of threats, such as the probability of crime, the seriousness of feared consequences and the feeling of having no control (see Bandura, 1986; Goffman, 1973). Killias and Clerici's (2000:437) research suggests that, in comparison to demographic and neighbourhood (contextual) variables, physical vulnerability (self-confidence, physical health, the presence of a handicap, likelihood of vulnerability in a hypothetical attack) plays an important and consistent role in the genesis of fear. Vulnerability also, therefore, seems to be particularly helpful in explaining seemingly disproportionate fear levels among women and the elderly, as well as in a few situational contexts. Killias and Clerici (2000:448) suggest that fear of personal crime "is explained by variables which are somehow related either to objective risk, or to the likely seriousness of the consequences, or the inability of the respondent to control risk or outcome, or both." Killias and Clerici (2000:448) further suggest that fear of personal crime has little to do with political orientation, social economic status or other socio-demographic variables.

Gabriel and Greve (2003) present a conceptualisation of fear of crime from a psychological perspective. They suggest, much in the line of Farrall *et al.*'s (2009) argument on the specific prevalence of fear of crime, that to gain sensitive empirical data, the conceptualisation of fear of crime must be based on a person's specific fear of being personally victimised and not based on a more general concern about crime or perceived extent of crime (Gabriel and Greve, 2003:601). In this sense, they explained that there are individual differences in the fear of crime (Chadee *et al.*, 2009) applying Spielburger's (1966) conceptual analysis of state and trait anxiety to an understanding of fear of crime. Gabriel and Greve (2003) differentiate between the

fear of crime as (1) a 'transitory state.' This might be best measured by asking individuals about those moments when they find themselves personally concerned about safety and security (Farrall and Gadd, 2004; Gray *et al.*, 2008a) and (2) the fear of crime as a 'dispositional state' (cited in Jackson, 2008:44). Dispositional fear is the 'tendency to experience fear of crime in certain situations.' As Gabriel and Greve (2003:601-602) put it:

“Such an individual disposition is characterised by experiencing more situations as being relevant to fear, being more likely to experience fear in a given situation, and possibly experiencing fear more intensely. Therefore, persons with such a disposition are more likely to experience the state of ‘being afraid’ ... Dispositional fear of crime is one of the parameters that regulate, influence or determine its actual occurrence, i.e. the situational fear of crime (as a state) ... The dispositional fear of crime is the result of a long-term (ontogenetic) developmental process that is influenced by personal conditions and attributes (such as anxiousness, perceptive tendencies and coping resources) on the one hand, and by individual experiences of fear-relevant situations on the other, as well as by the interaction of these two factors.” This is important for understanding how fear is experienced in both specifically fearful situations and how fear can manifest over a longer period of time. Here, an individual’s vulnerability appears to be an interaction between how that individual identifies fearful situations, the personal characteristics they possess and the coping strategies they employ to combat these feelings of fear.

Fear of crime, in relation to gender, finds consistently that women are more fearful than men despite being less likely to be victimised (Lee, 2007:116) suggesting that gender has as an important role in fear of crime research. There is a large body of empirical studies that have repeatedly found that women are more fearful of crime than men and yet, as with age above, are less likely to become the victims of most categories of serious crime. For example, LaGrange and Ferraro (1989) found that women reported significantly greater perceived risk and fear of crime than men regardless of how fear of crime was measured. Further to this, Allen’s (2006, cited in Wynne, 2008:9) Home Office-funded report into the findings from two recent British Crime Surveys found that more women than men have a high level of worry about burglary. Ramsay (1989) also found that women were more fearful of being attacked

or mugged than men. Importantly, Jefferson and Hollaway (2000) suggest that ‘fear of crime’ means different things to men and women. They suggest that men are more likely to be most fearful of assault whereas women are more concerned about sexually motivated attacks (Jefferson and Hollaway, 2000).

Sandberg and Tollefsen (2010) likewise suggest gender differences when researching fear of crime. They found that men and women describe different narratives when expressing their feelings about potentially fearful situations. Women were far more open about their fear and readily identified specific spaces and times at which they had felt most afraid (Sandberg and Tollefsen, 2010:6). They suggest that within their study, women from all racial and social backgrounds reproduced a shared narrative concerning the experience of fear. There were strong similarities, across cultural, social and economic boundaries about how women talk about fear in public spaces. According to Hollander (2001) women’s vulnerability is constructed in people’s everyday talk about fear and danger. In addition, Sandberg and Tollefsen (2010:8) suggested that there were also similarities in the adoption of restricted social norms in order to preserve personal safety. Men’s narratives, on the other hand, were fragmented and diverse, especially in terms of ethnicity (Sandberg and Tollefsen, 2010:1). This suggests, not only a paucity of a men’s fear narrative in everyday talk (Hollander, 2001) but a lack of consistency in the way that fear is experienced by men in comparison to women (Sandberg and Tollefsen, 2010).

Ferraro (1995: 86) introduces a concept known as the ‘shadow of sexual assault’ to explain female fear of crime. Whilst women are said to be fearful of being raped or sexually assaulted, Ferraro (1995) also believes that women are more fearful of other offences as a consequence of this initial fear. Women, for example, may be more fearful of being burgled whilst at home than men, because the incident may also include a sexual attack, Ferraro (1995). Ferraro (1995: 99) concluded that attempting to construct strategy or policy to reduce fear of crime among women, specifically reducing the fear of rape must be the main concern.

Having discussed who is afraid, it is important that attention now turns to examining the possible sources of interpersonal fear (being feared will be explored specifically later). For example, Hall *et al.* (1978) suggest that female fear is exacerbated by

images and representations of crime contained in the prevailing ideology of crime. This is an ideology shaped by popular images about what activity is criminal, who is likely to commit crime and who is more likely to become a victim of crime (Madriz, 1997). Furthermore, these images extend to exploring the connections between criminals and victims, when and where crime is likely to occur and what the best ways to control or prevent crime are (Madriz, 1997). According to Reiman (1995: 6) “these representations reflect attitudes so deeply embedded in tradition as to appear natural.” This being said, if these are deeply imbedded representations of crime and criminals, it is important to know who and what are represented within these attitudes.

There have been a number of studies attempting to illicit descriptions and perceptions of the stereotypical criminal. MacLin and Herrera (2006), for example, suggest the literature supports the assertion that individuals hold well-formed ideas about what types of people commit crime and who looks like a criminal. Indeed, some studies have demonstrated that there is consensus regarding criminal and non-criminal appearances (Bull & Green, 1980; Goldstein, Chance, & Gilbert, 1984; Jones & Kaplan, 2003). The existing research regarding the content of criminal stereotypes shows that they are comprised of physical and social category information, much akin to the development of stereotypes of other groups (MacLin and Herrera, 2006).

One such example of the categorisation of criminal attributes, whether physical or social, is from Madriz (1997: 347-8). Her focus-group research in New York City illuminated the perceived images of a criminal to be that of a man, who is Black and/or Hispanic, poor, living on welfare, lazy, new immigrants (by which there is the implication that they are not White), weird, dirty, big and tall. The research from Madriz (1997) goes further when suggesting that her participants also described criminals as being bad, immoral, cruel, undeserving, animals, inhuman, irrational, violent, out of control, alcoholics, insane, strangers to victims, attacking randomly in the streets, violent predators, murderers, and sexual criminals. This set of characteristics gives a sense of the wide-ranging images and features conjured when thinking of a criminal.

Overall, according to a slightly narrower list of features stipulated by MacLin and Herrera (2006), the stereotypical criminal is tall, with long or shaggy dark hair, wears

baggy, dirty and/or dark clothing, may be aggressive (and/or smart and articulate), have some form of facial hair, and beady eyes. There are further characteristics associated with criminals listed by MacLin and Herrera (2006) such as skin features like tattoos and scars as well as accessories like gloves, hats, and bandanas. Importantly, a connection needs to be made between the assertion of Hall *et al.* (1978) that fear of crime, as far as women are concerned, is exacerbated by a prevailing ideology of crime, the readily identifiable traits or physical characteristics of would-be offenders as outlined above and the ongoing affect that this can have on those that possess the fear (and apply the stereotype) and those that are potentially the cause of the fear (and conform to the stereotype) (see for example, Sandberg and Tollefsen, 2010; Day, 2009).

Indeed, Nils Christie's (1986) theory of the ideal victim tackled the paradox between real-life crime victims and imaginary victims. He defined the ideal victim as "a person or a category of individual who – when hit by crime – most readily [is] given the complete and legitimate status of being a victim" (1986:18). The characteristics of this ideal victim are as readily available as are those for the criminal stereotype (for example, Chapman, 1968). Following Christie (1986) and Walklate (2007:76–7), the identification of the 'ideal victim' is connected with vulnerability and innocence (Smolej, 2010) and is conveyed by the use of description of youth or virtuousness. It can be argued, along with the descriptions offered by Chapman (1968), Madriz (1997), and MacLin and Herrera (2006) amongst others, that there are those that are deemed worthy of being called a criminal (this can be justified when coupled with appropriate behaviour/actions) and worthy of being feared (this may not be justified and may be hypothetically centred on appearance, for example).

There is an important question to be raised here, which covers both the experiences of the fearful and the feared. This concerns the behavioural changes, whether in its wider contexts such as an increasing lack of social integration as a result of ongoing fear, or in the specific adaptive behaviour employed at moments when a person fears another individual. It is necessary to understand what people do and how they react in these circumstances. There is the tendency, according to the behaviours, activities and lists of common criminal characteristics described by Madriz (1997) and MacLin and Herrera (2006), amongst others, that when people (more often than not women in

much of the research) notice people in possession of some or all of the characteristics they associate with being criminal, or they walk into geographical spaces where it is more common to find people with such characteristics, or times of day when it is most likely that people with such characteristics will be present, then those people adopt avoidance measures or, in some way or another adapt to avoid encountering these people.

b) Environments of Fear

There appears to be no simple explanation of who is afraid within the fear of crime literature. As the brief synopsis above suggests, when considering just victimisation, age and gender, there are a considerable number of circumstances and conditions under which the levels of people's fear and the type of things they fear differs greatly. In light of this, rather obvious insight, it is important to understand the circumstances in which this fear of crime exists. For example, fear fractures the sense of community and neighbourhood, and transforms some public places into no-go areas (Atkinson and Parker, 2011; Morgan, 1978; Wilson, 1975). Fear of crime and geo-spatial related questions have helped to broadly establish where people feel safe and where people feel less safe. Research (see *inter alia* Bursik, 2000; Bursik and Grasmick, 1993; Sampson, 1988 and 1991) suggests that a perception of residential stability increases the likelihood of social organisation, social cohesion and informal surveillance of the neighbourhood, all of which can help to prevent crime (Vanderveen, 2006:13). Likewise, Sampson (1991:51) considers fear of crime to be a powerful force in decreasing community bonds.

Ramsay (1989:2) suggests that general incivilities in an area, such as public alcohol consumption or drunken behaviour, are contributory factors to fear. Ramsay's (1989:3) study suggested that, of those who reported feeling unsafe as a result of stranger interaction in public spaces, three quarters believed that those involved had been drinking. Importantly, Ferraro (1995) found neighbourhood incivility to be the most important predictor of perceived risk, suggesting that those individuals living in areas of incivility were more likely to have adjusted their daily activities during the last year, providing evidence of constrained or adjusted behaviour. Fear of crime can lead to more affluent citizens protecting themselves and their property, or moving

from the neighbourhood (Hartnagel, 1979; Sampson and Wooldredge, 1986). This can lead to the conclusion that the incidence of crime may be displaced onto those already suffering from other social and economic disadvantages (Lea and Young, 1984; Hale, 1996).

Fear of crime has also been shown to have detrimental psychological effects on individuals and neighbourhoods. Links have been made between whether the condition of a neighbourhood's physical and social environment is poor and fear of crime, although generally these effects seem to be weak (White, et al., 1987; Hale, 1996). There is a considerable body of work describing the habitual changes that a fear of criminal victimisation can cause (see *inter alia* Garofalo, 1981; Krahn and Kennedy, 1985; Lavrakas, 1982; Riger *et al.*, 1982; Skogan, 1986a). The literature suggests that those who are fearful tend to stay at home more, in surroundings they have made safer (income permitting) through attempts at 'target hardening' with locks chains bars and alarms (Hale, 1996:4).

Part 3) Fear: Emotions and Expressions

a) Fear as an Emotion

The relevance of fear in relation to its explicitly emotional context is where we must now turn. "Fear is a ubiquitous experience among human kind that can be traced back to distant mammalian heritage. Recent world events, with terrorist attacks randomly striking innocent bystanders at many locations, highlights the long standing insight that fear is an inevitable part of human existence" (Öhman, 2008:709). In this sense it can be simply suggested that "fear is a normal emotion exhibited in potentially dangerous situations" (Page, 1999). Fear is an intense emotion and occurs when danger is physically present which, importantly, is in contrast to anxiety (Steimer, 2002), which will be discussed shortly. Walter Cannon (1927) described the basic processes of fear as being a fight-or-flight response. Simply put, upon noticing a threat, the sympathetic branch of the autonomic nervous system is triggered (for detailed examples see Brodal, 2004), which in turn elicits mental, behavioural and physiological responses (Page, 1999). Inherent in the fight-or-flight saying are two

responses to a noticed threat that are opposing. Without wishing to state the obvious, one involves fighting and one involves running away. A crucial link is made here between fear and violence, a link that will be returned to shortly. The modern era of emotion research started when it became obvious that emotions are ‘not just feelings’ or mental states but are accompanied by physiological and behavioural changes that are an integral part of them (Steimer, 2002). Steimer (2002) suggests that today’s view of emotions is that they are experienced and expressed in three different, but closely related levels: the mental or psychological level, the (neuro) physiological level, and the behavioural level.

For the emotion of fear, these related levels can be shown easily in basic terms: Mentally, the person becomes preoccupied with the threat and the ways to ensure safety; Behaviourally, the person could freeze, attempt to flee, or stand and fight; Physiologically, a set of changes occurs that prepares the body to flee or fight so that the potential physical danger can be survived (Page, 1999; Steimer, 2002).

Epinephrine (also called adrenaline, is a hormone that increases heart rate, constricts blood vessels and dilates air passages) is released to stimulate the body into action, pupils dilate to attend to threat, breathing rate increases, and heart rate and blood pressure increase to ensure an adequate supply of oxygen (see, for example, Brodal, 2004). Blood is diverted to the muscles (which tense up ready for action), the (temporarily unnecessary) immune and digestive functions are inhibited, the liver releases glucose to provide quick energy and sweating is initiated to cool the body (Brodal, 2004). This fight-or-flight response (as espoused by Cannon, 1927), which incorporates a combination of mental, behavioural and physiological factors, is a normal response to danger that increases the possibility that a person will be able to cope with a threat. Similar reactions are available in non-humans, although the particular manifestations differ across species (e.g. an opossum will ‘play dead’ and a porcupine will raise its spikes) (Pain, 1999). The impact of fear on the body and its preparedness for action do not end there. Grossman (2004: 31) notes that when heart rate rises above 115 beats per minute (bpm), fine motor skills deteriorate; above 145 bpm, complex motor skills deteriorate; above 175 bpm, one loses peripheral and depth perception, audition and cognitive processing. These are the effects of fear, not merely of heartbeat elevated by bodily exercise (Collins, 2009). Under these

emotional conditions, violence does not come off as intended; escape from danger may be affected, as would accurate recollection of the events that unfolded.

However, the interrelatedness of these levels of emotions is cause for more searching questions. One of the main questions addressed by earlier scientific theories of emotions was whether the physiological changes precede the emotional experience, or if they are a consequence of it (Steimer, 2002:232). For James (1884) and Lange (1885 cited in Steimer, 2002:233), "...the bodily changes follow directly the perception of the existing fact, and...our feelings of the same changes as they occur *is* the emotion" (emphasis in original). In other words, according to the James-Lange theory of emotions, stimuli reaching the cerebral cortex (a sheet of neural tissue within the brain that plays a key role in memory, attention, perceptual awareness, thought, language, and consciousness) induce visceral changes (which relate to deep inward feelings rather than that of the intellect), which are then perceived as emotion (Steimer, 2002). Cannon and Bard (1915–1932) disagreed with James-Lange and criticised this theory and proposed that the neurophysiological aspects of emotions are subcortical and involve the thalamus (which is a structure that is found within the brains of humans (and other vertebrates). Function includes relaying sensation, spatial sense, and motor signals to the cerebral cortex, along with the regulation of consciousness, sleep, and alertness (Cannon, 1927; 1987). Stimuli from the environment activate the thalamus (for detail on the function of the thalamus see Percheron, 2003), which relays information to the cortex and viscera, and back again to the cortex to generate the 'emotional state' (Steimer, 2002).

Watson (1970) was also very critical of what he called the 'introverted viewpoint' of James' (1884) theory (Steimer, 2002). Importantly, he considered that there were only three types of non-learned emotional responses, which he called 'fear,' 'rage,' and 'love', although he wanted to "...strip them out of all their old connotations" (Watson, 1970). These three emotional responses can be elicited by sets of specific stimuli. Thus, a sudden noise or loss of physical support can induce an innate fear reaction, and restraint of bodily movements triggers rage (Watson, 1970 cited in Steimer, 2002:232). He also mentioned the fact that these emotional responses can be conditioned and that, although these reactions are usually accompanied by specific behaviours, "...visceral and glandular factors predominate" (Watson, 1970:56).

The view that there is a limited set of emotions (eg, fear, rage, etc) with specific neurophysiological and neuroanatomical substrates that can be considered as 'basic' and serve as the primitive building blocks from which the other, more complex emotions are built, was challenged as late as 1990 (Turner, 1990). However, Ekman (1992) who has convincingly argued that there is now enough evidence of universals in expression and in physiology to suggest a biological basis for these elementary emotions (cited in Steimer, 2002). Panksepp (1992, cited in Steimer, 2002) added to these arguments by stating that "genetically dictated brain systems that mediate affective-emotional processes do exist, even though there are likely to be semantic ambiguities in how we speak about these systems."

Given the conceptual debate surrounding fear of crime earlier in the Chapter and, in light of the above statement concerning the presence of a basic emotional tool kit from which other emotions are derived, there remains an important point that Steimer (2002) addresses. That point considers whether there is a biological difference between fear and anxiety. As discussed, the main function of fear and anxiety is to serve as a signal of danger, threat, or motivational conflict, and to trigger appropriate responses (Steimer, 2002:233). Ethologists, according to McFarland (1987) define fear as a motivational state aroused by specific stimuli that give rise to defensive behaviour or escape whereas anxiety is a concept that ethologists do not use according to Steimer (2002) because their definition of fear does, in fact, include all the more biological aspects of anxiety (2002:233). However, there is considerable literature pertaining to the differences between the two according to their etiologies, response patterns, time courses, and intensities (Steimer, 2002). These differences, it can be argued, are reflected in the complexities of defining fear, its measurement and its lack of clear conception in non-biological fields. Ethologically, however, the differences point to a clear justification for a distinction between fear and anxiety (Craig *et al.*, 1992) and this is where this discussion must now turn. Fear and anxiety are obviously overlapping; aversive, activated states centred on threat and, as already considered, share strong negative feelings and bodily manifestations (Öhman, 2008). Öhman (2008) suggests that fear is centred on the dread of impending disaster and an intense urge for defending the self and getting away from dangerous situations. Clinical

anxiety, however, has been described as an ineffective and unpleasant feeling of foreboding (Lader and Marks, 1973 cited in Öhman, 2008:710).

Importantly then, fear is considered as ‘post-stimulus’ (i.e., elicited by a defined fear stimulus) whereas anxiety can be said to be ‘pre-stimulus’ (i.e., anticipatory to [more or less real] threatening stimuli) (Öhman, 2008:710). This realisation supports the necessity of looking at fleeting encounters in order to understand the experience of being feared. The stimulus from which fear is elicited is the presence of an individual who is feared. In addition the biological bases of fear and anxiety are recognised, and the major brain structures and neuronal circuits involved in emotional information processing and behaviour are delineated (see for specific examples Steimer, 2002:231-249). This being said, emotional and cognitive processes cannot be dissociated, even when considering such a basic emotion as fear. The cognitive apprehension of events and situations is critically involved in emotional experiences and also influences coping strategies or defence mechanisms (Steimer, 2002). Molecular biology techniques, according to Steimer (2002:244), have been successful in exploring the role of various neurotransmitters, peptides, hormones, and their receptors in mediating the appraisal of stressful stimuli, information processing through the various neuronal circuits, and the physiological responses and behaviours associated with fear and anxiety. It is now clear that individual differences in affective or coping styles (which are also observed in nonhuman species) are directly associated with vulnerability to psychopathology. Studying these individual differences, including sex-related differences, in humans and in animal models have given interesting clues about the brain mechanisms of emotional behaviour (Steimer, 2002:244). Steimer (2002) finally suggests that the study of genetic predisposition and environmental influences, particularly during early development, in determining vulnerability traits and anxiety-prone endophenotypes (a psychiatric concept used to describe a specific kind of biomarker such as that seen in the study of schizophrenia) is certainly becoming one of the major, and perhaps most promising, domains of contemporary research with respect to our understanding of the etiology of anxiety and mood disorders (Steimer, 2002:244). The purpose of the concept is to divide behavioural symptoms into more stable phenotypes (an organism’s observable traits or characteristics) with a clear genetic connection.

b) Expressions of Fear

Having discussed the impact of biological concerns on fear it is important to consider, in light of the aims of the research, how these internal physical changes are expressed in ways that are visible to observers, how these expressions of emotion are read and interpreted and, importantly, how accurate or reliable these interpretations are.

According to Matsumoto *et al.* (2008) the study of expressions (facial) is noted for both empirical advances and for theoretical controversy. “The literature indicates that facial expressions of emotion, as described by Darwin over 135 years ago, (1) include universal reliable markers of discrete emotions when emotions are aroused and there is no reason to modify and manage the expression; (2) covary with distinct subjective experience; (3) are part of a coherent package of emotional responses that includes appraisals, physiological reactions, other non-verbal behaviours, and subsequent actions, as well as individual differences and mental and physical health; (4) are judged in discrete categories; and (5) as such, serve many interpersonal and social regulatory functions” (Matsumoto *et al.*, 2008:211). Darwin (cited in Matsumoto *et al.*, 2008) claimed that, facial expressions are the residual actions of more complete behavioural responses, and occur in combination with other bodily responses – vocalisations, postures, gestures, skeletal muscles movements and physiological responses. For example, characteristics of fear behaviour like putting the hands in front of the face and running for cover provides strong fear signals to observers who may not themselves be aware of any danger (Grezes *et al.*, 2006). It is in the claims of the universality of emotional expression that can be of the greatest importance to the understanding of the experience of being feared. For example, how does a feared person know they are being feared? Matsumoto *et al.* (2008) suggest that the strongest evidence for the universality of emotional expression comes from studies that aim to directly measure facial expression when emotion is being elicited in subjects. Further to this, and in accordance with Grezes *et al.* (2006), the universality does not lie solely within facial expression to include gestures, postures and the like. For example, if a person was cowering in front of another, shielding their face and head with their arms, this would likely signal fear to an onlooker regardless of whether this onlooker could see the facial expressions at that given moment.

A well-known example of the universality of facial expression is Ekman's (1972) study that used American and Japanese participants who watched a series of neutral and stress films, and whose facial expressions were covertly recorded throughout. The resulting data allowed Ekman (1972) to identify six emotions – anger, fear, disgust, happiness, sadness and surprise. Subsequent studies (more than 25 according Matsumoto *et al.*, 2008) have supported Ekman's (1972) original conception that emotional expression is common across nationalities and cultures. This realisation is crucial in the process of legitimising the awareness of those involved in an encounter in recognising the signs of fear in others. Further, this recognition need not be confined to facial expressions. For example, Grezes *et al.* (2006), as already mentioned, looked at how fear signals from the whole body were perceived using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI). They found that viewing neutral and fearful body expressions enhances amygdala activity (the amygdala performs a primary role in processing and memory of emotional reactions). Moreover actions expressing fear activate the temporal pole (auditory perception) and lateral orbital cortex (controls eye movement) more than neutral actions; and finally differences in activations between static and dynamic bodily expressions were larger for actions expressing fear in the superior temporal sulcus (involved in the perception of where others are gazing and is thus important in determining where others' emotions are being directed) and premotor cortex (critical to sensory guidance of muscles in the body) compared to neutral actions (Grezes *et al.*, 2006). For example, Grezes *et al.* (2006:959) suggest, “The sound of gunfire immediately causes one to bend forward and to run for cover. Such characteristic fear behaviour protects from danger and also communicates a strong fear signal to observers who may not have heard the noise themselves.”

Emotional Body Language (EBL) provides reliable cues to recognise another's emotions even when viewed from a distance and when the facial expression is not visible (see for example, Gelder, 2006). Again, this is an important realisation. It allows us to understand that expressions, whether given facially or bodily, are not only strongly indicative of emotional expression, but are universally recognisable as such. For example, “from everyday experience we know that an angry face is more menacing when accompanied by a fist, and a fearful face more worrisome when the person is in flight (that is, running away)” (Gelder, 2006:242).

In this sense it is safe to say that when a person perceives that they are feared, because they have viewed the actions of those they encounter to be so, they are likely to be basing their assessment on universally demonstrable behaviours. The source for this interpretive information can vary, be it facial expression, bodily gestures or both, depending on the situational circumstances. For example, “fearful faces signal a threat, but do not provide information about either the source of the threat or the best way to deal with it. By contrast, fearful body positions signal a threat and at the same time specify the action undertaken by the individuals fearing for their safety” (Gelder, 2006: 242). Along the same lines, an assessment of danger based on only facial expressions can be limiting. “When a frightening event occurs, there might not be time to look for the fearful contortions in an individual’s face, but a quick glance at the body may tell us all we need to know” (Gelder, 2006: 242).

Despite the possible situational difficulties in recognising or seeing facial expression, the universality of their interpretation has strong evidence. Matsumoto *et al.* (2008:222) suggest that early studies in the universal recognition of facial expressions of emotion were judgement studies, in which observers of different cultures viewed facial stimuli and judged the emotions portrayed in them. More recent research by Horstmann (2003 cited in Matsumoto *et al.* 2008:224) continues to compliment the universal conclusion proposed by Ekman (1972) and suggests that facial expressions are reliable markers of emotion. According to Keltner (2003 cited in Matsumoto *et al.* 2008:224) they serve important social functions. First, they provide information about the expresser’s emotions, intentions, relationship with the target, and relationship with the environment. Second, they evoke responses, particularly emotions, from others. Third, they provide incentives for desired social behaviour. In light of Keltner’s (2003) findings, the ability to judge emotions is equally important as it may be linked to important intra and inter-personal processes and has a link with emotional intelligence (Mayer *et al.*, 2001). In short, the ability to recognise emotion and or micro-expression may lead to an individual’s propensity for detecting deception (Matsumoto *et al.*, 2008) and this ability would also lead to a better recognition of emotion more generally in the behaviour of others.

There are important implications for the research into the experience of being feared here. For example, the suggestion that bodily and facial expressions provide important information about the expresser is important, on both sides of a fearful encounter, for the establishment of meaning and the conveying of intention. The fearful person will interpret the behaviour of the person with whom they interact by reading the emotions expressed alongside an assessment of these perceived intentions and importantly, the environment (or context) in which they are expressed (Keltner, 2003). Likewise, the feared person will, alongside the intentions they themselves possess, interpret their relationship with the other person in the encounter and recognise the behaviour being expressed. Within the encounter, responses can be evoked on both sides in relation to the interpretation of the situation. For example, an extremely fearful person may flee a fearful situation, thus demonstrating a response to fearful stimuli. Likewise a feared person, recognising their status within the encounter, may wish to engage in behaviour that will serve to reassure others that they do not wish, or do not warrant this fear. Finally, the recognition of expressed emotion may provide the incentive for a desired response. In the case of fear, this may take the form of adaptive behaviour to avoid harm or perhaps, a deliberate attempt to hide fearful behaviour on the part of the fearful person.

Questions still remain that require further deliberation here. It is necessary to establish what emotion(s) signal 'crime' or alert a person to impending victimisation, if any can be identified. In light of this, it would seem necessary to find and introduce a perspective that is capable of analysing and interpreting the moments and situations in which this fear of crime victimisation and/or fear of another is experienced. It is important to understand how people identify potential conflict and, indeed, how they navigate such scenarios. Equally, it is important to understand how people identify potentially fearsome people, what they are afraid of and what they do within those situations. It could be the *possibility* of violence. In this respect it is important to identify how people identify this possibility. That is to say, whom should one expect violence from? If not an archetypal person, per se, what cues indicate the possibility of violence? How is this potential for victimisation identified by the fearful and how is it recognised by the feared? How is it acted upon by the feared? In order to make clear the intricacies of person-to-person interactions, and to define the parameters and situate the interactions that are of interest in understanding the experience of being

feared, a conceptual framework that details and structures such phenomena is needed. Before that happens it is useful to recognise that, in light of the ability for emotions and expressions to be universally recognised it allows for the research to legitimise the idea that those people who experience being feared are able to accurately recognise expressions of fear in the people they observe. This may seem a small detail, if the universal conclusion proposed by Ekman (1972), which suggests that facial expressions are reliable markers of emotion, then those that observe and interpret these markers are reliable source from which to begin our specific understanding.

c) Towards an Understanding of 'Being Feared?'

To conclude the Chapter, it is important critically to introduce the concept of being feared and how exploring this 'inside out' view of fear of crime can help to expand understanding within the field. An investigation into the perspective of the feared is not an entirely new endeavour. It has been considered from a life experience/life narrative perspective (Ellis, 1995; Kelley, 1988) and has been situated within the wider fear of crime literature (Day, 2009). There is a need to have focused research to enable the exploration of the dynamics of fearful encounters in a way that has yet to be fully understood. As this Chapter has shown, the history (both politically and academically) often centres its efforts on the victim's (actual and potential) perceptions of crime. Questions and disagreements surrounding the measurement of fear of crime reflect this direction of thinking. This research, as already stated, takes its inspiration and direction from much of this work. This enables this research to understand the conditions, environments, and expressions of fear of crime as experienced by the fearful. It also, crucially, has provided this research with a starting point for understanding who and what people are afraid of.

In understanding this, there is a need to restate how being feared might be understood as a concept and to allow those that experience it to assign its true meaning and explain its varied contexts and nuances as they experience them. By addressing being feared, it turns the focus of fear of crime research towards those who are perceived to be threatening, and to those groups that the public views as potential perpetrators of crime. Questions remain unanswered about the perceptions, emotions and ensuing

actions of those who are perceived as a threat to security by others. Kirsten Day (2009) suggests that fear between people in public spaces is so universal as to almost pass without mention. Yet the perception of fear in interactions from this perspective, how this is recognised, and how these perceptions are attributed is, up to now, very narrowly understood. As already stated, for an experience with such apparent universality, there is a dearth of understanding concerning the perspective of the feared.

Previous work concerning this perspective such as Ellis (1995) and Kelly (1988) offer personal accounts of being feared. Day (2009) completed a qualitative study of university age males. Its focus was on a sample exploring primarily the experience of ethnic minority males. As such, the breadth of experiences and range of contexts for the experience of being feared is necessarily limited. This study has been designed to explore the experience of being feared from a wider range of experiences. This includes the everyday, mundane interactions all the way to the most extreme environments of human violence. In order to add to the vast array of fear of crime literature the study needs to consider a broader array of contexts in everyday interactions than has been achieved within the field to-date. Fear, within an interaction, can be exacerbated by deeper symbolic and social meanings. Individuals can assign the causal factors of perceived fear towards their occupational endeavours as well as or instead of personal characteristics.

It is from a point of deeper understanding of fear of crime more generally, and the established importance of being feared that this research is able to take its first steps. Initially this is centred on identifying the people that are most likely to have experienced being feared. The research needs to be able to frame the moments when people meet, face-to-face and define the contexts in which being feared is realised and understood. This can then be utilised to guide the focus of the data collection and focus the participants on recounting the specific details of their experiences. This ‘inside out’ perspective adds a dynamic to the existing literature but, it must be stressed, that such a position is not possible without understanding first what those on the inside (the feared) are looking out onto. It is this point that situates and links this research endeavour alongside the rest of the fear of crime field.

Chapter 3) Setting the Scene with Goffman

a) An Introduction to Goffman

The purpose of this Chapter is to introduce a conceptual framework that will allow us to understand the meaning and interpretations inherent in interpersonal communication. A conceptual framework based on the work of Erving Goffman has been developed. As previously mentioned, this situates the research on a micro-analytical scale and places it within a symbolic interactionist tradition. The Chapter explains and uses Goffman's overarching concept of dramaturgy. Alongside this, the Chapter introduces insights from *Encounters* (1961), the concept of 'performance' from *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959) and *Frame Analysis* (1974) as well as drawing on additional elements from the work of Goffman. The Chapter concludes with a deeper look into the critiques of Goffman's work and how this relates to the thesis and its aims.

Leading on from the previous Chapter there is a key thematic question that needs to be addressed: How can we best explore and begin to understand being feared? To answer this there are a number of things that need to be considered. First, within the thematic question is the implicit fact that in order to understand being feared it is important to observe that it is not only a spatial or temporal concern but one that includes a living object of fear – a person. Second, there are situations when we fear people or we fear that they will do something to us that we do not want; under what conditions does this happen? When it does happen how does the person, who is the object of this fear, realise? How does the feared person make sense of this and how do they link it to their experiences of life within a wider society and their sense of self? To answer these questions a micro-sociological approach will be needed that can consider an individual's sense of meaning in the minutia of interaction and a way of framing these experiences over a period of time. This starts by turning to the work of Erving Goffman to engage in several of his sociological contributions as a way to begin to conceptualise the dynamics of being feared. This Goffmanian framework will use dramaturgy, encounters, performance and frame analysis.

Goffman's dramaturgy makes it possible to identify that each aspect of a person's behaviour is essentially expressive in both the giving and the receiving of communicative information. Goffman's overarching concept, of dramaturgy in *Presentation of Self in Everyday life* (1959) conceptualises that all life is theatrical and this provides a detailed metaphor for understanding human interaction and how humans present themselves in society. It also, importantly, forms the basis upon which it is possible to analyse meaning within an interaction, how this meaning is constructed and how it endures. This places emphasis firmly within the micro-scale social examination of symbolic interactionism. The work of Mead, Cooley and Blumer were of particular influence to Goffman's work and are cited throughout. The emphasis within the symbolic interactionist tradition is again seen with *Encounters* (Goffman, 1961). Within *Encounters* (1961), Goffman conceptualised an area of specific interaction that metaphorically frames a situation within which it is possible to analyse fleeting encounters. Here the personal perceptions of specific interaction can create the experiences with which this research will engage and to which the participants will give meaning, attribute cause, apply reason and describe and structure experience. It is the moment when our actors meet and the expressions given by the 'interactants' form the perceptions of fear from which we can draw. Performance allows us to consider the 'ingredients' of each encounter. It gives us a framework to move away from a metaphorical frame towards an analysis of the actions and mannerisms shown on both sides of an interaction. In this sense we can identify that those who are feared are not only passive (are feared without a direct effort to be so) but can be active (specifically try to elicit fear). For example, some people might want to be feared. It is how this is acted out that can be illuminated through this study and ultimately why Goffman's framework, as used in *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959), is so useful. This performative, dramaturgical view of the world can be read and understood without witting knowledge of the existence of these phenomena. Thus the signals of fear in others, as identified by those that may have caused them/are the object of them, will be of great importance. It will be in the reflection of behaviour within encounters and the regularity with which they occur that can lead to a more structured understanding of what it is like to be feared. *Frame Analysis* (1974) represents a culmination in Goffman's work that links the situational aspects of interaction with the structural concerns of an individual within society. Goffman used the idea of frames to label

‘schemata of interpretation’ that allow individuals or groups to “locate, perceive, identify, and label events and occurrences, thus rendering meaning, organizing experiences, and guiding actions” (Goffman, 1974:21). Goffman’s schema brings these elements together to provide a metaphorical frame within which people can describe their experiences regardless of their specific knowledge of frames, as a concept and regardless of whether they have ever sought structure within their experiences before. This research, in light of this, will be able to identify, through investigation, how people experience being feared and what impact this has on the structure of their lives.

As discussed in the preceding Chapter, this perspective moves away from the current literature on fear of crime. This is not to suggest that a hitherto primary focus on the fearful with specific concentration on spatial, temporal or other extraneous external factors are unimportant to an understanding of fear of crime – quite the opposite. This being so, the question that still requires answering concerns how best to approach an understanding of what it is like to be feared. Erving Goffman’s work provides the best example of how to approach a topic based on the individual interpretation and structure of human interaction and this is why it has been chosen.

The Dramaturgical Model

Goffman conceptualised social life using a dramaturgical model, that is, all social life is theatrical within his (1959) book *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. The dramaturgical model is a metaphor for understanding human interaction and how humans present themselves in society. It is a theatrical framework that interprets individual behaviour as the dramatic projection of a chosen self. Dramaturgy is a sociological perspective stemming from symbolic interactionism. Much of the output in dramaturgical thinking has been either about, or inspired by, the work of Erving Goffman. There have, however, been notable efforts, for example by Lyman and Scott (1975), Combs and Mansfield (1976), Manning (1977), Harre (1979), Gronbeck (1980), Hare (1985), Cochran (1986) and Hare and Bloomberg (1988), to extend, elaborate and make a case for dramaturgy as a distinctive model, and in some cases a theory, of human behaviour (Brissett and Edgely, 1990).

The most straightforward definition of dramaturgy is that it is the study of how human beings accomplish meaning in their lives. Like other forms of interpretive explanation, it focuses on “connecting action to its sense rather than behaviour to its determinants” (Geertz, 1983:34). By adopting a dramaturgical model it is important to note that it assumes that there is a difference between what a person really ‘is’ or thinks he/she really is and what he/she presents to the outside world – how he/she wants to be seen by others (Goffman, 1959). This implies that social life is, metaphorically, a stage on which individuals enact the different roles in which they find themselves and different individualities that they want to demonstrate or the different ways that they interpret this role. “All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players: They have their exits and their entrances; and one man in his time plays many parts, His acts being seven ages” (Shakespeare, C1599-1600, *As You Like It*, 2/7). Goffman (1959), as part of this dramaturgical model, sees social life in terms of actors acting, that is, all of us are like actors on a stage, presenting a play. The ‘audience’ is made up of other social actors. According to Goffman (1959) we are all constantly play-acting all the time with each other.

Therefore, Goffman sees social interaction as involving ‘impression management’. This means that an actor wants to feel that he or she is performing the role and that he or she is playing well. Thus, when we are interacting with each other, we adopt certain strategies to try and ensure that our ‘act’ will be seen by an audience in a way that will reflect well on us (Goffman, 1959) or in the intended way (i.e. being violent). Here, importantly, Goffman focuses on both the role of the actor and of the audience. This suggests that within Goffman’s dramaturgy there is an emphasis on both the giving and receiving of expressive information. Additionally, Goffman (1959), in his dramaturgical model emphasises that the actor intends his performance to reflect well on him (‘performance’ is discussed in detail later). This is based on Goffman’s broad description of the dramaturgical model that can be developed in more specific settings. Strong (1988) suggested that Goffman, with his development of dramaturgy, explored virgin territories and left it to others to seek more substantiated conclusions. Strong’s (1988) point is an important one. He suggests that Goffman “was not too fussy about the means by which he derived his terms, or the manner in which others might operationalise them. And since he was driven on by his

desire to map, however provisionally, the many contours of his presumed newfound domain” (Strong, 1988:230).

For Goffman, in *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959), the scripts of many types of interaction outline in basic terms what roles are available and what is generally supposed to occur. However, in contrast to the theatre, individuals in real life negotiate among themselves to determine who will play which role and exactly how events will transpire. Individuals must also work to convince others that their roles are genuine; in doing so, they use the props appropriate to the role and enlist the tacit support of other actors to control the events that occur.

Dramaturgy asserts that people’s activities, their selections, their accomplishments and their communications in social interaction establish the meaning that can be derived from them (Brissett and Edgley, 1990:4). In other words, it is in the very expressiveness of their doing that the inexorable flow of meaningful human behaviour resides (Brissett and Edgley, 1990). For the dramaturgical vision of human interaction ‘meaning’ is not a legacy of or from culture, socialisation, or institutional arrangements, nor the realisation of either psychological or biological potential (Mead, 1934). That is to say that meaning is a continually problematic accomplishment of human interaction and it is fraught with change, novelty and ambiguity (Brissett and Edgley, 1990). This assertion puts dramaturgy firmly within a micro analytical frame and in doing so proves its usefulness to the study of fearful interactions. However, a full understanding of how an individual establishes this meaning is needed.

Meaning and Interaction

Mead, in *Mind, Self and Society* (1934) provides a definition of how ‘meaning’ is established within human interaction. “Meaning arises and lies within the field of the relation between the gesture of a human organism and the subsequent behaviour of this organism as indicated to another organism and the subsequent (or resultant) behaviour of the given organism, then it has meaning” (Mead, 1934:75). In other words, Mead’s (1934) definition situates the parameters in which meaning is established between humans through communicative behaviour. Simply put,

behaviour is given meaning by the observing person to the gestures of the observed and meaning can be observed in the reactions of other people.

Therefore, meaning between social actors cannot be assumed to involve a mutually accepted interpretation, rather it is given its meaningfulness by the individual's interpretation of the gestures of others (Mead, 1934), however it might be received and however it might be intended. So, importantly, we observe behaviour and we impute meaning. Here, meaning can only be deduced by observable behaviour. Therefore a person can only consider himself or herself as being (situationally) feared if there is observable behaviour that indicates this. Also, the conveying of meaning through gestures can be done to the point where all observers understand a shared or intended meaning or where different or discordant meanings are established between the actors. For example, a person joins a queue for a cash machine/ATM and is agitated because of the length of the queue and an important appointment they are late for. Their behaviour and mannerisms would be, as they see it, demonstrative of the aforementioned delays. For the person immediately in front of them in the queue entering their security code the behaviour could be interpreted very differently. They are unaware of the impending appointment and consider the behaviour to be irrational and worrying. In this example, the meaning that was intended in the display of impatience was not received in the way it was given. It is only in interaction with similarly expressive and empowered others that meaning emerges, and herein resides the fragility and precariousness of this achievement (Brissett and Edgley, 1990). The precariousness within the example above lies in the difficulty in establishing a shared understanding or intended meaning within the observed behaviour.

Mead (1934:78) suggests “meaning... is not to be conceived fundamentally as a state of consciousness or as a set of organised relations existing or subsiding mentally outside the field of experience into which they enter; on the contrary, it should be conceived objectively as having its existence entirely within the field itself. The response of one organism to the gesture of another in any given social act is the meaning of that gesture.” In this sense, meaning within an interaction can only be established in specific relation to the events at the point of the experience itself and cannot be brought into it. In relation to a fearful interaction, fear can be considered to

be present if the responding gesture by one of the interactants is considered to be indicative of fear by an observer.

Thus, Mead's point is an important one. First, it places the establishment of meaning with the individual. In doing so it legitimises the belief an observer has in the interpretation they make of other's actions. This is true of both a fearful individual and of an individual who perceives fear in another; even if the meaning derived by each individual within the interaction is contradictory. The personal agency inherent in this legitimating process also leads to the underlying concept that meaning, as established by the observer, is the representative of *their* reality. This process of objectifying meaning as the interpretation and counter-interpretation during interaction also allows us to legitimise the experience of being feared. Second, it links nicely with the adoption of a Goffmanian framework placing the specific establishment of meaning within a fleeting encounter (discussed in detail shortly). This also places an emphasis on microanalysis and the importance in realising the expressiveness of all human activity (Goffman, 1959).

Brissett and Edgley (1990:4) also suggest that it is important to understand that there is nothing in this expressive/impressive dimension of life that necessitates, requires or demands any consideration of cognition, volition, deliberation or intention. It is simply that whether we like it or not, plan it or not, want it to be or want it not to be, our behaviour is expressive. It is how we come to know others and how we come to know ourselves (Brissett and Edgley, 1990). It is also how we come to know our position within the wider social world as reflected in the reaction people have to us in situations of interaction and how the reactions of others may shape our ongoing behaviour and our ongoing sense of self.

“In every encounter, no matter what else is accomplished or what the intention of the person, the individual effectively conveys a definition of the situation which includes an image of self, and this definition of the situation may be confirmed, modified or rejected. The audience will tend to identify the person by his presented self, which includes elements of which he may be unaware, whether he wills it or not” (Zicklin, 1968:240).

Indeed, Goffman (1959) also directed a certain focus on the communicative dimension of human interaction. Goffman suggested “the expressiveness of the individual... appears to involve two radically different kinds of sign activity: the expression that he gives and the expression that he gives off. The first involves verbal symbols or their substitute, which he uses admittedly and solely to convey the information that he and others are known to attach to these symbols. This is communication in the traditional and narrow sense. The second involves a wide range of action that others can treat as symptomatic of the actor, the expectation being that the action was performed for reasons other than the information conveyed in this way” (Goffman, 1959:2).

There are important points to make here. First, is that Goffman treads a fine dramaturgical line between his emphasis on either the performer or audience. Carlson (1996:35) suggests, “cultural performance theorists tend to place more emphasis on the audience or upon the community in which performance occurs. Theorists...if they are sociologists, naturally tend in this direction while ethical philosophers and psychologists naturally emphasise the activities and operations of the performer. Although Goffman draws emphasis strongly upon both sorts of concern, his overall emphasis, is rather more toward the audience.” That is to say, Goffman’s emphasis focuses on how dramaturgical expression functions within society and how it is recognised and viewed (Carlson, 1996). Relating this to understanding the experience of being feared, the audience member(s) can be the feared person, observing and analysing the behaviour of those that are fearful. In the same sense, they are also the performer, providing the cues (whether intended or not) from which other fearful interactants will react and respond.

Second, it is with communication in this broad sense that dramaturgy is interested and how meaning can be established on different levels (Brissett and Edgley, 1990). Dramaturgical meaning is concerned with the inexorable expressive link between discursive (language, speech) and non-discursive (clothing, hairstyle, gestures) (Brissett and Edgley, 1990) communication. So in this sense, meaning within an interaction is not restricted to verbal communication. It considers both the importance of discourse (Mead, 1934) and the importance of appearance (Stone, 1986). As has been shown previously, non-discursive communication can be enough to infer fear

(see for example Madriz, 1997), when fearful people have described the appearance and characteristics of the people whom they fear. Indeed, this can be manifest with or without the addition of discursive communication.

Third, dramaturgy is a “fully two-sided view of human interaction” (Brissett and Edgley, 1990:4). In other words, actors can only establish meaning when an audience observes it. This helps to frame the type of interaction this research is exploring. It helps to frame fear interactions in which actors are present and not pervasive relationship based fear over time - it provides a situational frame. The meaning therein is open to wide interpretation but the two-sided nature of this interaction is a distinguishing realisation. Stone and Farberman (1986) discuss the ways in which human’s ‘negotiate’ the meanings derived from interaction with others suggesting, “First, man is conceived as a passive neutral agent buffeted about by stimuli that impinge upon his nerve endings. These stimuli may be external-reifications of society, culture, physical environment, or words and other symbols. They may also be internal instincts, needs or drives. Or they may be some combination of external and internal forces. Second, and in direct contrast, man is viewed as an active agent, selecting those stimuli or objects to which he shall respond, accomplishing his selections in the matrix of communication and transforming his society or his social world in the process” (Stone and Faberman, 1986:11).

Stone and Faberman’s (1986) suggestions place the performer in a contrasting or precarious position. On the one hand an individual could appear to be a subordinate or passive member of society from which stimuli are applied from the outside in, or are driven by a more basic need. On the other presents an individual as an active participant in a dramaturgical world, giving and receiving expressive behaviour, experiencing meaning within the world via a selective filter. As far as being the object of fear is concerned, the interpretations derived from this selective procedure are important. As Stone and Faberman (1986) suggest, the process of stimulus selection and the resultant responses can transform an individual’s social world. This can have considerable implications on the lives of those that experience being the object of fear. This is true regardless of whether fear is the desired outcome of interaction.

Dramaturgical Awareness

‘Dramaturgical awareness’ is a term used by Brissett and Edgley (1990). It refers to the process by which a person can become, not only expressive but also aware of their expressiveness (Brissett and Edgley, 1990). “The awareness of this (the dramaturgical) principle can be used to organise one’s experiences, communicate more effectively with other people, manipulate and deceive them, or present one’s self in a more favourable light” (Brissett and Edgley, 1990). This is a simple, but crucial observation. First, it moves forward from the more generic observation that dramaturgy is a fully two-sided phenomenon (Brissett and Edgley, 1990) to considering that the principle is one by which experiences can be organised and that this can, in turn, influence the relationship and the impression an individual has with the people and the world around them. Second, it leads to an understanding that the expressions of others and the self are both implicitly and explicitly meaningful. Third, the implication being, that an actor’s expressiveness has the capacity (although they may not necessarily be aware of this capacity) to influence the reactions of others. At which point, these experiences can form an ongoing and continuously developing narrative of an individual’s place in society. It is that, which we wish to explore in a very specific context.

Zicklin (1968) expands and clarifies the possible variances of interaction as viewed dramaturgically: “First there is the interaction in which the individual does not care how he is seen by others...Second, we have the individual who generates an impression unintentionally, merely by doing what he does, or being the way he generally is.... Third, we find the individual who wants to communicate to others how he experiences the world, including himself, and wants to give a candid realisation of his own unique, total, being in the world.... In this mode, the person intends to grasp the way in which the other experiences himself, as the other reveals this in his thoughts, expression and actions.... Finally, the one would face those orientations to the other in which a conscious attempt is made to make the other perceive the attributes and characteristics of self that one has chosen to emphasise” (Zicklin, 1968:240). Here Zicklin (1968) unfolds a universe of different types of interactions that are important for an understanding of the experience of being feared. The implication that can be taken from this is that within interaction there is a variation,

within the different types of interaction, between a person who passively generates an impression without intention, to a person who actively emphasises certain characteristics.

“Dramaturgical awareness is variable. People do not intend to be dramaturgical, nor do they have an intrinsic need to be dramaturgical. Sometimes people care a great deal about how they appear in front of other people; sometimes they could not care less. In any relationship, awareness of one’s expressiveness would seem to depend in both the significance and tolerance of the other. For whatever reason, some others are just more important to the actor” (Brissett and Edgley, 1990:6).

Brissett and Edgley’s (1990) point again approaches the distinction between the importance of the actor and the audience within an interaction. Some audiences can be more enabling whilst others are very critical and challenging. It would therefore seem that the level of awareness an actor has of himself and his acts is established, in large part, by the degree of his involvement with the audience and its reception of him. Or importantly, whether, in a fearful situation specifically, the actor defines himself as the object of fear. That is to say, an actor who is aware of being feared is aware of both his role and the role of his audience as well as the context of the situation. An actor who is not aware or sensitive to the fear felt by his audience would not define himself in these terms. So in this sense an audience without his knowledge can fear an actor that does not possess a distinct dramaturgical awareness.

Most scholars that write of dramaturgy concede that behaviour has expressive consequences (Brissett and Edgley, 1990). Indeed, in most fundamental ways that is what interaction is all about. However, when questioning the relationship dramaturgy has with dramaturgical awareness the picture is not clear. Dramaturgy is often characterised through the work of Goffman as dramaturgical awareness run amok (Brissett and Edgley, 1990). This is to say, that the dramaturgical image is often presented as one in which an actor is constantly employing his dramaturgical awareness in order to influence the impression that others have of him. This can stem from the often-cited example from Goffman (1959:15): ...“when an individual appears before others he will have many motives for trying to control the impression they receive of the situation.” This statement leaves itself open to translation in which

the motives of the dramaturgical actor are seen as nefarious, control is seen as manipulation and impression is seen to have a lack of authenticity (Brissett and Edgley, 1990). Deegan (1978), for instance, characterises Goffman's writings as a sociology of defence mechanisms, Lyman and Scott (1975) dwell on the differences between appearances and actuality, while Wilshire (1982) insists that a dramaturgical view of life implies that people conceal and also conceal the motivation to conceal.

It is certainly possible that this happens in some interactions. However, it is not necessarily as a result of employing dramaturgical awareness. This is clear when considering that whilst deceit, cynicism, con games and treachery can all be dramaturgically accomplished the same can be said for love, truth and sincerity (Brissett and Edgley, 1990). Not all presentations are misrepresentation in as much as it is possible that "some people may be as interested in revealing as in concealing" (Hannerz, 1980:210). Additionally, to reiterate Goffman's (1959:15) assertion that an individual will have many motives for trying to control the impression an audience receives of the situation, this has a multitude of implications for fearful situations. In as much as an actor can have just as much motivation for appearing as an object of fear as they might wish to appear as a non-threatening object or, no object within the interaction whatsoever. This is much in line with Hannerz's (1980) insight that not all presentations are attempts to conceal a different reality. Additionally it does not consider the legitimate establishment of meaning as discussed in the previous section. It does, however, highlight the need to address the various criticisms of the dramaturgical approach.

b) Encounters

Goffman (1961:17) posits a broad definition of an encounter being that of a "type of social arrangement that occurs when persons are in one another's immediate physical presence." This simple and elegant definition seems an easily applicable setting for the observance of any expressive or communicative action that happens within its boundaries. Yet Goffman's task was more detailed and therein the relevant parts of this detail must be teased out and applied to our necessarily narrower endeavour. More detailed descriptions of Goffman's encounters will be introduced, outlining how it will be used and to define a unit of analysis towards research into the experience of

being feared. To do this, interactions are broken down into several parts as described by Goffman (1961). However, Goffman himself suggested, “The term ‘encounter’; has a range of everyday meaning that reduces its value as a general term. Sometimes it is used to refer to face-to-face meetings with another that were unexpected or in which trouble occurred; sometimes it refers to meeting another at a social occasion, the frequency of comings-together during the occasion not being an issue. All of these meanings I have to exclude” (Goffman, 1961:18). Goffman’s point here is an important one. *Encounters: two studies in the sociology of interaction* (1961) concentrates on one type of interaction, *focused interaction*, as Goffman defines it. It is here that the discussion must start because a concentration on this does not, in itself, adequately serve all of our aims.

Focused and Unfocused Interaction

Goffman (1961) suggests that there was sociological tradition, prior to his insight, for distinguishing face-to-face interaction as part of the area of ‘collective behaviour’ focusing on the break down of normative interaction and concentrating thereafter on the formation of crowds, mobs, panics and riots (Goffman, 1961). Little consideration, according to Goffman (1961), had been given to orderly or uneventful face-to-face interaction. This being so, Goffman suggests that instead of subdividing face-to-face interaction into the eventful and the routine, a division should be made into the *unfocused interaction* and the *focused interaction*.

“Unfocused interaction consists of those interpersonal communications that result solely by virtue of persons being in one another’s presence, as when two strangers across the room from each other check up on each other’s clothing, posture and general manner, while each modifies his own demeanour because he himself is under observation” (Goffman, 1961:7).

A pertinent example of an unfocused interaction would be that of a journey on an underground train. There will be commuters sat in a carriage that are likely to be aware of the clothing, gender and posture of those around them (Goffman, 1961). An unfocused interaction, according to Goffman (1961), means that there

can be awareness of the presence of others and an engagement in a non-verbal interpersonal communication without a shared focus. There can be expressive communication that results solely by virtue of the participants being in one another's presence (Goffman, 1961). The concept of unfocused interactions allows us to be aware of the environments through which we travel on a daily basis and enable us to steer a smooth course through life or, in more extreme situations, to prepare for attack when combat cannot be avoided. In this sense Goffman (1961, 1971) suggests humans cannot escape from their evolutionary past. This includes the need and ability to detect and respond to predators and other animate and inanimate dangers in the environment (Warr, 1990). An understanding of unfocused interaction helps to describe what people will do, that they may perform corrective functions, and help set the directions a particular communication will take including the actions that might result from it. Goffman (1961; see also Hall, 1964) places importance on a non-structured recognition of those around us. Suggesting a level of physical and sometimes verbal communication upon which it is possible to engage without sharing a mutual focus. In order to acquire a mutual focus within an interaction it must become focused.

“Focused interaction occurs when people effectively agree to sustain for a time a single focus of cognitive and visual attention, as in conversation, a board game, or a joint task sustained by a close face-to-face circle of contributors” (Goffman, 1961:7).

It is within the co-operative element of mutual exchange that Goffman (1961) presents the focused interaction. A focused interaction can be initiated by an encounter such as eye contact, or a statement made in a particular tone of voice. When the other responds, the interaction develops and moves into the engagement phase, characterised by mutual glances, proximity of one speaker to the other, and gesture (Bartneck and Forlizzi, 2004).

In terms of the relevance of the focused interaction and, the study of fear is concerned, there is a high dependence on the characteristics and attributions made about the interaction by those who experience it. Indeed, this applies to

both focused and unfocused interactions. The relative 'focus' of an interaction will be attributed or assigned by those who apply meaning to that interaction and this point cannot be overstated.

Encounters, Focused Gatherings and Situated Activity Systems

Goffman, in *Encounters* (1961), dedicates his detailed examples exclusively on the focused interaction. However, beyond this assertion Goffman immediately ran into definitional issues. Goffman termed these interactions as "a focused gathering, or an encounter, or a situated activity system" (Goffman, 1961: 17). The assertion being that these interactions formed a natural unit of social organisation (Goffman, 1961:8). However, these concepts, and their ultimate usefulness to the research at hand, run into problems mainly due to the number of terms used to describe a focused interaction. Goffman (1961) himself suggested that the use of three terms were used out of desperation rather than by design (Goffman, 1961:17). Goffman also suggested that each of the three is unsatisfactory in many ways but each is satisfactory in ways that the others are not (Goffman, 1961). An introduction to each of these terms would be necessary to understand how an interaction can be best interpreted and understood. However, in much the same way as Goffman, it will be necessary to limit this exploration to those elements that lend themselves most effectively to the understanding of fearful interactions. First, a focus on encounters and how Goffman's own definition struggles to separate an encounter from a focused gathering. Second a look at the difference, as seen by Goffman (1961), between focused gatherings and social groups helps to situate an interaction as a temporary and fleeting event. Goffman's definitional distinctions are also important in allowing a fear research framework to be sensitive to the fact that fearful interactions are not limited to individual on individual interactions. They include individual/group interactions as well as group/group interactions. Third, situated activity systems will be introduced briefly to demonstrate that there are a number of constraints that do not work well with a focus on fearful interactions.

Encounters

Defining encounters according to Goffman as separate or distinct from focused gatherings is difficult. Within *Encounters* (1961) the terms focused gathering and encounter are often used interchangeably or simultaneously. The usefulness of the term 'encounter' can, in some senses then, seem relatively redundant if a focused gathering is adequately defined. As with Goffman's separation of focused gatherings and social groups one of the primary distinguishing features of encounters is their temporary nature, as with focused gatherings, and the tendency of members of social groups to maintain their group identity beyond the boundaries of immediate interaction – a far greater sense of social permanence. Goffman in *Encounters* (1961:17) limits himself to one type of social arrangement that occurs when persons are in one another's immediate physical presence to be called an encounter or a focused gathering (Goffman uses the terms together here). For the participants this involves: a single visual and cognitive focus of attention; a mutual relevance of acts; or an eye-to-eye ecological huddle that maximises each participant's opportunity to perceive the other participants' monitoring of him (Hermer, 2001). Here we can take Goffman's notion of an encounter which posits an immediate, zero-sum, atemporal game of interaction (Hermer, 2001) and re-cast it in such a way that captures the complexity of fear inducing conduct. The central concentration of Goffman's work in *Encounters* (1961) was on that of the focused interaction exclusively. Our attention, and the working definition that will stem from that, must not share this exclusivity. Equally, the concept of the encounter (as defined for a focused interaction) is well documented within Goffman's work. However the definition as might be used for an unfocused interaction remains less clear.

An unfocused interaction lacks the central focus of its focused alternative. It lacks the openness to verbal communication or willingness to engage in eye-to-eye contact (Goffman, 1961). So in this sense the boundaries or ingredients of an unfocused encounter appear to be reduced to being in one another's presence and, where fear is concerned, a mutual relevance of acts. Each of these definitional elements can be discussed in turn.

Being in one another's presence is a fundamental element of the interaction as

Goffman saw it – be it termed as a focused gathering or an encounter. Goffman suggests “whatever an individual does and however he appears, he knowingly and unknowingly makes information available concerning the attributes that might be imputed to him and hence the categories in which he might be placed” (Goffman, 1961:102). The ‘status symbolism’ suggested here is discussed in detail later with regard to ‘performance’. A differentiation must be clarified as to the latent structural properties of focused and unfocused interactions and their relevance to fear. As Goffman suggests, in relation to the focused interaction as documented in *Encounters* (1961), “I fall back on the assumption that, like any other element of social life, an encounter exhibits sanctioned orderliness arising from obligations fulfilled and expectations realised, and therein lies its structure” (Goffman, 1961:19).

Focused Gatherings and Social Groups

In *Encounters* (1961), as is so often the case with Goffman, the introduction of new terms require differentiation from each other. Focused gatherings and social groups are a good example of this. With these terms Goffman is keen to set apart groups that have a history and ongoing social forms from groups that are, instead, a getting-together of people. Goffman is separating the stability of interactional familiarity from a fleeting encounter. It would, therefore, be prudent to understand how focused gatherings are similar to, and different from social groups according to Goffman – a definitional issue that Goffman is keen to make. To start, Goffman (1961) does recognise that there are certain requisites shared between focused gatherings and social groups. In both instances if persons are to come together for a period of time various ‘system problems’ will have to be solved (Goffman, 1961:8). ‘System problems’ can be taken to mean a set of social interaction rules. Take the example of a political debate between office workers at lunch. Goffman (1961) asserts that participants will have to submit to rules of recruitment. In the sense of a conversation it may be a direct invitation from a participant to a non-participant to comment/join in or a question posed directly to an individual outside of the conversation. Goffman (1961) also suggests that there are limits on overt hostility and in the context of a political debate this might include a limit on emotional outbursts or personal attacks or even the expression of radical or extreme opinions. Goffman (1961) also suggests that there would be some division of labour within the interaction. This can be

marshalled by adhering to a convention of question and retort within the conversation or an expectation that everybody invited into the debate must contribute in some way.

Goffman (1961) was also keen to stress that despite the apparent similarities between focused gatherings and social groups a distinction between them is necessary.

Goffman (1961) defines a social group as “a special type of social organisation. Its elements are individuals: they perceive the organisation as a distinct collective unit, a social entity, apart from the particular relationships the participants may have to one another; they perceive themselves as members who belong, identifying with the organisation and receiving moral support for doing so; they sustain a sense of hostility to out groups. A symbolisation of reality of the group and one’s relation to it is also involved” (Goffman, 1961:9). Goffman also demonstrates the variances possible when considering social groups. According to the conception of groups as outlined above, ‘small groups’ are distinguished by what their size makes possible (Goffman, *ibid*). For example members of a small group may have a more extensive knowledge of one another, wide consensus, and reliance on informal role definition. Small groups in this sense differ in the degree to which they are formally or informally organised; long standing or short lived; multi bonded or segmental; relatively independent, much in the same way that a gang or a family might be or pinned within a well-bounded organisational structure as in the case for army platoons or office cliques (Goffman, 1961:10). The important separation between social groups and focused gatherings is that some of the properties that are important to focused gatherings and encounters seem much less important to social groups (Goffman, 1961). Examples of such properties include embarrassment, maintenance of poise, capacity for non-distractive verbal communication, adherence to a code regarding giving up and taking over the speaker role and allocation of spatial position” (Goffman, 1961: 11).

A further crucial aspect of focused gatherings, as separate from social groups is the participants’ maintenance of continuous engrossment on the official focus of activity, which is not a characteristic of social groups in general. Social groups, unlike focused gatherings or encounters, continue to exist whether the members of the group are physically present or not. In this respect a coming together can just be part of a wider phase of participation in the life of a group (Goffman, 1961). It is when considering these two aspects together that the importance of embarrassment, maintenance of

poise and the like are realised. The continuous engrossment in an official focus of activity leaves no room for interactional faux pas. Finally, there are many gatherings – such as a set of strangers playing poker at a casino – where an extremely full array of interaction processes occurs with only the slightest development of the sense of group. All these qualifications can be made even though the data for the study of social groups and for the study of focused gatherings are likely to be drawn from the same social occasion. In short, a focused gathering, according to Goffman (1961) has participants whereas a social group has members. A focused gathering is characterised by persons physically present and continuously engaged in some activity; they sustain interest in a single focus of attention, and when they lose interest or leave, the gathering is terminated. A social group retains its members as distinct within that group regardless of their proximity to each other. Though it must be remembered that social groups have gatherings, and gatherings may become groups, Goffman (1961) argues that failure to analytically separate these two types of organization tends to merge and blur what is uniquely characteristic of each.

The situated activity system is the third element of interaction described by Goffman in *Encounters*. Defining it as “a somewhat closed, self compensating, self-terminating circuit of interdependent actions” (Goffman, 1961:96). In simple terms, the situated activity system has a defined start and end. He gives examples, in *Encounters*, including the playing through of a game; surgery; the execution of one run of a small group experiment; or having a haircut. These sorts of specific interactional situations, where a task is wholly performed by one person or by a group together in one locale, are distinguished from situations where an endeavour is multi-situated (Goffman, 1961). Goffman (1961) is particularly interested within this definition in how people do things together (a specific activity) in a circumscribed (situated) environment. However, it is both of these aspects that suggest that this particular element of Goffman’s interaction schema does not suit a study into the experience of being feared. This is because there is a definitional specificity with regard to the interdependent nature of the actions and outcomes of those involved. This does not suggest that it has a use within the study of the experience of a fleeting, random and/or open encounter in which fear is perceived. This is to say, that a fearful encounter is not a self-terminating circuit of activity (Goffman, 1961) in the same way that a haircut is (to use an example from Goffman). With a haircut, there is a

predefined expectation of the activity, a defined role for the participants (one person has their hair cut and one is asked to do the cutting), there is a defined end to the interaction when the customer is satisfied and a payment is made. With a fearful encounter, there is unlikely to be a systematic, closed or repeatable activity. There will not be defined roles that would satisfy the definition of a situated activity system.

c) Performance and the Minutia of Interaction

Goffman (1959:32) uses the term 'performance' to refer to all the activity of an individual, which occurs during a period marked by his continuous presence before a particular set of observers and which has some influence on the observers. That is to say, for our purposes, 'performance' refers to the human interaction that occurs during an encounter as defined in an earlier section of this Chapter. In this sense 'performance' represents the 'ingredients' of an interaction, that expressive information that is given by individuals in each other's presence. It is this expression information from which the meaning within interaction is derived by each of the participants. Following Goffman's overarching dramaturgy, as seen in *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, interaction is a 'performance', shaped by environment and audience, constructed to provide others with impressions that are consonant with the desired goals of the actor (Goffman, 1959). Importantly, Goffman, following Mead (1934), suggests that the interpretation of the actor's performance lies with the audience. This has important connotations with everyday interaction but also, more importantly for this research, with fearful interactions. That is to say, where fear is concerned, the performance given by an actor as interpreted by an audience is of greater importance than the *intention* of the actor. This relates to a previous debate concerning the meaning within fearful interaction as interpreted through the experience of being feared. The presence of fear within an interaction is the fear that is presented by the feared individual. Thus, keeping the attention squarely with the experience of the feared individual and the attribution to self and not diluting this with a good deal of attention placed on that of the fearful actor, to darkness or any geographic or spatial features. Fear as experienced and attributed by the feared individual will remain the chief concern of this research. This is not to suggest that a performative understanding of the feared actor is not required. Within the process of

attributing the cause of fear an actor may possess a distinct understanding of their actions within a fear-provoking situation.

This being said, performance exists regardless of the mental state of the individual, according to Goffman in *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. This is because particular expectations are often imputed to the individual in spite of his or her lack of faith in, or even ignorance of, the performance (Goffman, 1959). In this sense, performers are categorised as performers regardless of whether they are aware of it or not. Goffman's (1959) 'performance', as part of a dramaturgical model, outlines ways in which performers are communicative beyond verbal interaction to a point where their environment and demeanour act as descriptive tools for impending interaction.

Front – Setting, Appearance and Manner

Goffman (1959) uses the term 'front' to refer to that part of the individual's performance that regularly functions in a general and fixed fashion to define the situation for those that observe the performance. 'Front' is therefore considered to be the expressive equipment of a standard kind intentionally or unwittingly employed by the individual during his performance (Goffman, 1959). The front acts as a vehicle of standardisation, allowing for others to understand the individual on the basis of projected character traits that have normative meanings. Goffman (1959) therefore addresses the issue of credibility when considering the characteristics of front. A front must be convincing and as such be 'in-line' with these normative expectations. This is significant in terms of attributing ethical, correct or 'inappropriate' characteristics of those around us within an interaction. Goffman, in *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, suggests that the actor transmits information via various channels. This is also a process to be controlled if others are to be convinced that behaviour is in line with the role and person they assume. This would hold particular significance for a person wishing to give and maintain a particular or specific performance. Such credibility, according to Goffman (1959), can be acquired by satisfying the expected duties and mannerisms of an attributed role (school teacher, police officer) and through consistency in the communication of activities and traits associated with specific roles. Following this Goffman breaks the concept of front down into three constituent parts - setting, appearance, and manner.

‘Setting’ refers to the furniture, décor, physical layout and other background items, which supply the ‘scenery’ and ‘stage props’ for the space of human interaction that is played out before, within or upon it (Goffman, 1959:32). In the case of a fearful interaction these external elements could take the form of alleyways, graffiti, dead-end streets, street lighting and, secluded forest or wooded areas. The setting tends to be geographically fixed (Goffman, 1959:32) so requiring those who perform within a specific setting unable to start until they are in the appropriate place and must terminate their performance when they leave (Goffman, 1959). Such an example would be that of a teacher at their school and within their classroom. Goffman does suggest that some exceptions are possible where the setting can follow along with those performing – a funeral cortege for example (Goffman, 1959). Setting, in this sense provides an important part of the experience of being feared. It may be the case that a person who perceives fear within an interaction believes that this has been caused by the setting itself. A dark alleyway, as previously suggested, might be an obvious choice rather than an assumption that the fear within the interaction was caused by the action of the actor. Goffman uses the term ‘personal front’ to refer to the other expressive equipment that is more intimately associated with the performer themselves and that which would follow the performer wherever they go. ‘Personal front’ can include: insignia of office or rank; clothing; sex, age and racial characteristics; size and looks; posture; speech patterns; facial expressions; bodily gestures; and the like (Goffman, 1959). Goffman (1959) suggests that some of these characteristics, these vehicles for conveying signs, are relatively fixed over a period of time and do not vary for the individual from situation to situation. Some of these vehicles, however, are relatively transitory like facial expression. This can vary during a performance and from one moment to the next (Goffman, 1959). This variance, as described by Goffman, from one moment to the next has been experienced by the author in relation to the reactions of others to clothing and the class/threat implications therein. It has become very obvious that there is a marked difference in the reaction of those encountered when wearing a tracksuit compared to wearing a tweed jacket, for example.

Goffman further sub-divides personal front into ‘appearance’ and ‘manner.’

‘Appearance’ refers to those stimuli which function at the time to tell us of the performer’s social statuses. Expectations about appearance are, according to Goffman in *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, often regularised or normative within a culture. ‘Appearance signs’ are selected, for example, corporate and gang uniforms. Appearance also works ritualistically to tell an audience of the performer's status - formal or informal, conformity/individuality. Dress, in this sense can serve as ‘props’ (clothes, body posture, facial expressions, gestures) that serve to communicate gender, status, occupation, age and personal commitments. These ‘props’ can serve to demonstrate group validity in formal and informal group collectives. For example, a suit and tie can signal a person’s validity in a professional occupation in the same way that a particular style of clothing can signal membership of a gang or musical genre – the Mods and the Rockers of the 1960s famously represent such a divide. These stimuli also tell us of the individual’s temporary ritual state: that is, whether he is engaging in formal social activity, work, or informal recreation; whether or not he is celebrating a new phase in the season cycle (such as wearing shorts instead of trousers) or in his life-cycle (no-longer wearing a school uniform) (Goffman, 1959).

‘Manner’ refers to those stimuli which function at the time to warn us of the interaction role the performer will expect to play in the oncoming situation. Manner, simply put refers to how an actor plays the role, the personal touch. It works to warn others of how the performer will act or seek to act in role (dominant, aggressive, yielding, receptive and the like). Thus a haughty aggressive manner may give the impression that the performer expects to be the one who will initiate the verbal interaction and direct its course (Goffman, 1959:35). Whereas a meek, apologetic manner may give the impression that a performer expects to follow the lead of others or at least that he can be led to do so (Goffman, 1959:35). Here Goffman suggests that we often expect a confirming consistency between appearance and manner; we expect that the differences in social statuses among the interactants will be expressed in some way by congruent differences in the indications that are made of an expected interaction role (Goffman, 1959:35). That is to say, if an observer imputes a role upon someone that they will be helpful and honest (like asking a policeperson for directions), they will assume that this expectation will be upheld. They have formed this expectation by relating the policeperson’s appearance (as a person in uniform) and their expectation of the role they perform. Likewise, this imputed role, and

therefore expectations, can be negative. If a person observes someone wearing the insignia of a youth gang, they would expect the manner of this person to be in-line with the expectations they have formed of such an appearance. Goffman, in *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, does illustrate that there is a possible conflict or contradiction between appearance and manner when these expectations of interaction are not fulfilled. In the same way that there is an expectation of a degree of consistency between appearance and manner there is also, according to Goffman (1959) an expected coherence among setting, appearance and manner. Inconsistency with appearance and manner may confuse and upset an audience/observer until enough information is gathered to decide what is coherent or what is not.

d) Goffman: From Situation to Structure

Within the preceding sections the experience of being feared, as considered by a Goffmanian framework, has been situated with an overarching dramaturgical model, a unit of analysis (encounters) and the ingredients of interaction, as analysed using expression (performance). This section addresses the process by which the experience(s) of being feared can be structured and given meaning within the lives of those who experience it. This leads us towards *Frame Analysis* (Goffman, 1974). “Goffman, it has been argued, stands between the two traditions in sociology and has attempted to bridge ‘situations’ with ‘structures.’ He reminds us of the continuing need to interdigitate the metaphor of structure with the fleeting comings and goings of individuals” (Williams, 1986). *Frame Analysis* (1974) itself, a later work of Goffman, draws on his earlier work and, as Manning (1980) suggests, could not have been written without this earlier work. The same can be said of the framework used within this Chapter to construct the world around which being feared is experienced. Thus, the usefulness of Goffman’s frame analysis for the study of being feared can also be found quickly in Goffman’s own words.

“This book (*Frame Analysis*) is about the organisation of experience – something that an individual actor can take into his own mind – and not the organisation of society. The author makes no claim whatsoever to be talking about the core matters of sociology – social organisation and social structure. Those matters have been and can continue to be quite nicely studied without reference to frame at all. The structure of

social life will not be addressed but the structure of experience individuals have at any moment of their social lives. The author personally holds society to be first in every way and any individual's current involvements to be second; this report deals only with matters that are second" (Goffman, 1974:13).

With the adoption of *Frame Analysis* (1974) we can see a culmination of the Goffmanian frame work in general and specifically, with the ongoing cumulative experiences of those who regularly or intermittently perceive themselves to be regarded as threatening and how this shapes and structures their relationship with society, public space and with individuals around them. Additionally, whilst adding a structural element to the formation of experience Goffman is able to remain within the remit of a micro-sociological approach. Relating the experiences of the individual into an organised collection of meaningful and personal events, rather than relate a larger society to these individuals. In this sense the adoption of a Goffmanian framework allows this research to situate conceptions of the self and how an individual reflects on their impact and position in the world. This being said, key concepts within frame analysis need to be introduced and related to an understanding of being feared. This Chapter will not summarise every aspect of *Frame Analysis* as proposed by Goffman (1974) but will identify particularly relevant areas for deeper exploration.

To start, Goffman's key thematic question within *Frame Analysis* (1974) is '*Under what circumstances do we think things are real?*' When this question is given consideration within the aims of this research (a far more narrow enterprise than was Goffman's) the same question is a helpful one to consider. There are important points that are worth re-emphasising when talking about the adopted perspective, chief of which is directly related to Goffman's (1974) thematic question. The presence of fear on the part of the fearful within an encounter is largely a matter of interpretation. It is where we go for this interpretation that sets the work aside from other fear of crime studies as outlined in Chapter 1. The attribution (of meaning *and* reality) here lies only with the people who perceive themselves to have been feared. Therefore all elements of causal attribution lie within their belief in this perception and their belief that the way in which they interpret and structure this ongoing experience is perceived as real. These being so, there are a number of elements to *Frame Analysis* that are

particularly apt to exploring the experience of being feared. Firstly the establishment of frame is important. Therefore we will start with primary frameworks.

Primary Frameworks

Primary frameworks indicate a starting point for structuring experience and organising the situations and things that we experience. As Goffman suggests in *Frame Analysis*: “When an individual in our western society recognises a particular event, he tends, whatever else he does, to imply in the response (and in effect employ) one or more frameworks or schemata of interpretation of a kind that can be called primary. Primary because application of such a framework or perspective is seen by those who apply it as not depending on or harking back to some prior or original interpretation; indeed a primary framework is one that is seen as rendering what would otherwise be a meaningless aspect of the scene into something that is meaningful” (Goffman, 1974:21).

For example, a victim of a crime, in describing events to a Police Officer, will detail elements of the experience that will resemble a series of frames that, on any other occasion, would be relatively meaningless but due to the specific situation take on a new meaning. The victim may say something akin to: “I was walking home from work along my usual route. It was no darker than normal but I heard footsteps behind me. I turned to see who it was and it was at that moment that they took my bag. I just didn’t see them.” For this victim, the event is framed in a separate and unique significance despite the regularity with which the journey is travelled. The meaningfulness of the darkness is given significance here in relation to the eventual victimisation. In this sense the prior interpretation of the darkness was relatively meaningless on account of the regularity of experience and the fact that prior to this event the darkness had not been a limiting factor in the act of travelling home.

This meaningfulness will form, as far as experiencing fear is concerned, an important component in identifying the significance of being feared in the social existences of those who experience it. It will enable the formation of this experience to be presented in a more structured way. In addition, the meaning attached to the performative aspects of encounters can be given this structure for specific encounters and for

encounters of this nature as experienced over a longer period of time. Indeed, “each primary framework allows its user to locate, perceive, identify, and label a seemingly infinite number of concrete occurrences defined in its terms” (Goffman, 1974: 21). The primary framework allows the individual to identify and attribute meaning to all observed occurrences within the frame.

Goffman identifies two broad classes of primary frameworks: natural and social. Natural frameworks identify occurrences seen as undirected, unoriented, unanimated, unguided, and ‘purely physical’ (Goffman, 1974:22). The natural frame, importantly, allows a subject to engage with, and organise, environmental, temporal and spatial factors within their field of experience. Here, as already suggested, the primary framework serves to render something meaningless to something meaningful and when meaning is assigned it, in effect, identifies or filters those events worthy of separation. These natural frames, as Goffman suggests in *Frame Analysis*, are not impacted by wilful agency. As such the control of a natural frame lies outside the agency of an actor. Rather, a natural frame, from start to finish, is to be understood as something more akin to determinism or determinateness (Goffman, 1974). The current state of the weather is one such, very broad, example of this as might be the passing of time or the setting of the sun. Such events can pass as meaningless if such happenings bare no importance as assigned by an individual. Yet, if an individual wanted to air their washing, the presence of rain would hinder this and as such meaning would be assigned to the clemency of the weather. Likewise, if an individual has missed a train and they have an imminent meeting at work, the passing of time is assigned a significance that may not otherwise have been recognised in the course of that individual’s day. In the case of experiencing a fearful interaction, this can include those areas of a natural frame that may be present and deemed worthy of separation, and thus given significance within the interaction. This might include things such as darkness or secluded areas away from more populated spaces, such as an alleyway or parkland area. In this sense, the individual may seek to identify why they perceived fear in the actions of a passer-by. This may lead an individual to consider those elements of a natural frame that they deem to be sufficiently meaningful to cause this fear. The individual could identify something such as the layout of the buildings or the darkness of the area in which the encounter took place – elements that are largely outside the immediate control of the individual.

The social frame, on the other hand, provides the background understanding for events that incorporate the will, aim and controlling effort of an intelligence, a live agency, the chief one being the human being (Goffman, 1974:22). Such an agency is anything but implacable; it can be coaxed, flattered, affronted, and threatened (Goffman, 1974). Goffman, in *Frame Analysis*, calls this process ‘guided doings.’ “These doings subject the doer to ‘standards’, to social appraisal of his action based on its honesty, efficiency, economy, safety, elegance, tactfulness, good taste and so forth. A serial management of consequentiality is sustained, that is, continuous corrective control, becoming most apparent when action is unexpectedly blocked or deflected and special compensatory effort is required” (Goffman, 1974:22). An example of this can be seen in when an individual walks down a busy path in a city. For the most part, a pedestrian is able to weave a path through the oncoming walkers by moving to the left or right, by sliding the shoulders and giving concession with the fellow footpath commuters. These subtle concessions can go unnoticed by each of the actors and are thus assigned no special meaning or importance but when special compensatory action is required this can change. For example, when an oncoming pedestrian obstructs an individual’s path, there may be occasion when they mutually give concession to the same side, an adjustment is made and both, again to the same side, give concession. At which point the onward progress has, for both, been halted. Here the interaction can take on a more embarrassed or apologetic tone when they are eventually able to move past each other, having had a far more memorable interaction, than would otherwise have been the case. The social frame, in the example above, frames the experience of corrective control in the momentary breakdown of an often meaningless and uninterrupted process.

Here the differences and, the usefulness, of natural and social frames become clearer. Goffman (1974:23) suggests that we use the same term ‘causality,’ to refer to the blind effect of nature and the intended effect of man, the first seen as an infinitely extended chain of caused and causing effects and the second something that somehow begins with a mental decision. This being so, it may appear obvious to concentrate on the social frame (within the broader primary framework) for the purposes of understanding how experiencing fear can be understood. However, such a presumption may appear limited. A natural framework may prove important for

understanding how the feared individual attributes the cause of fear in others and for particular situations. For example, an individual may notice that fear is present in a particular place or, more appropriately, when particular temporal conditions are applied – during the night, for example. It is from the attribution of individual's experiences during the course of the fieldwork that such a framework can be demonstrated or at the very least be shown to have a structural property alongside the social element of the primary framework.

d) An Awareness of Limitations

As with any framework there is a need to engage with, and acknowledge, the weaknesses and shortcomings within. Goffman's work, for all its complexity and seemingly endless adoption and use is certainly not without criticism. This section will look into these criticisms and the possible implications within the study. In doing this it is important to acknowledge what Goffman's work has been able to give and what it has not.

On Methods and Consistency

Lamert and Branaman (1997: 10) suggest that “one of the most unimaginative complaints against Goffman is that he has no replicable method.” For the most part, he renounced the expected levels of protocols, proofs and techniques of peers. Some even go as far as to say that there are no facts presented in Goffman's work in as far as we understand them (Lamert and Branaman, 1997). What he does supply in abundance are definitions that are presented in such a way as to mirror the quirkiness of human nature itself.

There are, if taking a holistic view of Goffman's entire contribution to knowledge, areas of repetition. There are also ideas which Goffman adopted and then abandoned, sometimes with little or no acknowledgement. As Psathas (1996: 382) suggests, “[Goffman] refused to be consistent. He didn't even try to be consistent. (I once accused him of not being consistent, and a reviewer of my paper commented that this was a wasted criticism since Goffman never intended to be consistent. Nevertheless, I argued, he should have tried.)”

Goffman did not consider himself a theoretical sociologist or a theorist. This is perhaps a guiding reason behind this study specifically describing the use of Goffman as a framework first and foremost. Goffman prided himself on being able to synthesise and make sense of seemingly disparate observations, to find the significant in the seemingly insignificant. This formed part of his magnification of the very smallest elements of human interaction. To do so, Goffman “used, borrowed, adapted, and modified theories as these suited him (from game theory to dramaturgical metaphors to ecology) in order to organise his observations and then abandoned the theories as he saw fit” (Psathas, 1996: 383).

As an addendum to this, Colomy and Brown (1996) suggest, Goffman was neither trained nor interested in making certain kinds of logical or theoretical analyses within much of his work. Colomy and Brown (1996) add to this by suggesting that it was not until *Frame Analysis* (1974) that Goffman took up a sustained critical explanation of his evolving theoretical perspective. However, this was offered perhaps as a bespoke way of re-organising his earlier work. However, there are implications for re-readings of these texts (Colomy and Brown, 1996). This is particularly true of the structure of interactions and the ways in which interpretations of meaning are derived over time and between encounters. Again, this is its chief area of importance for this research.

Social and Political Change? A focus on the small at the expense of the large

The micro-sociological approach considers an individual’s sense of meaning in the minutia of interaction and a way of framing these experiences over a period of time. In this regard, and particularly where Erving Goffman is concerned, there is an obsession with the small at the expense of the large. This very much forms the first key critique of a Goffmanian framework.

Colomy and Brown (1996) suggest that Goffman did not write nor did he give much attention to the study of social change. Instead, Goffman offered his detailed ‘descriptions’ and ‘analyses’ (see the final Chapter in Goffman, 1974) of what he proposed was to be found in the contemporary society that he studied and allowed the

reader to infer that the present differed from the historical past. He did not attempt to venture into detail on the terms of what to 'sample,' what time periods, what groups and persons to select as 'representative' of the race, sex, ethnic, disabled or other categories (Colomy and Brown, 1996). It would be a safe assumption to suggest that definitions of these categories changed and develop over time. The reader-derived inferences inherent in Goffman's work may also be an indicator as to the plethora of uses and the life of his work long after his death.

This criticism certainly holds a good deal of merit, yet there are important caveats to consider. Goffman's research methods, such as they were, form a separate and important critique to that which has already been addressed. It is argued that the importance in Goffman's focus was not the construction of the sample and its representativeness, nor of the periods in time, and their changing social and structural idiosyncrasies. Instead, that there was meaning (a careers worth of meaning) to be found within interaction. To link again to Mead (1934) it is in the giving and receiving of expressive information that the interest lies. These meanings will change from person to person and place to place ad infinitum. The importance for this research lies in how those interactions have been ascribed meaning and, the ensuing actions or inactions preceding or resulting from them. Legitimising the source of the information was Goffman's doing. Understanding and interpreting a specific output is the job of this thesis. There is room for further critique in understanding that, even when looking at a phenomenon from a new perspective (being feared) and legitimising the experiences of those that have encountered it, there is still another side to each of these stories that may bear very different meanings.

In terms of Goffman's own contributions to sociological endeavour, it may be important that he never sought to bring clarity or an ultimate order to his work. Ostrow (1996) faults Goffman for failing to carry through the sociological implications of his more phenomenological insight; specifically, those insights that Goffman exposed as fundamental to human experience that we are always spontaneously involved in something. Further, he argues that Goffman potentially ignores what precisely is going on as a matter of experience in the person's real world and that means that Goffman is circumventing the meaningful social world (Ostrow, (1996).

In this regard, Gouldner's (1970) critique, that Goffman's work lacked politics, takes this point a little further. Gamson (1985) was at pains to suggest otherwise, rather than dismiss the political impact of Gouldner's (1970) infamous critique, Gamson (1985) argued that it was important to recognise the micro-events out of which political action is contrived. There is further caution from Collins (2008) when applying Goffman's analysis to his own endeavour. Suggesting it "is drawn from the polite middle and upper classes of British and American society around the mid-twentieth century, and it is not clear how far it applies, historically, cross-culturally, and across categories of age, social class and ethnicity" (2008:340). Whilst it's wider application to a 21st century is indeed, unclear, Collins (2008) does accept that it represents a good 'baseline' from which questions of how conflict arises given these ritual acrimony-limiting constraints are in place. If this is the case, this also provides a good baseline from which we can understand how fear arises.

Yet this may not be the end of the inquisition into Goffman's appropriateness. Manis and Meltzer (1978) suggest that Goffman's contribution is not applicable to large-scale social structures. Within this is the suggestion that he neglects the emotional dimension of human conduct, focusing strictly on logical behaviour (Manis and Meltzer, 1978). In doing so, Goffman could be accused of overestimating the power of individuals to create their own realities, ignoring the extent to which humans inhabit a world not of their own making. The critique for application to large-scale social structures does not end there. It has been the experience of the researcher, especially when considering the collective works of Goffman over his career, that there is a tendency to be needlessly complex. This, almost on its own, is a way to ensure that the meaning and application of his work becomes ever harder and ever more vulnerable to misinterpretation.

To conclude this Chapter there is a need to succinctly reflect on what the use of such a conceptual tool offers the research. Goffman's core influence within this research is based on his work connecting the meaning within interaction, as understood through Mead in *Mind, Self and Society* (1934), and how we, as individual actors, navigate and make sense of the world around us. Of deepest importance here is the acknowledgement that these interactions carry essential symbolic meaning that can be

understood, interpreted and put into action. Life experience, frequency of interaction and accumulated knowledge can lead to an expectation of the behaviours of those around us – this is true of those that fear other people and those that are feared. Any theory concerned with explicating human social phenomena must of course deal with the ontology of social action and of social actors on some fundamental, if only tacitly articulated, level (Chriss, 1996). Any attempt to do this without acknowledging Goffman's work would be to ignore one of sociologies preeminent post World War II scholars (Lamert and Branaman, 1997). Goffman's work allowed for the legitimisation of the personal experience and the potentially disparate meanings within. In doing so, whilst the work and analysis may have lacked a direct connection to the larger social world, it provided a frame and the tool from which those actors that lived those experiences could apply their own meaning and derive their own politics. As will become evident within this research, there is substantial cause to bring political consideration to bear. Goffman provides the clear background to which those actors can apply their own experience. Goffman legitimises the meaning within these interactions and the actors provide their own interpretations. One cannot exist without the other. It is perhaps best summarised when saying, "whatever else can be concluded from his social science, Goffman is surely one of the most disturbing guides we shall ever have to the social ever-present; as in the way he uncovers the layers of hidden expiatory functions behind an act each of us performs daily" (Lamert and Branaman, 1997: 11).

Human beings live in inextricable entanglements with others (Psathas, 1996). One part of their being consists of diverse physical and biological features which are noticed, responded to, and evaluated by others as well as themselves. In such noticings, responses, and evaluations, social considerations are paramount. Thus, the presence of prior agreements and understandings and arrangements concerning the meaning of physical features, demeanour and conduct are inescapable. Goffman's strengths are centred on showing how remarkably able and skilled human beings are in their interactional repertoires, how sensitive they can be to subtle changes in face-to-face displays, appearances, speech patterns, conduct, demeanour, and how they nevertheless are caught up in and involved in structured or institutional configurations, normative entanglements, obligations, and moral considerations. Herein rests the importance of his work within this thesis. By acknowledging the

ingredients of encounters it is then possible to explore the meanings derived within. This is as true of understanding being feared as it is of any other interaction. It is only from this point that the setting can be framed and analysed. It is also from this point that this research takes its first steps into recruiting, discussing and exploring the experience of being feared. It is to the mechanic of that process that the next Chapter turns.

Chapter 4) Methodology

The purpose of this Chapter is to outline and reflect on the aims, design and conduct of the empirical processes within this thesis. It will do so by focusing succinctly on what was done, how it was done and why it was done. There is a thread within the research that needed to be reflected within the methodological thinking. It is a thread that concerns the difficulties and obstacles in identifying, approaching and engaging with individuals who have had the experience of being feared. The specific focus of this research is concerned with an experience, which could be considered sensitive to some. It is something that can happen to people in incredibly varying contexts. This posed a major challenge for the design and recruitment within the study. As the research eventually found, being feared as an experience has largely gone unarticulated and even unnoticed. In some, being feared was a source of pride and a topic on which they were happy to speak. As a result of the possible problems of focusing on such an experience it was important that contacting and recruiting potential participants was addressed in the earliest stages of research design. This was particularly important to ensure that the research could effectively engage with those who took part and that they understood what was being asked of them. This research was difficult at times. The researcher was presented with some procedural and ethical challenges both prior to and during the research process. These challenges ultimately proved positive for the research and provided lessons in the research process, which will be taken forward by the researcher into future endeavours. The research also challenged the researcher to address assumptions and existing beliefs about the nature of the experience of being feared. These assumptions were based around age, gender, race, and ethnicity. The basis of assumptions prior to fieldwork and analysis was centred on the learning of existing research and have been expanded upon and tested throughout.

A number of important areas will be addressed within the Chapter in turn. First, the research's aims and objectives are stated and linked with the rationale for the study. Second, the choice of a qualitative design is explained and justified. Third, the process by which the research instruments were designed is explained. Fourth, the selection and recruitment of research participants is discussed in detail including the

rationale behind the choice to strategically sample the research participants in order to capture the varying contexts and experiences of those that have been feared. Fifth, the data collection process and the data analysis methods will be introduced and explained. Sixth, a description of the total sample will be given. This includes an account of the process by which participants chose their alias within the research and the merits of this process. Seventh, the ethics and safeguards of the research process will be discussed in detail. Finally, the challenges and limitations of the research will be discussed.

Research Aims and Objectives

The previous Chapters have highlighted a number of key areas that have informed and guided the methodological approach of this research. Nearly all studies addressing the fear of crime to date have focused on perceptions of ‘otherness’, thus taking the perspectives of those who deem particular groups a threat to their own safety and security; the fearful. This research instead turns to those who are perceived as a threat and to those groups that the public view as potential perpetrators of crime; the feared. The research focuses on the perceptions, emotions and ensuing actions of those who are perceived as a threat to security by others in mostly fleeting encounters. It provides an in-depth analysis of the perception of fear in interactions, how this is recognised within an encounter, how these perceptions are attributed and reacted upon, how these experiences relate to particular situations and how they are structured in ongoing life experiences.

The research adds a micro-analytic perspective to the wider concerns of fear of crime. Questions of social exclusion, conflict, trust and fear are analysed using the perspectives of those who are deemed as fearsome and intimidating, and the interactions through which fear is elicited, managed and avoided. The research focuses on the personal/individual experiences of fearful interactions. Aspects of insecurity and fear in everyday encounters can connect to a variety of in/out-group affiliations, like ethnic/religious and class lines as well as generational and other group divides. On a larger scale they put a strain on local social cohesion and inter-group trust, and simultaneously affect other members of the in-group whose members are deemed a threat to order and security. The micro-processes of fear, threat and

ensuing violence and their interactive and dynamic nature are vital for our understanding of how individual citizens (as well as collectives) shape their existence and the way they understand and interpret the world around them as a secure or insecure place. Considering this, the research adds to behavioural and micro-perspective analyses, which aim at understanding the challenges of interaction, the meaning derived therein and the way in which this shapes the lives and behaviours of those involved.

The main aims and objectives of this study are first, to understand the micro-dynamics of fear from the perspective of those who are perceived by the public and in communities as potential offenders, as ‘fearsome’ and ‘intimidating’. Second, to research into how this feeds into perceptions of identity, threat and fear and how these perceptions shape the actions of those that perceive themselves to be feared. Third, to understand how these actions and perceptions are shaped at the point of interaction as well as the possible long-term impacts on those individuals that experience being feared. Finally, to understand the role that fear plays in the production/maintenance of order within personal and/or work-based encounters.

Choosing a Qualitative Methodology

This project, in light of the aims and objectives, has relied on qualitative research. In this sense, a qualitative design is ideally suited for understanding the experience of being feared because it can provide the contextual understanding of individual and group experiences and how interaction is interpreted (Punch, 2014). It is the best method for allowing the research aims and objectives to be operationalised. A qualitative research design will allow for an in-depth examination of the ever-changing nature of human interaction and the meaning that is attributed, assigned and derived from it (Bachman and Schutt, 2007). By examining the experience of being feared there is an opportunity to conduct a piece of qualitative research that can add a new perspective to fear of crime literature. By doing this, it is possible to close some of the existing gaps in knowledge concerning the wider experiences within the fear of crime phenomenon. Much of the existing research is based on survey data and from the perspective of the fearful (Day, 2009). The importance of this research is not in question. However, it provides a limited scope for and understanding of those that are

deemed to be fearsome. The perspective and qualitative design of this research allows for these voices to be heard.

A qualitative methodology allows the researcher to explore, through appropriately designed questions and the development of a life and experience narrative, the way that being an object of fear is experienced. This can lead to an understanding of the way that being feared is attributed within an interaction and the possible cultural, experiential and personal contexts in the way that the causation of fear is attributed. Furthermore, a qualitative design will help shed light on the way that an individual's behaviour is adapted (or not), and the way that the experience of being an object of fear impacts on the general outlook of those that experience it. In this sense, the key strengths of qualitative research are complementary to the aims of this research. That is to say, a qualitative design provides an ability to explore how individuals understand, interpret and respond to their experiences (Becker, 1986; Miles and Huberman, 1994; Morrow, 2001; Denzin and Lincoln, 2003). The research was concerned with understanding just these kinds of phenomena in relation to the micro-dynamics of fear.

To understand the meaning and interpretations inherent in interpersonal communication, a conceptual framework based on the work of Erving Goffman has been developed. It uses dramaturgy, encounters, performance and frame analysis as well as drawing on additional elements from the work of Goffman. Dramaturgy makes it possible to identify that each aspect of a person's behaviour is essentially expressive in both the giving and the receiving of communicative information. By using 'encounters' the research is able to conceptualise an area of specific interaction that metaphorically frames a situation within which it is possible to analyse fleeting interaction. Goffman's 'performance' allows the research to consider the 'ingredients' of each encounter and the expressive information given and received during an interaction. 'Frame analysis' provides a schema that brings the aforementioned elements together to provide a metaphorical frame within which individuals can describe and structure their experiences of being feared. The type of detailed micro-social analysis commensurate with Goffman's work went hand-in-hand with the richness of detail within a qualitative research process. Qualitative methods are most useful in exploring new issues and determining the meaning people give to their lives

and actions (Bachman and Schutt, 2007). The inductive nature of this qualitative enquiry and Goffman's focus on the micro-dynamics of interaction is an ideal marriage. This research has tried to understand the social context, the nature of attitudes and actions and to explore the subjective meanings that participants attach to being feared.

In seeking the perceptions and experiences of people over, in some cases, a long period of time, depth and complexity in the data were prioritised and this approach allowed other topics, not just those raised by the researcher, to emerge naturally throughout the research process (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996). In other words, specific detail was requested and, at the emergence of this detail it was elaborated on at length. Such flexibility within this qualitative process allowed for the research to approach topics and groups of people that had not been considered within the initial research design. This was an important component both in the drawing out of essential detail but also in the contexts and explanations given by the interviewees.

Designing Research Instruments

There is one principal research instrument: semi-structured, open-ended qualitative interviews (for interview schedules see Appendix 1). It was designed to reflect the research aims and objectives as well as the chosen conceptual framework. It was considered that the most appropriate way in which to gain understandings of the experience of being feared was with individual, face-to-face, semi-structured interviews. This was considered the ideal tool for this research because at the core of the interview process is the intent to understand the lived experiences of other people, and the meaning they make of that experience (Seidman, 2013). The instruments were designed to highlight the biographical narratives and experiences of those that have experienced being feared as well as seeking an understanding of their own experiences of being fearful. To design the research instrument appropriately it was important that they could reflect both the research objectives and conceptual framework. It was also important that they were sensitive to the differences between the strategically selected groups, the various experiences and contexts of being feared inherent in these groups and the overarching need to address being feared

sympathetically and without fear of judgement. In light of this there were differences in each of the interview schedules. For example, the schedule designed for the police had a section focused specifically on the work-based experiences of being feared. The key questions and prompts were constructed to highlight each individual's experience within the unique setting of police work. This helps to understand a specific context of being feared but also allows for an analysis that considers the front stage and back stage elements of Goffman's performance (Goffman, 1959), thus utilising the conceptual framework. For the students and young people this was necessarily different. The research has applied the most appropriate instrument to each specific group, allowing for the strategically selected contexts, from the every-day to the extreme, to come through. This attention to specific design has allowed the interviewees to answer the questions in their words and to go into depth on topics and contexts that are appropriate to their inclusion within the research. Within the design of the instrument there has been sufficient space for the interviewer to ask additional and follow up questions and to allow the interviewee to guide the detail of their answer to their specific experience.

The process of constructing the schedules was painstaking. Advice and best practice was sought and taken, primarily via supervision. Additional assistance was taken from colleagues with direct experience of similar fieldwork and supplemented by the author's own experience. The process included addressing issues of validity. This was ensured by performing checks and reviews throughout the design process to make sure the instrument concentrated on the aims and objectives of the research (Gray, 2014). This was a process overseen within the primary and secondary supervisory processes.

The schedules, once finalised, remained largely unchanged from the outset; there was a degree of refinement as the author gained more experience. That is to say, questions designed to aid in acquiring rapport were used in early interviews and were refined and/or omitted when the interviewer was confident to proceed. The schedules were also designed to avoid using complicated language, multiple questions and leading questions. The list of themes and topics was kept as short as possible whilst still being able to service the aims and objectives of the study more broadly. In order to

encourage in-depth responses the instrument was designed with flexibility to allow for the order of questions to change in conjunction with the answers being given by the interviewee. This allowed the interviewees, on occasion, to spontaneously move from one general theme to another without the need for the interviewer to introduce it.

Selecting and Recruiting Research Participants

The research sample has been strategically selected. The selection of these groups was both inspired by, and an attempt to expand upon, the current literature and understanding. The initial list of groups comprised of young people and students, gym-goers, police officers and bouncers (soldiers were also recruited at a later stage of the data collection and their eventual selection will be explained shortly). As already discussed (see Chapter 2), there is only a cursory glance at the fear of crime from the perspective of the feared. The core purpose of this research was to gain an understanding of what it is like to be feared; taking form as an exploratory study hoping to unpick and develop an under-researched area. It is therefore important to explain and justify the rationale for choosing each of the groups.

The justification for the sample can be explained as a process by which the research was designed to explore the experience of being feared from a broader range of sources and contexts than hitherto attempted. This range has been derived from relevant existing literature and from a number of different academic disciplines. Whilst criminological literature was an obvious starting point, the study includes influences from sociology, social anthropology, lifestyle and biography. This wider exploration of disciplines outlines the need to look at different aspects of life and interaction to understand the necessary contexts of being feared. This includes interactions of multiple contexts such as the personal, the workplace, the accidental and the criminal. All of which requires a strategically selected sample to encompass a complex and diverse possible combination of interactions. The following will outline the rationale and the academic origin and the principles for inclusion.

Police officers are able to provide a work-based insight into fearful interactions. Officers may be aware of the impact their presence may have with certain individuals and certain communities. Officers are aware of, or employ, certain techniques and

tactics in order to maintain order in certain situations. This may involve causing fear or surprise as well as threatening violence and committing acts of violence. For example, the researcher, during the course of his previous occupation, accompanied a dawn raid conducted on suspected drug dealers. The element of surprise and the fear that resulted could be considered an integral tool in the maintenance of order or, indeed, integral to the performance of the role of the police.

Bouncers, much like the police, are in a position of relative power. They provide a work-based insight into fearful encounters and use similar mechanisms to the police. Yet in this work context bouncers possess less formally recognised authority and with more limited powers. Certain sites and certain activities need to be controlled. It is not uncommon for access to be denied or terminated depending on the behaviour of those people that are present within the boundaries of the establishments to which the bouncers serve. The methods, tactics, feelings and behaviours of those involved in these encounters will show how fear is experienced and, how fear is used, within this private security environment.

The young people group fall within an age range that has often been described as the most likely to be the cause of interpersonal fear. It is critical for the research to understand the experiences of those deemed by others, as the group most likely to be the objects of interpersonal fear (Pearce, Dixon, Reed & Margo, 2006; British Crime Survey, 2009/10). This includes both individual and collective action. That is to say, that the experiences young people have of being feared when they are on their own as well as when they are amongst larger groups of friends. This group can also open the research up to understanding the experiences they have of being feared amongst their peers as well as people of different ages.

Gym-goers have been selected in order gain a perspective on the experiences of those that may have an outward physical appearance that may be of an athletic or muscular nature and may cause fear as a result. The group possess a high level of physical awareness and bodily performance (Wacquant, 2004). They are aware that the appearance of their physique might cause fear (Fussell, 1991). This insight goes alongside further insights into the motivations of those that partake in activities to

improve their physical strength and/or appearance. An awareness of one's physical appearance and the reactions to it is an integral element of understanding the experience of being feared.

Students, much like young people, fall within an age range that has often been described as the most likely to be the cause of interpersonal fear. Day's (2009) work laid much of the ground work for interest in this group. She centred her work on that of college-age (university-age) males. This research took its lead from this starting point but expanded to understanding young people more broadly and not limiting its scope by gender. The student group has been strategically selected to provide an alternative/diversified interpretation of the younger person's experience of fearful interactions and as such this group represents an larger intersection of young people than seen in previous studies. In this sense the student population can shed light on the differences in attributing the causes of fear if and when it is noticed within an interaction. These feelings of attribution, whether similar or different to each of the groups will help to give a deep and diverse understanding of what it is like to be an object of fear and how this impacts on their lives.

A number of soldiers were selected after data collection had commenced. This was due entirely to an interview arranged with a gym-goer, which took an unexpected direction. It opened the door to a range of fearful interaction that allowed the research to move beyond the everyday civilian encounter to one of extreme conflict situations. After this interview, it was decided that an attempt would be made to expand this group if possible to understand the micro-dynamics of interactions within war. Soldiers are aware of, and are trained to use, certain techniques and tactics in order to maintain order, achieve military objective and in specific situations have the mandate to kill. This may involve causing fear or surprise as well as threatening violence and committing extreme acts of violence. The soldiers have first-hand knowledge of fear in the deadliest of circumstances and in doing so add a dimension of being feared that is otherwise unexplored.

The underlying principle for the strategic sample was a simple question - 'From where can the experience of being feared be best acquired and understood?' The

groups were selected to provide a wide variety of contexts for being feared, as assisted and identified within a multi-disciplinary search. There were, and doubtless would continue to be, unique elements and expressions from each of the selected groups. That can be in the inherent common features of their experiences that may be unique to the group. That being so, their separation within the structure of the study has assisted in providing the research with clearer findings and more definable future directions for ongoing research. There are commonalities between the groups and the way the experience of being feared can be understood. The core differences lay within the process of attribution of fear. That is one of the core principles for structuring the thesis using the groups initially. It allows for the specific tools, powers and resources available to each of the groups to be explored, whilst the comprehensive analysis maintains the ability to draw out the strongest common themes within the final data Chapter.

Initial identification of participants was through personal contacts held by the researcher. Each of these initial contacts had known experiences of being feared and, importantly, each of these contacts fell within one of the five strategically selected groups. In this regard, following this stage of identification with known contacts, further contacts were identified and developed. For the interviews, some of the developed contacts were 'gatekeepers' rather than potential interviewees allowing access to each of the group elements within the sample. These included; youth group leaders, sixth-form teachers, area managers, gym owners and police officers. On other occasions the contacts developed directly led to potential research participants. The availability of such gatekeepers and such groups ensured the appropriate diversity within the strategic sample gathered. Each group provided a different and necessary aspect of the experience of being feared.

In light of this it was necessary that each group be approached in a specific way. With the Police, approaches were made to known contacts, with the intention that they were able to assist the research in the capacity of a gate-keeping role. Contact was made via email and telephone and two gate-keeping contacts were made. Both contacts were made within the same constabulary. This allowed sufficient time for the potential gatekeepers to assimilate the relevant research information, consider the people that may be included within the study and decide on whether they would like to formally

participate in the research in that capacity. The researcher made the initial approach only. From these early contacts it was possible to access potential participants and acquire a sufficiently sized sample.

Bouncers, much like the police, were initially approached through known contacts via email, telephone and face-to-face interaction. Again, this was to create gate-keeping contacts from which a sufficient sample could be developed. Two gate-keeping contacts were made. They were in separate cities and this ultimately provided a spread of experience within the sample. One of the individuals was an area manager and was able to provide a number of contacts that were used within the research. The second contact ran a commercial cleaning business that specialised in cleaning bars and pubs and was able to assist in setting up meetings with door company supervisors. This allowed for the sample to develop to a sufficient size.

Young people were approached using existing contacts through personal face-to-face interaction, through telephone contact (including MSM) and, eventually, via social media. The latter form of contact was at the request of the contacts themselves and proved the most reliable way of making contact. This communication flexibility allowed the researcher the best possible chance of obtaining a large enough youth sample and gave the participants time to assimilate the relevant research information and decide on whether they would like to formally participate in the research. The researcher was initially hesitant to use the social media for this purpose but it was considered an appropriate method of communication in light of the propensity of the young people's group to communicate in this way. The researcher was the only person to make the initial approach.

Gym-goers were approached, much in the same way as the previously mentioned groups, with existing contacts. This was with personal face-to-face interaction in a gym setting and through telephone and email contact. The initial contact was made here with a gym manager. This did not allow for direct access to gym members but was a procedure that informed the management of the original gym of the research objectives. The sample was able to snowball from this point and gym-goers from various facilities and a number of different cities were used. One point of interest here was that one recruit to the study volunteered whilst travelling on the same train as the

researcher. The person in question was reading an academic paper over the shoulder of the researcher. The person initiated conversation and eventually suggested that they may have something to say about the research. Email addresses were then exchanged and a date set for interview some weeks later.

Approaches were initially made with students using existing and new contacts through personal face-to-face interaction in a social setting and through established telephone contact and email contacts. This allowed the researcher the best possible chance of getting a large enough and diverse enough student sample (ages 18-23). The initial approach to soldiers was, as mentioned earlier, serendipitous. Following this initial interview a number of further contacts were made with the help of the first participant and additional interviews conducted.

Collection and Analysing Data

The semi-structured interviews were recorded using an electronic recording device and were transcribed by the researcher only. An interview field log and an interview personal experience log were used to record the researcher's thoughts and observations throughout the research process. The field log was used to keep a record of the aliases chosen by the participants, the city or town the interview was conducted in and the digital code for the interview specific to the recording device. This enabled safe storage and allowed for an easy transition into data protection protocols. The interview personal experience log was of use at the point of data analysis and was a way of recording the initial thoughts on the interview itself. It allowed the researcher to form an initial impression of the data. It was a useful tool for adding personal insight into the analysis process as well as some of the physical characteristics of the participants. In a very simple sense, this allowed the researcher to recall the faces, physiques and personalities of the participants and not just their voices and narratives during data analysis. The practice of using a field log is not uncommon (see Gaskell, 2005; Burman *et al.*, 2001) and the researcher found both of these iterations particularly helpful.

The interviews were conducted within a setting in which both researcher and participant felt as safe and relaxed as possible. As far as was manageable the

interviewer accommodated the interviewee and met at a venue of their choosing. Such venues included, cafes, bars, shared/public space such as sports centres or gym, meeting areas or rooms at universities and restaurants. On one occasion, a police station was used shortly after a shift had finished and on a separate occasion the interviewer agreed to attend the interviewee's private accommodation. The researcher's plan allowed for considerable flexibility in this area in order to make the process as comfortable and as accommodating as possible for those who participated. In total, the interviews were conducted in 9 towns and cities ranging from the North to the South of England. Travel to the interview locations was by the researcher's private transport on some occasions and by public transport (trains and buses).

A grounded theory approach was initially considered within this research. Grounded theory was well suited to this study because the experiences and explanations of those being feared needed to come from within the data. That is to say, the essential idea in using grounded theory here is that the explanatory theory will be developed inductively from data (Punch, 2014) and not the other way about. This research, commensurate to a grounded theory approach, began with research questions concerning the experience of being feared and to generate understanding where there was none (Bachman and Schutt, 2007). However, the research analytical process most appropriate for investigating being feared was Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA). IPA is an approach to qualitative data analysis with an idiographic focus, which means that it aims to offer insights into how a given person, in a given context, makes sense of a given phenomenon (Larkin, Eatough and Osborn, 2006). This approach helped to situate the research within a micro-social analysis and helped to focus the investigation on the specific contexts of being feared. Larkin, Eatough and Osborn (2006) suggest the use of IPA is ideally suited if the researcher is interested in a research question, which aims to understand what a given experience is like (phenomenology) and how someone makes sense of it (interpretation). This was entirely appropriate to understanding the experience of being feared because the research process was interested in what mattered to the participants that had experienced the phenomenon and what meaning they had assigned to it. IPA is "an approach committed to how people make sense of their major life experiences" (Smith, Flower and Larkin, 2009:1).

The qualitative data analysis processes and procedures used within this research have allowed the researcher to move from the qualitative data that have been collected into some form of explanation, understanding and interpretation of the people that have experienced being feared (Smith *et al.*, 2009). Qualitative data analysis can often be based on an interpretative philosophy (Gibbs, 2002) and as a result can provide complex, context-based deep understanding. The interpretive philosophy is seeking explanation within individual consciousness and subjectivity from the standpoint of the participants (Bachman and Schutt, 2007). This being so, it is ideally suited to the research aims. The principle is to examine the meaningful and symbolic content of qualitative data. According to Taylor and Gibbs (2010) the process of qualitative data analysis usually involves two things, writing and the identification of themes. The initial phase of data analysis within this research was indeed centred on writing and developing early codes and themes. Analytic ideas and various précis were formed when using the research logs. These pieces of writing, sometimes resembling a summary, helped to form the genesis for later analyses.

The early coding and analysis, in the context of this research, involved writing about the data and what is found there (Taylor and Gibbs, 2010), what was given import by the participants and what meaning could be interpreted from this by the researcher. In many cases what was written was in the form of analytic ideas. In other cases it was some form of précis or summary of the data, though this also contained some analytic ideas. This process was followed within this research from the earliest point in the form of the field logs and continued throughout the larger data analysis. Following the transcription of the data these initial ideas and analyses from within the field logs were added to and expanded upon. Thereafter it was possible to start to code the data more systematically and gather together the broad themes and emerging key points. This was done by identifying passages of text and applying labels to them, which indicated they were examples of a thematic idea. This coding process allowed the researcher to retrieve and collect together all the text and other data associated with a particular thematic idea.

The analysis of data within this research was done manually. Taylor and Gibbs (2010) suggest that qualitative data sets tend to be very large. This research was no different. Whilst the sample size was not that of a survey approach the data transcripts were

very lengthy and required considerable and intensive examination. In light of the decision to organise manually and considering the length of the raw data it was essential to organise and structure the coding process (Seidel, 1998). The researcher made a number of copies of the data. The researcher then used folders (electronically stored and physically stored) to gather together the materials that are examples of similar themes or analytic ideas. Whilst multiple copies of the data were being made and drawn together, the researcher was mindful that a careful method of labelling the material in the folders or files was needed. This was to ensure that it was possible to check back and examine the broader context in which that data occurred. The analyst needs to know where the snippets of data in the files came from so that they can be re-contextualised (Taylor and Gibbs, 2010). This process was especially important when analysing themes between and across the research groups.

Description of the Sample

Overall, the research achieved 32 interviews. From these 32 interviews data was used from 29 of them. One male participant withdrew consent a number of days after the interview. One interview with a female student was lost due to a technology malfunction with the Dictaphone. One interview with a bodybuilder did not yield sufficient experiences of being feared. After initial inclusion in early drafts it was considered that the data was not focused specifically on the experience of being fear and was not included. Within this sample there are 7 Police officers, 5 bouncers, 4 gym goers, 6 students, and 7 young people. From this achieved sample there are 24 men and 5 women. The ages of the men range from 16 to 45 for the men and from 16 to 37 for the women. Of the achieved usable sample, 17 participants described themselves as White or White British, 8 participants described themselves as Black, Black British or African British, 2 participants described themselves as Mixed Race (both as Black/White mix), and 1 participant described himself as British Indian and 1 participant described himself as Pakistani British.

A point of interest here is that prior to these interviews I invited the participants to choose, if they wished, their anonymised name. This is not usually of any interest but the researcher believes that, in the case of the fieldwork undertaken for this thesis, it is. For example, in an early interview the participant chose to use, as his alias, the

name 'Pink Fairy.' There was no hesitation in their thought processes. They went straight for the name Pink Fairy. Following this was a realisation that, upon writing-up this research the name Pink Fairy would appear on a number of occasions and in possible future publications. This would appear alongside other such names gathered from various interviews such as 'Wolverine', 'Agent X' and, in the case of two female Police Officers interviewed together - 'Thelma and Louise.' In the case of Pink Fairy, the researcher was also to learn that the soft and gentle nature of the name Pink Fairy was, in fact, a far cry from the nature of the events and situations that were described during the hour or so that that particular interview lasted.

There is little doubt that there is something to be learned methodologically from allowing interviewees to choose their aliases. In the case of this research, in fact, the early introduction of the alias could have helped contribute to more detailed and, ultimately, to better data. On more than one occasion the interviewee that chose the name Pink Fairy said, "I can tell you this because I am a Pink Fairy." There are, of course, always limits to the type of information someone is prepared to divulge within an interview setting. This is especially true in some of the interviews collected for this project and in light of some of the topics and themes that arose from eliciting answers regarding the experiences of being feared. For example, there were also occasions during the interview that Pink Fairy explicitly stated that detailed information could not or would not be shared. In light of these firm statements, further probe questions or requests for more information were not employed in these instances. The adoption of this small protocol was, for the researcher, relatively profound. It will likely inform the protocols adopted in future research and was regarded as an innovation for this researcher.

Ethics and Safeguards

There were a number of issues identified prior to the commencement of fieldwork and various protocols were introduced to address them. Each of these protocols was considered at the earliest stages of research and informed the final research design. Each element of the ethical implication and the necessary safeguards formed the application for ethical approval. Each of the ethical considerations and safeguards are outlined within this section.

Informed consent, as Guba and Lincoln (2001) suggest, is a wider concept than just informing the participant what they are taking part in. It also needs to attempt to help participants understand the purpose of the research they are agreeing to take part in. So it was important that those participating in the research process were aware of what was required of them, what topics they would be asked to talk about and what will happen to the information they provide. They were also informed of the perspectives and types of experiences they would be asked to draw on and how, as far as was possible to explain, their contributions would be used. In light of this, for participants of the research, consent forms were produced to inform them of each element of the research process. The consent forms were produced with sensitivity to the audience to which they were being given. In this sense, each consent form was appropriately adapted for each of the target groups (police officers, bouncers, young people, gym-goers and students) with a later form being adapted for soldiers.

Alongside appropriately informing the participants and gaining their consent they were made explicitly aware that they have the opportunity/ability to withdraw their consent at any point up to the moment at which the interview data has been transcribed and anonymised. This was explicitly stated within the consent form and verbally re-stated during the remainder of the consent process, prior to interview. They were made aware that they could withdraw from the interview without needing to explain why. All attempts were made to explain that this was a genuine statement and they should not, at any point, feel that they are obliged to go through with the interview should they not want to. They were also informed that they could withdraw their consent at any stage after the interview had finished and prior to transcription. This timeframe was anticipated to be at a minimum of 48 hours. Should any participant have withdrawn at this stage, all data associated with that individual would be removed and destroyed. This protocol was also made clear prior to the commencement of each interview.

Assurances about confidentiality were made to each of the participants by outlining each part of the research process and all protocols in relation to data recording, data storage (and storage timeframes), data destruction and the anonymising of data. Participants were being asked to comment on their personal opinions, experiences and

feelings. Additionally, professionals within the sample were not asked to comment on structural, organisational or operationally sensitive elements of their jobs. This point was made clear during the process of recruiting participants. On some occasions such issues were raised by participants and, in doing so, pre-empted the assurances that were going to be made by the researcher. These occurrences served to remind the researcher of the importance of such protocols. In this sense, any place names, people, ranks, and/or events that participants have been involved in or described during the interview have been anonymised to avoid identifying them, their colleagues or the specific things to which they refer. In some cases, the interviewees did not divulge place names or individuals within their answers. In this sense they self-anonymised some elements of their responses. Furthermore, the experiences of the respondents were not shared anecdotally within the context of other research interviews. That is to say, the interviewer did not mention, for example, that ‘all the other police officers had the same experience’, or ‘all the other young people felt the same.’ It is important that the experiences of others were not used to guide or support the descriptions of other interviews and to keep the experiences of each individual exclusively within their interview during the data gathering process. On some occasions interviewees specifically sought assurances or affirmations about their own experiences. For example, on more than one occasion an interviewee would ask ‘did other people have similar experiences?’ or questions of a similar nature. In response to direct questions of that nature, the interviewer often responded, as briefly as possible, from personal experiences if it was appropriate to do so.

In addition to the assurances of confidentiality and anonymity, issues of data storage were addressed. Interviewees and research sites were anonymised and stored in line with the Data Protection Act 1998 and the rules of the British Sociological Association (2002: 36). This protocol includes using password protected electronic storage files and storage equipment such as discs and USB sticks hardware and making sure that these are stored in locked filing cabinets in a locked room with limited access.

Some of the information within the interviews was of a sensitive nature. It was considered, prior to the commencement of research that, within the research setting there may be information relating to specifically sensitive situations including specific

events, geographies and people. In light of this, all attempts were made to provide the participants with an environment in which they felt they were able to share, without fear of judgement or identifiable dissemination, their experiences. In some cases, information that participants were not happy to share was specifically spoken of. In other cases, for example, participants felt comfortable enough to share: 'I have never told that to anyone before.' In relation to the use of sensitive information the age of the participants was an important ethical consideration. The strategic sample was designed specifically to avoid recruitment from certain age groups. To this end, the study did not recruit any participants under the age of 16. There were moments when the participants described events that occurred in the past or when the participants were under that age of 16 and this is reflected within the transcriptions and the narratives around which they were speaking.

Protecting the researcher during the course of the data collection is also an important consideration. In order to ensure the researcher was adequately protected during fieldwork a 'buddy system' was used. Within such a system the researcher notifies a previously designated colleague whenever they are going to be doing some fieldwork – where they are going, with whom they will be meeting (but without divulging personal information about the participant) and an estimated duration of the interview. Protocols were put in place should the researcher be unable to be contacted by his buddy within the predetermined time parameters. The researcher informed the appropriate 'buddy' on his safe return upon completion of the fieldwork exercise. More than one buddy was used during the data collection process. This was necessary due to the number of interviews that were planned, the timescale of data collection and the varied locations in which the fieldwork was conducted. Any phone calls that were needed between researcher and participants were made on a University phone with hidden caller identification and/or a specific research mobile telephone to avoid the sharing of personal details. In some instances, the personal number of the researcher was used. This was in the case of some of the gatekeepers that were used, for example. All of these protocols were added in to a fieldwork risk assessment log that was submitted for approval by supervisors. The risk assessment was approved prior to the commencement of fieldwork.

Within a study of this nature the issue of discussing illegal activities is an important one that requires consideration. In light of this it formed an integral part of the request for ethical approval and also formed part of the consent forms and discussions with participants. Whilst the project concerns the experience of being feared it was conceivable from the outset that some of the information within the interviews may reflect past activities that are illegal. It was important to understand and articulate that if the discussion reflected the participant's intention to participate in future activity that could be considered illegal the researcher has an ethical and legal responsibility to declare anything they may have said about illegal and/or harmful activities if they involve hurting himself or herself or somebody else in the future.

Therefore, in light of this, the researcher could not guarantee anonymity in such cases. In the case of past events of illegal activity divulged within interview, we live in a rule of law country and no citizens are forced to report/forward to the police or authority if not under subpoena or the witness stand, including victims of crime (with an exception for serious and organised crime which was not/is not part of this study). It was recognised both during the ethics application stage and in write-up that this is a difficult ethical line to tread. Indeed, some events discussed within the interviews have been dealt with already by the criminal justice system. In some instances certain activities of the participants have not come under the scrutiny of the criminal justice system. However, having received the warning about possible divulgence of criminal activity, the respondents all indicated prior to the commencement of the interview that they understood any ethical obligation the researcher has with regard to criminal activities past or present.

There were other issues considered, beyond that of discussing illegal activity, that might have posed a risk to both the researcher and the participants and it was important to consider the possible responses. Therefore, anticipation and adaptation was importantly emphasised prior to fieldwork. Unexpected problems, and being prepared for such eventualities and discussing these issues with supervisors ahead of fieldwork was important in reducing any potential problems. In this instance, the researcher drew upon his own experiences of conducting fieldwork under difficult and, sometimes, unpredictable circumstances in the past. The researcher is also

trained in emergency first aid. If such a skill is required the researcher has experience in dealing with such situations and will act accordingly.

All research data has been, and is, stored under lock and key. The School of Law at the University of Leeds has provided facilities for data storage. Safety measures include password protected data storage as well as encrypted flash-drive devices and the like. These password protection and encryption protocols are in addition to the anonymisation of data at the point of transcription. Assurances were made to each of the participants by outlining each stage of the research protocol in relation to data recording, data storage (and storage timeframes), data destruction and the anonymising of data.

It was identified at the outset of the research process that it was possible that personal information might be shared within the interview and that this information may be of a sensitive nature. Within the pre-interview protocol each participant was asked to sign a consent form that ensures that all views of participants will be respected and will not be attributed to them. Within the research setting there may be information relating to specifically sensitive situations including specific events, geographies and people. All attempts have been made throughout the research process to provide the participants with an environment in which they can share, without fear of judgement or identifiable dissemination, their experiences. All information within the research setting has been anonymised using rigorous protocols of the individual interview. Aliases have been used immediately within the transcription of data. Everything that relates to a specific date, time, place and person has been changed or removed even if the participant indicated that they felt this was not necessary.

Challenges and Limitations of the Research

The research process was not without its challenges, sticking points and dead ends. This was true of both the research design and the fieldwork. Some limitations can be attributed to the research design and the chosen research methods. Equally, some challenges were connected to the difficulties inherent in the research topic and the type of participants needed to understand being feared.

Some of these challenges were foreseen and were taken into consideration when deciding on the desired size and breadth of the samples, the groups that would be recruited and the methods of data collection. Other unforeseen challenges were often of a more practical nature. There were instances of technological failure (a computer hard drive failure and Dictaphone software failure), which were mitigated as much as was possible but nevertheless caused disruption to the data gathering and storage processes. The process of organising, recruiting and conducting the interviews was not a simple one. Travel, transcription and data storage were all concerns that had to be approached with each interview. It was the experience of the researcher that the interviews could be organised and conducted in clusters. An intense phase of interviewing would inevitably be followed by a cessation of fieldwork. This periodic recruitment proved useful in order to transcribe and make sense of the growing data.

Some of the challenges within the research were points from which opportunities could develop. In particular the accidental recruitment of a former Royal Marine within the gym-goers group helped to lead the sample into an unexpected direction. A flexible approach was always the intension within this research due to the nature of the topic. It has proved a constructive way to conduct data collection and ultimately improved the empirical process.

The research design and choice of methodology also has its limitations. The researcher was aware of these limitations and entered the process of conducting the empirical work knowingly. This research, with its qualitative design, does not seek to make wide generalisations. The fact that this is not an intended consequence of the research output is an area for keen criticism. Instead the research seeks to unpick and explore those generalisations, sometimes made initially by quantitative research (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003). This process is very much evident in the literature and focus of most research into the topic of fear of crime. This research is situated at a point where exploration of a different kind is needed to advance and add to the knowledge already gained. Nevertheless, a qualitative methodology still raises concerns of an epistemological nature (Bryman, 1998). Qualitative data have been dismissed as anecdotal (Bryman, 1998) in some quarters, or journalism (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003) in others. These criticisms are often levied at the generally smaller

sample sizes found in qualitative research in comparison to quantitative research (Wincup and Noakes, 2004).

There are limitations within the chosen research instrument and conceptual model. The chosen conceptual model necessarily focuses the study in very specific ways. It can be broadly conceived of as micro-sociological. This importantly narrows the study towards the experiences of the individuals involved and their interpretations of the events, actions and encounters they have experienced and understood. The framing around a Goffmanian conceptual model can bring with it all criticism of Goffman's work (as has been explored in Chapter 3). These will not be fully regurgitated here as much of this has been considered within the previous Chapter, but often centre around Goffman's work remaining focused on micro-interaction and never challenging or applying the larger social order. Goffman's dramaturgy and underlying principle can be criticised around four key points according to Manning (2013). The first is that the concepts are assembled in a disorganised way, with the result that no formal theory emerges (Manning, 2013). This is as much to do with Goffman's prose as much as his development of ideas. As with much qualitative sociology, dramaturgy is suggestive but difficult to test. The second criticism is that dramaturgical findings can be obvious and are therefore trivial. Or those dramaturgical findings are not obvious but are trivial anyway (Manning, 2013). A third criticism is that dramaturgical analysis uses "an impoverished model of the self, seeing each of us as primarily shallow and manipulative" (Manning, 2013:8). The source of critique here is with the dramaturgical focus on the presentations of self rather than on the self who is doing the presenting. This is a criticism levied at the overarching principle of dramaturgy, yet the exploration of being feared has provided personal context to the dynamics of interaction. A fourth criticism is that "dramaturgy offers merely a photograph of social life when what is required is a full length feature film" (Manning, 2013: 9). The argument here is for the expansion of dramaturgical analysis beyond the narrow confines of social situations established by Goffman.

A potential limitation of the research can be addressed within the selection of the research groups and their presentation within the thesis. The groups were asked to speak to the context in which they were recruited initially and then asked to expand thereafter. Whilst they were in control of the narratives of their own experiences, they

were aware of the reasons for their recruitment and the interest the researcher had in them. In other words, police officers were asked to comment on the experience of being feared from a work-based, policing context for the most part. Young people were asked to reflect on their experiences from their own context and so on. It was a logical step to consider that the participants will understand their interactions from their own contexts first, and then the research has the job of finding the commonalities. In this sense, there are some specific elements to each group and further elements of the experience of being feared that can be followed up and expanded in light of the research findings presented within this thesis. Specific issues of race and gender would be one such area in need to far more concerted research. This would require a more targeted and specific methodological approach in order to draw conclusions on these areas with any validity.

Ultimately the layout of the groups within the thesis analysis serves important purposes. It offers the ability to have the best of both worlds. The distinctive elements and experiences of each group can be presented and explored. It allows for the unique tools, powers and resources of the groups to stand out. This broadens the contexts explored and offers a wide range of experiences. As will be presented in the coming analysis, a soldier interrogating a prisoner of war offers a vastly different context for being feared than that of a teenager following someone along a canal tow path. However, when looking into the data from the sample as a whole, thematically there have been succinct areas of similarity that it has been possible to bring together. The final data Chapter presents the final themes in a Goffmanian collection of groups and sub-groups that centre around the dramaturgical model and impression management (Goffman, 1959).

There are important elements of the chosen research design that, when condensed to an individual's experience, can leave other areas of academic interests on the sidelines. For example, the research engages with five groups; with police officers, bouncers, young people and students, gym-goers and soldiers. A focus on the interpretations of encounters from the members of each of these groups neither allows nor aims to expand on the wider meanings of those specific contexts *beyond* the experience of being feared. That is to say, the work-based context or social position of the participants is derived from what they have articulated and what can be interpreted

from these data. There are wide and various bodies of research concerning each of these groups, which are useful and insightful. Yet the focus of the analysis needs to remain within the context of being feared.

In relation to both the research design, the conceptual model and the informed decisions that lead to the recruitment of the groups, there are further limitations to be explored. These limitations can inform future research for the better. In light of the focus on micro-dynamics and the use of a Goffmanian framework, there is an incredibly heavy emphasis on legitimising the experiences of participants. Whilst there is evidence for this and is justified within the thesis (see Chapters 2 and 3), there is little to corroborate their accounts or challenge the assumptions they hold towards those they have come into contact with. Nor are there checks and balances on the judgements they make about the behaviour of others. Ultimately the themes and interpretation rests with the author and the research instruments were designed with the appropriate checks and measures to ensure validity. However, this is a limitation to bear in mind. This being said, as with many other areas of fear of crime investigation, there is little evidence required in the corroboration of stories, feelings or anxieties in order to consider it worthy of inclusion as a legitimate field of study. So it can be submitted that if the standards within this thesis are flawed, they are flawed in the same way as all other fear of crime research.

This Chapter's purpose was to conclude the process of setting the scene and establishing the context from which the empirical research will move forward. Outlining the research literature, the rationale for this research and the conceptual framework within which this research was conducted has done this. In light of this, it is possible to say with confidence that each group has been selected on the basis that they will be the most appropriate and relevant groups of people from which the research can gain an understanding of the experience of being feared. The following Chapters will outline the major findings to come from the empirical data. This will initially be done by addressing each research group in turn (police officers, soldiers, bouncers, gym goers and students and young people), and will reflect on the findings with a final data Chapter bringing out the core findings from within the research with reference to contextual and conceptual Chapters.

Chapter 5) Fear in a Work-Based Context: Threat, Fear, Violence and Order

Police officers are able to provide an insight into fearful interactions in a specific working environment. Officers may be aware of the impact their presence has with certain individuals and certain communities. Officers are aware of, or employ, techniques and tactics in order to obtain and maintain order in certain situations. This may involve causing fear or surprise as well as threatening violence and, indeed, the use of violence. This may also involve alleviating fear that they perceive within an encounter with a member of the public.

The ways in which officers use their powers, express their authority and the means by which they achieve their aims is multifaceted and complex. To this end, the data concerning the experience of being feared from a police officer's perspective has been broken down into key areas that address, not only the techniques and aims of fear within these interactions but the feelings and ensuing actions of others and how this impacts on the decisions and techniques used by the officers.

The Chapter utilises Goffman's (1959) *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. This adds an important dimension to understanding the experience of being feared in that it provides a detailed metaphor for understanding human interaction and how humans present themselves in society. It also, importantly, forms the basis upon which we can analyse meaning within an interaction, how this meaning is constructed and how it endures. This is important for understanding interpersonal fear. It is especially important for understanding the experiences of fear in a work-based role such as the police. As has been explained in a previous Chapter, the importance of 'appearance' and 'manner' (Goffman, 1959) help to explain the way impressions are formed and intentions are communicated within an interaction. For understanding the experience of being feared in this context, there is an added significance. A police officer's appearance and manner (in a Goffmanian sense) refers to the stimuli which function to tell us of the performer's social status and guides them as to the behaviour they might expect from them. A police officer's uniform is a visual clue to an observer that indicates the status, role and powers available to that individual. Goffman's (1959)

Presentation of Self in Everyday Life is being used here because it allows for an analysis of fearful experiences that takes into account the minutia of interaction whilst providing a framework that recognises the symbolism and meaning of a professional status like that of the police.

There are 7 police officers, 5 male and 2 female, whose experiences contribute to this Chapter. They perform a number of different roles and have served from between 3 and 10 years. PC Flemming is a white male, 39 years old. He has been a police officer for more than 10 years. Of all of the officers interviewed, he has been in the force for the longest time. He is a Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) officer and this, as he explained, was more like the classic bobby-on-the-beat. He has specialist training in riot and public order techniques and regularly polices football matches, protests and riots. He was deployed to the London riots in 2011. He is 5'10" and is of a large muscular build.

Casey Ryback, a white male, 33 years old, is an officer in a specialist tactical unit and has 9 years service with the police. The unit provides specialist support to front line officers and possesses a higher level of training to help them resolve potentially violent/dangerous situations with the minimum amount of force. The day-to-day appearance of Casey's team is different to the other officers interviewed. The uniform is more militaristic and is distinguishable from the standard uniform. Casey is 6'1" and of a medium-large build.

PC Endeavour is a white male, 30 years old and has been a police officer for 3 years. PC Endeavour has recently moved from SNT policing to TPT (Tactical Patrol Team). This meant moving from working in a familiar locale to being deployed as and when emergencies arise within the city. PC Endeavour is the officer with the least service experience. PC Endeavour is 6'3" and of a large build.

PC McLaren is an Asian male, 40 years old and has been a police officer for 10 years. PC McLaren is an SNT officer. He manages a small team in a satellite police station within a large town. His team comprises of Police Community Support Officers (PCSO), Community Wardens, Special Constables, volunteers and partners.

PC McClaren has also been deployed within a TPT at various points of his career. PC McClaren is 6'4" and of a large build.

Thelma is a white female, 37 years old and has been a police officer for 7 years. Thelma is a TPT officer having recently moved away from SNT. She works in a town of around 90,000 people. Her role involves responding to emergencies within the town and surrounding boroughs. The role involves dealing with people and situations quickly. Judgements and decision-making needs to be done quickly. Thelma is 5'7" and of medium build.

Louise is a white female, 35 years old and has been a police officer for 6 years. Louise used to work with Thelma before she moved to work on a different shift. Louise is an SNT officer. Louise had the option to move shifts alongside Thelma but preferred to stay within her neighbourhood as she felt she had built a connection with the community. Louise is 5'8" and of small build.

PC Leeds is a white male, 33 years old and has been a police officer for nearly 10 years. Like many of the police officers he has experience in both SNT and TPT policing and has been trained in specialist crowd control and deploys to football matches and riots. Like PC Flemming, PC Leeds was deployed to the London riots in 2011. He is not based in London and was deployed because of his experience. PC Leeds is 5'8" and of small build.

First, the Chapter will look at fear in a work-based context. It will explore the techniques that are employed by officers deliberately, with the intention to cause fear to service a particular policing aim, such as compliance to a command. Here the initial emphasis will be on the uses of fear within the professional setting of a police officer. Second, the Chapter will consider areas of the policing experience in which fear is identified as an unwanted emotion within an interaction and what, if any, tactics can be used to reduce this fear and what impact this has on the policing role.

a) Gaining Compliance and the Techniques for Causing Fear

The officers interviewed demonstrated that fear can play an important role within their professional lives as police officers. This was reflected in their own fears, and the fear that they are able to elicit, both purposefully and accidentally. They also suggested that this happens on a number of interrelated levels that can both help and hinder the execution of their policing role. More specifically, the officers detailed the way in which they are able to cause fear and, importantly, to use fear to gain or maintain control of a situation. This was explained with the use of scenarios and situations that the officers have been involved in and a series of specifically trained and learned techniques were expounded. The way in which the officers related these techniques to fear varied. Some suggested that certain techniques were deliberately used to cause fear. Others suggested that amongst the techniques they used fear was a by-product of an encounter of which the primary focus was driven by a policing outcome other than that of causing fear.

Fear: the use of force and the threat of force

One technique that a police officer can deploy during the course of his/her occupation is the use of legally sanctioned force or violence when the situational circumstances allow it. This, in many ways, goes without saying. However, within such a statement it is necessary to be able to link the uses of these powers with the individual officer's aims underpinning their use, the reasons why such tactics were considered reasonable and, most importantly, what impact fear has on these situations. This is true, not only for the people on the receiving end of this force, but also for the officers that are using this force or the threat of force. The point of potential confrontation is the very point at which Collins' (2009) barrier of confrontation tension and fear can be most evident. Within the data, officers reflect on their personal experiences and reflect on specific scenarios. That is to say, that the aims, decisions and assessments of fear within each scenario are the individual interpretations of those officers involved.

As a starting point, it is important to make a distinction between the actual use of force and the threat of force. In other words, it is necessary to recognise that there are scenarios in which force is threatened but not used and, indeed, scenarios where it is

both threatened and used. The distinction is needed to separate the threat and application of force in order to tease out the point at which the officers perceive fear has, if at all, had an impact on each of the scenarios. That is to say, when an officer is able to gain control of a situation by threatening the use force, does fear have anything to do with the de-escalation of the situation? Likewise, when the threat of force fails to defuse a situation, to what is this failure of the threat attributed?

In addition to this, it is important to understand the process by which interactions between police officers and members of the public can move from verbal communication to physical action and the abundance of variation between these interactional extremes in a policing context. By way of an example, an interaction between a police officer and a member of the public could start with a simple line of questioning which becomes an interaction where voices are raised, which in turn becomes an interaction where threats are made and eventually becomes an interaction where an arrest is made amid fierce resistance.

Furthermore, distinction between the use of force and the threat of force is important because of the situational characteristics inherent within the individual scenarios the officers describe. As already suggested, in some situations the officer is able to gain or maintain order or compliance without the use, or threat, of force or violence. In other situations the use of force or violence is necessary to gain order. In addition, the reasons and justifications the officers use to describe the deployment of particular tactics are important. In other words, the ways in which the officers understand and respond to the people around them and their interpretation of their intentions in relation to the level of force used by the officer. The way the police officers describe this interpersonal communicative information and, how it informs their ongoing action is of great importance. In addition, the reasons the officers describe for the success or failure of the use of force or the threat of violence to maintain/achieve order and for the role that fear plays in this reasoning is key. That is to say, do police officers consider fear to be a useful tool in the maintenance of order and, if this is the case, what techniques do they employ when eliciting fear?

Police officers, during their daily work routines, are constantly making decisions concerning the people they engage with, the laws and powers they choose to use and

how they respond to each and every situation in which they are placed. In order to assist in this decision making process the police have used various models to help train officers and standardise, as far as possible, the processes that go in to making these decisions. The Conflict Management Model (CMM) or as it has more recently become known the National Decision Model (NDM), as used by UK forces is a police framework that is meant to make the decision making process easier and more uniform.



Figure 1. National Decision Model (NDM).

The relationship between figure 1 (above) and fear has specific relevance to understanding the professional context of being feared. The NDM model works clockwise from the top (Gather Information and Intelligence). It is a way in which the officers are continually asked to make assessments, checks and balances of legitimate action and understand their own accountability and the meanings and consequences of their action. It is a tool that attempts to ensure professional accountability is related to central policing values. In relation to when fear is used as a proactive policing tool, it is, or should be, a considered and purposeful action.

Every officer in relation to the processes they undertook before using or deploying particular policing tactics, including eliciting and alleviating fear, mentioned the NDM at some point. In many cases this involved tactics that were, according to the officers, deliberately designed to cause fear. It is important to stress, in relation to the model, that it ties the use of fear with a policing aim. That is to say, the decision to use or threaten force needs to be underpinned by a demonstrable level of due diligence and a justifiable use of the legally sanctioned authority that a police officer possesses. The powers the officers chose to use have to be justified in every situation and every encounter. It is the relationship between the justification of sanctioned force and the professionalism (and accountability) of those that are allowed to use it that makes this model relevant.

More specifically in relation to the use of force, police officers are often faced with making decisions about how and when to escalate the encounters they experience during their daily working lives. This includes the threat of force and, indeed, the use of force. A number of the scenarios, described within the data, show a steady escalation of force before the use of hands-on force is required or justified. One technique employed by the police is the 'show of strength.' Explanations from the officers regarding a 'show of strength' were often mentioned with direct referral to the NDM and the scenarios reflected the officer's incremental use of tactics in response to the behaviour of the perpetrator.

There were a number of situations described by the officers regarding the scenarios in which they used the threat or use of force and the ways in which a 'show of strength' did and did not, have the desired effect. The officers within the sample described a 'show of strength' in various ways. The first officer to introduce the term in interview was PC Flemming who described the 'show of strength' as 'generally a group activity', meaning that it is often used within public order situations. He said that:

“A command will be given to withdraw asps¹. We then raise it up high in the air and then rest it on our shoulder. We used to shout as a unit, repeating the command, Roman legion style.”

PC Flemming, crucially, added that the purpose of the ‘show of strength’ was as a show of intent. Inherent in this intent is the use of force. The officers withdraw, and display, their weapons. This is a purposeful and trained technique within public order scenarios. Importantly, PC Flemming related this process to fear when outlining the policing purpose of using a ‘show of strength’:

“It’s sending a message [to those observing]. A warning shot. Hoping to send a message that we are beyond the realms of a friendly chat and a cuddle. It is related to fear. You want them to stop. It can be intimidating. It works on some people and not with others. It’s the last throw of the dice, really. Before we have to go hands on.”

Here, there is ample cause to remember Collins (2009) and the confrontational tension fear barrier (Ctf) to help understand the effect a show of strength and, the implied threat of force, can have on those that it is directed towards. Collins (2009:71) suggests, “Where enemies make a strong showing, or where police or other authorities display a clear willingness to use force, the rioters almost always retreat, at least in that immediate locality.” In this instance, the ‘show of strength’ is, to use Collins’ (2009) terms, testing the willingness of the rioters to breach the barrier of confrontational tension and fear. If the show of strength demonstrates to the officers that the participants are unwilling to engage in violence, then they retreat and the situation dissipates. If they are willing to engage, then the officers escalate their threat to action. Each decision is a response to the stimuli in front of them.

Not all officers used these techniques in large public order scenarios. For example, PC Endeavour, on a more localised and less formally organised level, also described the ‘show of strength’:

¹Asp - a colloquial term for the police officer’s truncheon. It is a hand held, telescopic metal baton.

“On a day-to-day level officers talk about it in similar terms [to the group show of strength] but on a smaller level. Friday nights, for example, there might be four of us in a van as well as a few pairs on foot. In a pub fight, two officers turning up is not always as effective as four bowling up in a van all on-scene at same time. So a ‘show of strength’ with numbers reduces likelihood of it escalating. As enough officers are there to deter any further acts of disorder.”

PC Flemming, in particular, considered whether there was a scenario in which the show of strength did not work or did not have the desired impact. For him, the desired impact referred to a ‘policing outcome.’ In other words, a person or people stopping the activity that PC Flemming and/or his colleagues deemed inappropriate or illegal:

“...it’s difficult, I can’t think of a situation where it [the show of strength] has not worked in some way or another, although, you know, I have only had to use it [his asp] once.”

In PC Flemming’s eyes, as described below, this scenario represented a relatively unsuccessful ‘show of strength’. This was measured by the fact that this interaction was escalated to a higher level and the crowd did not fall back in the expected fashion (Collins, 2009). In other words, he had to actually use force. In this instance, it resulted in him striking someone with his baton/asp. In other words, PC Flemming’s belief was that a successful ‘show of strength’ was often a situation in which the use of force or violence is threatened, but not used. It would take the form of a directed threat, followed by cessation of activity.

The scenario PC Flemming describes involved a public order deployment at a local football match. There had been fighting during the course of the day and a group of fans had attempted to break through a barrier:

“[The football fans] actually lifted the metal barrier up and there was one steward, on his own, trying to hold on... I don’t know what they were going to do with it, and literally my show of strength went from show of strength to strike straight away. I actually ran towards them and struck them...my number one goal is to try and protect the steward and also stop them from breaking out because otherwise we have home

and away fans mixing in a big car park. So it was very dynamic and almost split second decision-making.”

In the situation described above, the show of strength escalated to a point at which violence became a tool that the officer believed was necessary to deploy. PC Flemming’s use of physical force was targeted and had a specific aim:

“They dropped the barrier...I struck him on the upper arm. It was a single hit and it did the job. They stopped trying to break out.”

Importantly, PC Flemming again related the threat of force and the use of force to fear in his professional context. This strikes similarities between Collins’ (2009) assertion that violence and fear are very closely related. Fear, as PC Flemming explained, was an essential element in gaining compliance. It was the looming spectre of violence that helped achieve this. The importance and usefulness of fear in a policing context was evident within many of the scenarios he described and, as he succinctly states:

“You are reliant on fear to get a positive result.”

In this sense, a positive result is compliance and fear enables compliance for this police officer. Put another way, fear is an essential tool for police officers in gaining control within a situation where they believe to be a lack of control. Indeed, PC Flemming’s explanations of the efficacy of the ‘show of strength’ and the use of force were not unique within the data.

For example, Casey Ryback is 33 years old, and is an officer in a specialist tactical unit and has 9 years service with the police. Casey described further scenarios where he had used force during the execution of his role as a police officer. Suggesting that he and his unit deployed specific techniques in order to cause fear in those that they came into contact with. Casey offers an insight into the tactics involved in using force and fear on a more frequent basis professionally. This was given deeper context when he explained that the unit would spend weeks, and even months, planning an operation and that, unlike many other officer’s actions, theirs were specifically targeted and planned:

“We plan. We plan for this, we plan for that and we train for it, for each scenario. When I go up to a house I know what side of the door the hinges are on, I know the layout of the building, I know what my role is and I know who and what I am there for.”

In contrast to the situations described by PC Flemming, Casey’s experiences suggest a lesser tendency for on-the-spot decision making or improvisation and more deliberately administered protocols as far as the use of force and the use of fear was concerned:

“Quite often I encounter fear when I do house entries. We break through the door quietly, if it allows. The tactic is, if they are asleep don’t wake them up. You wait until the rest of the house is cleared. If you can get up close and wake them up at the same time they’ll make less fuss. If you wake one early and they start shouting and screaming then it all kicks off.”

In this scenario Casey recognises that the element of surprise and, the ensuing fear, is an effective way of gaining compliance:

“The screams some people let out! You know, a guy dressed all in black with a helmet, a mask and a shield has just woken you in your own house. They go cold. That’s the fear, that’s fear. They keep saying they’re cold.”

There are a number of points to reflect on here. First, the recognition that feeling cold is associated with fear is an astute observation by Casey and is a physiologically supported observation. As has been shown, when a person is frightened blood is diverted to the muscles, the liver releases glucose for quick energy and the body starts to sweat and cool (Brodal, 2004). In the minutes following the initial fear eliciting moment, this would cause the body temperature to cool and, possibly, shiver (Brodal, 2004).

Second, Casey Ryback suggested that the people they deal with are used to dealing with the police. Alongside this familiarity comes an expectation of behaviour of

police officers. Goffman (1959) suggests that in everyday interaction one can expect a relationship between the way a person looks and the way one would expect them to behave. In a specific policing sense, those that are used to interacting with the police would have expectations concerning police behaviour. In this sense, Casey suggests they are not easily intimidated by the normal procedures and are likely to offer more resistance when being arrested and, importantly, are able to intimidate a lot of police officers. However, Casey was keen to outline the differences between his unit and the way they operated:

“Our unit is aggressive and thorough. We use force. It is not necessarily linked to fear but we do use it. A lot of them [the people they come into contact with] know we won’t be bullied. If they want a fight they’ll get one. So they tend to come quietly. These guys can intimidate normal cops. Not with us.”

Casey suggested his unit need to take a more assertive and aggressive stance because of the regularity with which the people he deals with come into contact with the police. In describing another scenario Casey alluded to the role that fear plays within his, more specialised police role. However, it is necessary to differentiate between the dynamics of the situations that Casey Ryback often works in, in comparison to the other officers interviewed. Many of the scenarios that Casey described were surprise entries to properties supported by a court acquired warrant. They were not improvised or reactive scenarios. Instead, they were targeted and planned police actions. A point Casey was keen to make clear. In this sense, he was able to describe the purposeful use of explicitly fear provoking behaviour within his role. He was also, importantly, able to say why he thought provoking fear was necessary. In doing so, despite the specialist nature of his role, Casey reflected very similar sentiments to PC Flemming and PC Endeavour:

“Fear makes your job easier. Show aggression and you can neutralise people that would otherwise be empowered. It’s bread and butter for us. Some will kick off until you get right on them. Then they comply. Fear is definitely useful.”

Again, Casey indicates a strong link between fear and compliance. He suggested that his behaviour in these situations was deliberate and targeted. It was also evident that

he did not lose sight of the importance of being able to justify these actions in a professional context:

“Intimidation is important in a lot of these situations - threats, aggression, that sort of thing. [When you go into a situation] you’ve got your game face on. Get there, get the kit on and go. You have to mentally document everything. So if I knock him out, I need to know what I’ve seen, what I did, what I said.”

Two important areas are described above. Firstly, Casey mentions a specific behavioural change, ‘the game face’, when he engages in the activities of his day-to-day working life. This indicates that he recognises that this behaviour is suitable, or perhaps, necessary when engaging in these interactions. Secondly, Casey’s recollections also refer to the longer-term necessity of justifying every action and its consequences. This demonstrates the existence and guidance of an underlying professionalism and, in this sense, Casey was clear that the activities he described are not acts of gratuitous violence but an administered set of protocols on specifically selected people/s with a desired and legally justifiable outcome. The outcomes are, in Casey’s situations, derived from evidence gathered intelligence reports. As Casey remarked ‘our presence at the scene is not an accident.’ For Casey, as with all of the police officers, the measures they employ are considered alongside a firm belief in the legitimacy of their actions and the need to evidence and justify the thought processes and resultant actions that they choose to deploy. The specific relationship between legitimacy and the use of fear in a policing context will be returned to in detail later.

This being said, when Casey referred to the training and/or protocols he did indicate that there were more nuanced tactics and learned behaviours that differentiated his actions. In a Goffmanian sense, there are two points that stand out when taking into account Casey’s experiences. First, there is a distinction in the uniforms of the specialised officers compared to their colleagues. To those that came into regular contact with the police this was a detail that allowed the more specialised officers to stand out as their insignia of rank (Goffman, 1959) had important differences. With these differences came different expectations of behaviour. The differences were in the manner (Goffman, 1959) displayed in their interactions. When speaking about the ways in which he would be able to cause fear in others he remarked:

“A lot of the training is stand-offish. You have got to be like a train. Don’t go on the back foot. As soon as you see them you have got to take them out. You need that momentum. Can’t stop. That is the key – aggression and loudness.”

Whilst reiterating the specialist nature of his unit, Casey suggested that he was aware that his description and, indeed, his actions would not fit in the more general world of policing and the general public. Suggesting that, in a way, those people that he surprised were complicit in this process:

“The people we deal with know why we are there. They are not necessarily expecting us though. Once they get over the initial shock and calm down I have had one give me and nod as if to say ‘yeah you got me there.’

For a good number of the officers interviewed, unlike Casey, there was a lack of certainty regarding exactly how they or their actions were able to maintain compliance on occasion. For example, PC Flemming described a scenario in which he and 4 other officers were able to hold apart two rival sets of football fans totalling more than 60 between them. One set of fans had, according to PC Flemming, occupied a pub that was known to be a favourite with rival fans on match day causing unrest, but the situation was contained and no real violence broke out. This was, according to PC Flemming a frequent thing but, nonetheless, puzzling:

*“If they [the football fans] really wanted to push past us they could have done, and if the people in the street had really wanted to push past those four officers they could have done. And you notice that quite a lot. We contain people and take them away from a situation and some of them may be saying things like ‘f***ing come here!’ ‘Come on then I’ll take you on!’ to other groups of fans but if they really wanted to get past us they could do. So what is keeping them in this imaginary box? What is keeping them in the pub? ...But they weren’t trying that hard to get out, because I am one guy and I’ve got one colleague with me. We are not supermen. We couldn’t keep them back if they really wanted to get out. So you could say, ‘oh maybe the use of force worked, maybe the uniform worked, maybe that was enough that your average person would think ‘I don’t want any of that.’”*

Collins (2009) talks about the confrontational tension fear barrier with a specific emphasis on policing. Collins (2009) suggests in relation to rioting, that if there is violence within the situation, it is carried out by a small proportion of persons at the front, pushing and taunting. Collins (2009:71) also suggests, as has been previously discussed, that “the behaviour of most people in riots shows tension and fear, manifested in great caution, and frequently in running towards safety at signs of counter attack from the other side.” This seems to confirm that, whilst PC Flemming finds it puzzling that a greater level of violence or resistance didn’t break out, it was unlikely to given the fear experienced by all participants at the moments of confrontation.

Many of the officers spoke of using the same techniques when causing or eliciting fear responses in people. This is not surprising as their techniques are all derived from the same, or very similar, training. However, the distinctions can be seen in the ways that they are verbalised and, in the frequency with which certain techniques are used. PC Flemming, for example, possesses the highest level of public order training offered, as does Casey Ryback, yet their roles determine that Casey is in a position to use these techniques far more often. That is to say, the confidence or single mindedness of Casey Ryback’s professional narrative is necessarily different from officers with a less specialised role. In this sense, Casey’s use of fear and intimidation in a professional capacity was a far more frequent occurrence than would be the case for most officers.

For example, PC McLaren, an officer with 10 years experience, speaks of training, techniques and the methods of gaining compliance within a number of situations with varying degrees of danger and seriousness but does not relate them to fear in the same way that Casey Ryback or PC Flemming does. PC McLaren commented:

“At work, if you have someone in front of you that is violent or refusing to comply with you, you are equipped with the tools to gain control of that person by means of verbal communication, talking them down. You may be the first one on the scene and they just want to rant and rave.”

PC McLaren has a different role to that of Casey Ryback. PC McLaren is a Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) officer. A Safer Neighbourhood Team is a dedicated team, which can comprise of police officers, Police Community Support Officers (PCSO), Community Wardens, Special Constables, volunteers and partners. All of these elements are tasked with working together in partnership with local people in neighbourhoods. In light of this, PC McLaren's professional life is shaped by a very different set of dynamics and preconceptions when encountering members of the public. There is far less expectation of imminent confrontation:

"I never go into anything anticipating a fight. I never think, 'in 10 seconds I'll be rolling around on the floor with someone.'"

However, whilst this contrasts with Casey, this does not mean to suggest that PC McLaren is unaware of the tendency for people to fear him, far from it. It was rather that, in contrast to Casey and PC Flemming, PC McLaren did not suggest that he had actively or purposefully engaged in causing fear to gain compliance with his day-to-day policing role.

For example, PC McLaren described a situation in which he was called to a park where there had been reports of a man taking pictures of young children during the height of summer. He was tasked to locate the individual concerned. He was able to find the person in a local supermarket, detained him and conveyed him back to the police station. It turned out that the person in question was a holidaymaker from India:

"On getting back to the station he completely broke down. Emotionally broke down. He was hysterical. He started to exhibit signs that he was going to hurt himself. He was banging his head against the cell wall, things like that. I went in to speak to him. I speak some Punjabi; he was asking God to forgive him. He started screaming 'please don't hurt me! Please don't hurt me! His face was full of fear.'"

Whilst the events described above were the most vivid in PC McLaren's interview and the moments at which he was able to genuinely reflect on another's fear of him he did not relate these experiences in the same way as other officers in that he describes

essentially the same techniques but does not describe them within the context of explicitly causing fear. That is to say, fear does not seem to be regarded as an end in itself for establishing order within the police role for PC McLaren.

Fear, Presence and Manner

When considering the variety of encounters and situations that police officers find themselves in, it is not always necessary or justified to threaten force or use force. Therefore officers must be able to use different techniques, tools and skills to perform their policing role. In-line with Goffman's (1959) concept of the presentation of self, the officers suggested that, alongside the use of force, their identifiable visible presence as officers (insignia of rank), their physical size and number (presence) and the way in which they talk to people (manner) can all have an effect on the role they perform. Fear, according to the officers, is still important and can be both help and hindrance.

The relationship between the police uniform, fear and compliance will be returned to in detail shortly. First, a number of the officers remarked on various tools, beyond force, that they believe help them gain compliance and fulfil their professional role. For example, PC Endeavour, like many of the officers, believed that alongside politeness and 'the way you present yourself in public' that his physical presence plays an important part of his ability to be an effective police officer. In this instance, PC Endeavour was referring to his personal physical size:

"The uniform may or may not have an impact. My size does. More often than not."

To qualify this, PC Endeavour described a scenario in which he and a female officer drove to attend an incident at a house. Upon arriving the female officer went to the door and attempted to deal with the occupants while PC Endeavour remained in the car. PC Endeavour observed that a male occupant was being aggressive and non-compliant with his colleague using verbal threats and aggressive gestures.

"I got out of the car and his behaviour completely changed. He came right back down. By the time I got to him he was almost apologetic. Before I got out he had been

pointing and shouting, telling her to get out, being aggressive. That's happened more than once and not just with female crew."

PC Endeavour made explicit the reasons he believed this person's behaviour changed:

"Sometimes you have to up the ante to get people to pay attention. That's where my size, my weight make a difference. My colleagues have the same powers, the same training but a different presence."

This impact of having an officer of large stature in a situation was a concept shared by other officers. There were further recollections within the data suggesting that an officer's size can have a positive impact when trying to gain compliance with otherwise unwilling people. Very similarly to PC Endeavour's scenario, Thelma and Louise described an officer on their shift that stands at well over two metres tall:

"The effect of his size is amazing. He has to unfold himself out of police cars. We had an incident in town and couldn't get a fighting group of lads to calm down. He was in the car and I just said, 'we could really do with your size out here.' He got out and just stood there and the situation diffused. They won't even take that on."

These scenarios present an interesting point of discussion concerning what impact the size of the officer has. That is to say, Collins (2009) would suggest that by adding someone of physical size to the situation, presents would-be aggressors with a harder obstacle to overcome and the police may move, situationally from a weak position to a stronger one. Thus the chances of the aggressor winning a physical confrontation are reduced and the attractiveness of violence as an option is therefore reduced. To use Collins' (2009) term, they would be unwilling or unable to breach the barrier of confrontational tension and fear.

In addition, as was described earlier in the Chapter, the presence of a large bodied officer could be interpreted as a 'show of strength.' As was described in the scenario with Thelma above, the request for a larger officer to make himself visible was made. This was a spontaneous policing tactic. However, Thelma made the request to the larger officer in full expectation that it would aid in diffusing a violent situation,

despite its spontaneity. In other words, there appeared to be an expectation that his physical presence alone would be operationally useful. However, PC Endeavour alluded to the fact that this was not necessarily as simple as the presence of a large-bodied officer appearing on the scene. Gaining compliance in some situations was more nuanced and required the use of different techniques for different circumstances:

“It’s all situationally specific. Please and thank you go a long way but ultimately you need to provide a consequence to people’s actions. A line needs to be drawn ‘the law is this, I need to do this.’”

As an example PC Endeavour described a scenario in which he was crewed with a much younger, newer officer. They attended an incident that required a crime suspect to be brought in for questioning. His fellow officer was unable to get the man to comply and, according to PC Endeavour’s recount, was beginning to lose control of the situation.

“My colleague didn’t provide a consequence for this person’s behaviour, he was younger, smaller, newer. You don’t need to meet people with aggression but be assertive and meet people head on. I am not going to step back. I guess the correct procedural way to say it would be I’d give them a show of force.”

PC Endeavour described how he presented the person with an ultimatum that involved a voluntary trip to the station for questioning or an arrest and extraction from his house. At which point he deliberately withdrew his handcuffs from their holster. Much like a number of the scenarios presented previously, this could be seen as a type of ‘show of strength.’ PC Endeavour suggested:

“I presented him with something that would have been difficult to overcome. Being aggressive to someone younger and smaller is easily done. If presented with someone harder to push around, if it had turned into a fight, you look at size, height, I can only presume he equated all of this and decided he couldn’t win and conceded.”

Much like PC Flemming, PC Endeavour did show insight into the fact that this process can have different consequences:

“When it doesn’t work [diplomacy and outlining consequences]...you can go to public order for this because that is where physical force comes into play more often, you are taught in training about your various tactical options. So you have presence, some people will adjust their behaviour simply because you are there. You can give warnings about their behaviour and it goes all the way up to physical contact. If they are not compliant and you have to go hands on, inevitably, you end up rolling around.”

PC Endeavour also described the policing tools he felt he, personally, had at his disposal:

“It is a running joke on my shift that if there is a violent arrest that needs to be done it tends to be me upfront. I am a firm believer in working with the tools that you’ve got. In these situations [situations where violence is possible] I am able to have the desired effect on the deviant or person who is up to no good, and then it’s a result. But I would not actively seek to be feared.”

Whilst not specifically wanting to be feared was a point that PC Endeavour was keen to emphasise he was, however, pragmatic about his capacity to do so:

“I hope I don’t generate fear in people. It’s not my aim. However there are times when people’s behaviour changes. I’d like to say that they don’t fear me specifically. It’s just what society projects on people, you know, the size, the build, and the haircut. I am a man, it’s what society say ‘he’s a lump of a lad, avoid conflict.’ Yeah it’s me in front of them but you know...”

Many of the officers suggested that there are limits to the usefulness of force and a tool. Indeed, they suggested that a propensity to over use violence could acquire you with a reputation that can be damaging. That is to say, fellow officers would identify a tendency for an over use of force as would those members of the public that they come into contact with on a regular basis. For example, Thelma and Louise described various issues with officers that appear overly keen to exert physical force and, in their minds, lack the verbal and interpersonal skills to avoid such confrontations:

*“Some officers are sh*t magnets. No matter who they are talking to, people get irate and start kicking off. Some officers have presence and are handy when they need to be but don't rely on it. That's the key. You don't want to work with the bad ones.”*

Here, considering that fear and violence are related processes (Collins, 2009), it is apparent that fear is a phenomenon that needs to be negotiated. Thelma and Louise's description relates directly to when officers get the fear balance wrong. Indeed, Thelma and Louise indicate, with their disapproval, that this makes the policing process more difficult and, in turn, makes fear harder to manage. In an expression of the virtues of understanding the interactional balance, Louise placed a good deal of emphasis on the need to have skills beyond the overtly physical and intimidating:

“I can't walk into every scenario and just start putting people on their arse. You need to be able to talk to people, get them to calm down, reason with them”

This being said, Thelma and Louise suggested that there were officers they worked with that were physically intimidating for the people they came in to contact with, and that, for them, this could be a policing advantage on occasion. Thelma remarked:

“People are so afraid of [officer's name] that they wouldn't commit crime. It's all those muscles. He looks like he could be a bit of a git. But he doesn't go up [by this she means to refer to the officer's temper], even when people kick off. That's a skill. Some officers have presence and are handy when they need to be but don't rely on it. You might expect [officer's name] to be more chopsy [argumentative] and fighty but then he'll talk someone down. He is like a walking contradiction. He looks like he'll take you down but then he'll just talk.”

In describing a 'walking contradiction', Thelma outlined an expectation disconnection (Goffman, 1959) between an officer's physical appearance and his manner during professional encounters. That is to say, it was her impression (and the impression of members of the public in her eyes) that the officer's visual physical appearance gave the impression that he was 'handy', meaning he was a skilled fighter. Yet, he possessed the ability to manage policing situations by other means. Demonstrating

sensitivity with regard to understanding when to use force and fear proactively and when to use other tools. To use Collins' (2009) terms, this officer knew when to challenge members of the public up to and beyond the barrier of confrontational tension and fear, and when not to.

b) Encountering and Recognising Fear in Others

It is necessary to outline the ways and situations in which officers perceive fear in those that they come into contact with when it has not been expected or wanted. As many of the police officers suggested, they do not spend their entire day chasing criminals, having fights and smashing doors down. That is to say, their role and the tactics they employ therein, are not always fear eliciting. Indeed, all but one of the officers interviewed were, or had experience of, policing in a Safer Neighbourhood Team. This involves a considerable amount of locale-specific community liaison, victim support and preventive policing. Amongst this work is the notion that, in some situations, their role requires them to alleviate fear in the people they come into contact with.

PC Endeavour, an SNT officer, described a scenario in which he and another officer were feared in a way that was not intended. That is to say, that they did not, in their opinion, engage in behaviour deliberately designed to cause fear but were feared by a person they came into contact with. PC Endeavour and his colleague had been tasked with conducting an out of uniform or plain-clothes drugs operation within the local area. They were to patrol their area, as covertly as possible, and accost anyone they suspected of buying or selling illegal drugs. They were walking down a path at night when a young man in front of them lit a cigarette and walked in the opposite direction. PC Endeavour smelt cannabis and he and the other officer decided to approach the young man. They followed for a short time and the young man, according to PC Endeavour, was looking increasingly anxious. In their attempt to catch up the young man attempted to flee the scene. They eventually managed to get close enough and PC Endeavour shouted 'stop police!' Following this, the young man stopped and and PC Endeavour noted:

*“His behaviour instantly changed. He immediately relaxed and said ‘thank f*** you are the police. I thought I was going to get mugged.’”*

The above recognises that in this short example the officers were, understandably perhaps, feared for reasons that were not commensurate with their intentions. That is to say, they wanted to talk to the young man about his drug use and the possible source of the drugs. Instead, the young man thought they were going to deprive him of property by force. As soon as their real intentions were clear his behaviour changed and, according to PC Endeavour, his fear dissipated. In addition to this, PC Endeavour recognised signs of fear in this person’s actions. He described this as a quickening walk, rapidly increasing level of frantic glances behind him and, eventually, flight.

This encounter is important for a number of reasons. First, PC Endeavour was in no doubt that he was seeing fear in the behaviour of the young man. As already suggested in a preceding Chapter, there are a number of key understandings within the display of emotions and expressions that support PC Endeavour’s certainty. For example, Emotional Body Language (EBL) provides an observer with reliable cues to recognise another’s emotions even when viewed from a distance and when the facial expression is not visible (Gelder, 2006). Indeed, the universality of emotional expression (Ekman, 1972) is as true of facial expressions as it is with gestures, postures and the like (Grezes *et al.*, 2006). Also, regardless of the universality of emotions facially, bodily or otherwise, PC Endeavour interpreted this young man’s actions as fearful ones and acted accordingly. This, for understanding what it is like to be feared, is key. That is to say, PC Endeavour’s actions were guided because of the fear he perceived.

Second, PC Endeavour, having understood the young man to be displaying fearful mannerisms, at first, believed that he was running away because of his apparent drug use and a desire to avoid being caught. Instead, the young man feared that PC Endeavour and his fellow officer were criminals that were going to attack him. When this realisation was made apparent, this lead PC Endeavour to reflect on his actions after the event and he realised that, without the insignia of rank or position inherent in wearing a police uniform as mentioned earlier in this Chapter, then his actions could (and were) interpreted as threatening:

“I suppose when you consider what we were doing and how we looked [without uniform] then he had every right to be afraid. It was just the difference in behaviour when we stopped him. He wasn't bothered about being caught with drugs. He didn't want to get mugged. I suppose if I had two big lads chasing me I'd feel like that too.”

This brings into focus Goffman's (1959) concept of social expectation and, within this scenario, where the expectation of behaviour from the observer (the young man) was very different to the intentions of the police officers and vice versa. Goffman's (1951:296) elaboration on symbols of class status would suggest that the police uniform and the identification of a person as a police officer are symbols that testify to a person's presumed authority. Indeed, in the scenario described by PC Endeavour, the young man did not, and could not, visually corroborate (Goffman, 1959) his legal authority because there was no uniform and, as a result, his confusion as to their intentions was evident. Indeed, this leads to the matter of social and behavioural expectation on the part of the young man and that of PC Endeavour. That is to say, from the young man's perspective, he observed that two men were following him. The two men split apart and tried to encircle him. He reacted by attempting to flee. From PC Endeavour's perspective, he was tasked with performing a policing function and his authority in this matter is not legally different or dependent on his clothing. It was only following the interaction that PC Endeavour was able to reflect on the point that he interpreted the fear of the young man as being fear of being caught by the law, rather than the fear of being criminally victimised.

In this encounter, PC Endeavour lacked the visual symbol, the uniform, which can immediately provide an observer with a set of expectations about his behaviour or his role within any given situation (Goffman, 1959). Indeed, if PC Endeavour had been wearing uniform the young man's behaviour may have been different from the outset. It is unlikely that the young man would have started to openly smoke cannabis if he had observed the presence of two uniformed officers. As Richard and Johnson (2001) suggest, people in the presence of a person in uniform cooperate more and curb their illegal or deviant behaviours. This symbol, as with many symbols of authority can be viewed positively, as a symbol of protection, of lawfulness or safety and negatively,

as a symbol of threat, of sanction and violence depending on the context of the encounter.

There were other examples of officers relating the fear that they observed in other people to the uniform specifically. For example, PC McLaren indicated that fear could, in fact, be a barrier to his police role. He suggests that, on occasion, there are times when fear impedes his ability to reason with people:

“The uniform is something that people can be genuinely afraid of. But fear can be a barrier to the job. A lot of the time you just want to talk to people.”

Indeed, PC McLaren referred to the uniform as a barrier here because fear was impeding his ability to effectively police because he was unable to gain information and to talk to people due to their fear of the uniform and its associated connotations. Contrastingly, PC Endeavour, rather than thinking the uniform had an adverse impact because of fear of the uniform, suggested that the uniform didn't have enough of an impact as far as policing was concerned:

“Within the area I work in I don't think the uniform has any impact. No respect. I don't want people to be quaking in front of me saying ‘oh my God I'm in trouble here’ but I do like respect. We have been entrusted with the duty and role of upholding the laws of the land.”

This view was not shared with all the officers. For example, Thelma and Louise both agreed:

“We know the uniform can be threatening. I am aware of that. I know people can be frightened of us.”

It is certainly true that the opinions of the officers varied concerning the relationship between fear and the uniform, but all agreed that there was a relationship with fear in some capacity. PC McLaren was able to give a more detailed example of the negative impact a uniform can have when he described his encounter with the Indian

holidaymaker who was suspected of taking indecent images of children in a park. Having described the man's hysterical fear PC McLaren remarked:

“He was taken out to the exercise yard as he was having trouble breathing. I have no idea what he thought I was going to do.”

In this sense PC McLaren has, in his recollection of the situation, considered that it was he, to a certain extent, who was the reason for, or object of, this fear. For PC McLaren this proved an important point and guided his following actions:

“He was on his back flailing uncontrollably. He was still looking at me, praying and shouting ‘please don’t hurt me.’ I knew he was afraid. Initially I was taken aback. I have never experienced someone being that afraid of me before. I genuinely think he thought I had come out there to hurt him.”

Whilst PC McLaren suggested he had little experience of this kind of behaviour he was able to recognise that action needed to be taken:

“The first thing I did was to take the utility belt off. The reason I did that, he could see all this stuff round my belt, handcuffs, gas, asp, if I take that off he will see that I have nothing to hurt him with anyway. I took the stab vest off too, those things look pretty militaristic anyway, and I got down on my hands and knees so I could be at his level.”

Here, PC McLaren showed sensitivity to the way he looked in uniform and to the implications or barriers this might have in this scenario. Shaw (1973), when talking about uniforms in the criminal justice system, suggests that clothing determines the behaviour of the wearer and that the uniform may have a bearing on the wearer's actions. Here, for PC McLaren, his realisation that the uniform, and what this uniform represented, was the cause for this individual's fear. Indeed, Shaw (1973) also argues that clothing in the criminal justice system seems to both express and to be the cause of, attitudes, actions and reactions. The police uniform generates a particular conception of order and is invested with heavy moral significance (Shaw, 1973). For the observer in this situation, there was no difference between the wearer of the uniform and the expectations he had of his actions (Goffman, 1959). That is to say,

his uniform, inextricably linked PC McLaren as a person and as a police officer. In this scenario, PC McLaren suggested that his actions were not necessarily born from training or protocol:

“This [removing items of uniform] was a decision I made. Not protocol. I thought I needed to demonstrate that I wasn’t going to hurt him. I got down, placed my hand on his shoulder and said ‘I am not going to hurt you, you are safe here.’ He placed his arm on my shoulder, still crying. There was a degree of trust between us at that point as he felt he could reciprocate.”

PC McLaren’s actions were not unique within the data. Indeed, this suggests strongly that there is a link between the uniform and fear as well as a link between the uniform and an *expectation* of fear. Fear of the uniform itself was not such an explicitly strong feature in the officer’s descriptions of their techniques for causing fear or gaining compliance (with perhaps the exception of Casey Ryback). However, they are clearly aware of the need to remove items of uniform to alleviate fear or, at the very least appear less threatening to some of the people they come into contact with during their working life. Indeed, PC Endeavour, PC Flemming, PC Lee, Thelma, Louise and PC McLaren described various scenarios in which they felt it necessary to remove certain items of uniform to alleviate the fears or worries of others.

For example, Thelma described a situation in which she was called to a house in which a mother had physically abused 2 children; she had used belts to hit them:

“First up, I had an argument with the social worker because I turned up in uniform. I told her that if she wants a police response then this is what she gets. But if the situation is appropriate, like this one was, I’ll remove the body armour, remove the belt and try to be a bit more human. Appear a bit more like them. It took a very long time to get through to these kids.”

In reference to appearing more human, Thelma, stripped away some of the visible layers of authority that she felt might cause distress in this scenario. She wanted to appear as similar or as normal as possible. A good number of these uniform-based scenarios reflect a pre-emptive expectation of fear on the part of the officers and they,

as a consequence of this expectation, actively engage in a personal action or a fear reducing protocol in order to address this. These strategies can be implemented spontaneously, as was the case with PC McLaren and the Indian holidaymaker or they can be considered in advance. That is to say, by virtue of their profession, police officers are often (but certainly not always), aware of the people they will meet and the reasons they are there. In other words, they will be called into a situation and given information about the people they are looking for and the reasons for their presence. A point exemplified by PC McLaren:

“We had to go and interview a 13-year-old lad who had developed a relationship with a man more than twice his age. He was over 40. I was very conscious that this lad could be worried and we needed his help. I told my sergeant that when we go to this guy I don’t want us to be wearing any Personal Protective Equipment (PPE). Go in shirts, fleece, normal uniform.”

PC McLaren was adamant that when these actions are done properly, they helped him in the course of this element of the police role:

“I genuinely think people can be afraid of the uniform. They can build up negative connotations. You can see it when you go to people’s houses and when you pass them in the street. The account we got from this lad was brilliant. I think removing the PPE helped that. I genuinely do. I stand by that. I have done it many times. It breaks down barriers and helps me do my job.”

Again, there is a sense or an expectation that certain elements of the police appearance will cause certain members of the public worry and will inhibit the policing process. In this sense, the policing process is one that is not designed to cause fear or gain compliance but one that is more pastoral or caring. PC McLaren and Thelma’s intention in these scenarios was to gain information and to help and not to intimidate. This was a sentiment that was supported by Louise:

“When you take off the rattling belt, the hat, the silly yellow vest and all that, they can actually see you as a person rather than the force. That’s useful.”

Louise was, like Thelma, describing a situation in which she came into contact with a minor. This sensitivity to the fear and apprehension that a uniform can cause, especially in children, supports the notion that children's initial perceptions of police status are dominated by superficial aspects of appearance which are more directly accessible to children than matters of status that might be conferred by society (Durkin and Jeffrey, 2010).

In addition to their superficial outward appearance, there were other tools used for alleviating fear by the police that appear to be based around the manner in which they engage with those they came into contact with. For example, Thelma described a situation in which she and her crewmate observed a car driving off without the headlights turned on after the hours of darkness. They followed and pulled the car over. Thelma asked the driver, a young man in his teens, to step outside and described the fear she observed in him:

“He was physically shaking, his voice was quivering, eyes all over the place and shifting from foot to foot. He was clearly very uncomfortable. It was his first experience with the police and he panicked from start to finish. I had to reassure him.”

Upon noticing his very obvious fears, there were two main issues Thelma felt like she had to deal with as a police officer. Firstly she needed to ascertain whether further action needed to be taken. Secondly, she felt like she needed to reassure him:

“I couldn’t tell you what it is but I identified him as Mr Innocent. Sometimes you can look at someone, hear the way they communicate and know. All the checks came back clear. So I tried to reassure him. I tried to crack jokes to make him smile but that doesn’t always work. It’s a situation of stress for him. So in this case I actually verbalised it, I said ‘I can see that you are frightened. Please don’t worry. It was just that you didn’t have your lights on. I had to be clear. Body language and jokes sometimes only get you so far.”

Similarly, Louise described observing fear when she performed door-to-door enquiries after burglaries:

“When we are going house-to-house you can see it in people’s faces [fear]. Their faces drop. I see it straight away. You just see the panic. In those situations you go into that mode. You expect fear. It’s real fear too.”

By ‘that mode’ Louise recalled a specific way or manner of interacting when trying to quickly gain information that could apprehend a burglar. It would start with immediately assuring the house occupants that nothing was wrong (she assumed that they would think this due to her presence) and quickly initiate the process of ascertaining whether they saw or heard anything that could be useful. Louise suggested that, in this situation, the presence of fear for any length of time would hinder this information gathering process.

PC Leeds suggested that his process was less to do with being in a particular mode, as was seen with Louise above, but was more concerned with viewing each scenario he encountered ‘on merit.’ By this, the inference is that he did not develop a prior expectation to reactions to his presence. To illustrate his point he offered two examples. First, was a man stopped in a car that spoke little English, and his reaction to being stopped was, for PC Leeds, very memorable:

“As soon as we arrested him he became very passive, very subservient, he was literally, he was scared of us. He made himself very small rather than very big and the first thing he said to us was, ‘are you going to beat me?’ Was he scared of the police? Yes. He probably associated us with violence and corruption because of where he came from. He was timid. Very timid.”

In addition to these observations, PC Leeds made some important observations about what this fear could lead to for this individual:

“Because of the language barrier, this guy would have said yes to anything we said. Because he was scared he would have agreed to anything. He was a vulnerable person because of his fear, because he was so scared. He didn’t want to get hurt.”

There are important points to make here. These statements implicitly recognise that the threat of violence and its consequences are capable of gaining compliance within certain scenarios. This was clear at the start of this Chapter with specifically fear evoking behaviours and tactics. However, with this example, it was PC Leeds' impression that this man was, because of his fear, in a vulnerable position and it was necessary for him to actively allay this man's fear of being hurt. PC Leeds was able to recognise that a particularly sensitive approach needed to be taken:

"I don't think he believed me when I said he wasn't going to be beaten. I think there is considerable fear for the system with those people that have little experience with the police."

It was this expression of the importance of experience with police procedures that led PC Leeds on to his second example. Here in contrast to the inexperienced, he suggested that those with a greater knowledge or experience hold far less fear or are far more aware of where the boundaries are with police interaction. This was a point supported by Casey Ryback. In this sense, PC Leeds recognises when there is less of a need to alleviate fear and a greater need to concentrate on maintaining order:

"The people we deal with the most are not fazed by the situation at all. They will attempt to challenge and take control of the situation. Challenge your authority. With big guys, when they are in the cell they will attempt to impose their will over you. They will make everything hard for you. They'll oppose everything."

Upon reflection, PC Leeds suggested that a large amount of the merit with which he views each situation concerns his interpretation of 'body language' and, importantly, the amount of fear or anxiety that he observes:

"If someone has done something wrong, they know why you are there. They have been through it all before. There is a big difference in behaviour when someone has not had contact with us [the police] before. You read the signals and you act. It is important to try and understand what has made them scared. That's the best thing. Then you can try and work around your behaviour and the way you do things. Even sometimes it could be as simple as taking your hat off to appear less authoritarian."

PC Flemming among others also described a clear and deliberate process to calm people's fears. Much like Thelma, clarity of speech was important, as was the physical process of talking to people at their level. PC McLaren described this nicely here:

"It might be that you just need to speak to them and explain why you are there. Explain what is going on. Bring it down a level, even if you are in their lounge. Maybe sit down with them, come down to their level and just talk to them in a very calm and reasoned way and talk things through. If someone is frightened, there is no point in frightening them any more. You don't want to make it the most traumatic circumstance ever or anything like that. Just try and de-escalate a situation."

PC Leeds also suggested that these techniques were learned or born from experience and not covered in training, unlike the techniques for conflict situations:

"They don't really do this in training. There's no input on that area. You just rely on experience and common sense."

Perhaps the officer that provided the most sensitive understanding to how fear could manifest within his professional environment was PC Leeds. He described, alongside talking about his own fears, a scenario in which he pulled a car over for a standard set of checks. Upon making a check on the Police National Computer (PNC) he found that the occupant was a prolific offender who had, among many other previous convictions, been convicted of murder. Reflecting on the question of whether he felt this man had been scared of him PC Leeds offered a layered answer:

"There are two aspects to this. Was he scared of me as a person? I'm slim, 5'8", short and I'm not stocky. I don't think he would consider me a physical threat. You wouldn't see me as I am and consider me as a risk or fear. Especially for this bloke who was 6'3" maybe 16 or 17 stone and all that muscle."

Here, PC Leeds reflects mainly on the physical differences between the two men within this scenario. He was clear in stating that this may be different for other people

in other scenarios where the physical differences between them may be less stark. The key for PC Leeds here was evident in the second aspect that he introduced:

“Then you have what I represent; the police. He has obviously had a lot of dealings with the police and most of them have probably been bad. He’s also from London, I am aware that people don’t get on with police so well there; there is a lot of them-and-us atmosphere. So, I think the uniform would pose more of a risk than I would. By wearing it I represent something that perhaps he would not like. People are probably scared of the consequences.”

For PC Leeds, Richard and Johnson’s (2001) observation that the uniform of a police officer conveys the power and authority of the person wearing it would hold true in this situation and would have a direct impact on the way that both men engage in the encounter. The uniform is a powerful, and visual, clue to the wearer’s authority, capability, and status (Richard and Johnson, 2001).

Another point is worthy of mention simply because of the frequency with which every officer, with no exception, cited it in one way or another, regarding fear observed by the police, and that is fear of children. This is separate to the sensitivity with which the officers dealt with younger people in direct interactions but could be a reason why there is an expectation of fear. All of the officers described the way in which a parent will point out an officer to a misbehaving child. Each of the scenarios was similarly described. For example Thelma expounded:

“Parents do it, I have no idea why they always do it, but they point to us as we walk down the street and say, ‘if you don’t behave they will take you away and lock you up’ or words to that effect. ‘They’ll put you in prison.’ That scares kids and that can have an impact over the long term. If a kid is missing and we need to help them find their parents, it really doesn’t help if they think I’m going to lock them up.”

This scenario, or very similar, was mentioned a great deal. This may seem, in comparison to house entry or violent confrontation, as trivial or somehow less impactful to the process of policing. However, PC Leeds felt this had an impact on particular communities:

“I have the perfect example of this. Travelling communities, because of their lifestyle, come into contact with the police on a regular basis. I attended a travelling site, I was on my own, pushing a bike, it wasn't like there was a whole load of us, and there was a kid on a swing. His sister said 'they've come to take you away.' He was inconsolable for 5 minutes. No matter what I said he would not believe I wasn't going to do anything. I suppose that is why we do a lot of work in schools and things.”

Children often have an underdeveloped knowledge of the legal process and are reliant on visual cues like uniform (Durkin and Jeffery, 2010) and are only able to associate the threat of arrest alongside the police uniform. Couple this with the threat of being taken away should they not comply with their parents' demands and there is certainly a justification for the worry put forward by the officers within these data.

Conclusions

The Chapter brings together two very different but interrelated elements of being feared. That is to say, causing fear and alleviating fear. The giving and receiving of expressive information, as described by Goffman's (1959) concept of dramaturgy, between officers and members of the public can shape the course of the encounters they have and the behaviour and outcomes therein. This difference in outcomes is perhaps best demonstrated at moments when officers perceive a threat and deliberately deploy tactics with the intension of causing fear. Equally, and contrastingly, the difference is demonstrated at moments of reassurance when officers within the sample have actively sought to behave and appear less threatening and recognise that the fear they see is related to them, their role and what it represents. In both extremes the motivation and reasoning behind these deliberate actions is driven by the desire for a successful outcome based on the duties of their role.

It is certain, for the officers within the study, that fear plays an important part of their working lives. This is true when fear is seen as a desired product that is the result of a deliberate action and, as a consequence, represents a useful and deployable policing tool. It is also true when fear is seen as a barrier to policing and behaviours, actions

and protocols are employed to allay the fears of those around them in order that they fulfil their professional duty.

The concept of legitimacy plays an important role within trying to understand fear in a policing context in a number of ways and is demonstrated within the scenarios and situations described within the data. First, there is a belief amongst the officers that their actions are legitimate. This is to say their actions, in relation to fear, were and are a justifiable and appropriate response to the behaviour they observed and the information they may have received. This ability to reason and account for each action is a testament to the decision-making processes that they go through on a daily basis. In this sense, for the officers, causing or allaying fear has to be justified by wider policing outcomes that can be achieved within the individual and personal decisions made by officers in an encounter.

Second, there is a belief amongst the officers that their interpretation of the fears, intentions and behaviours of others are understood to be authentic. In this sense, this authenticity guides their ongoing action and these ongoing actions are those that are required of police officers, both situationally and legally. In other words, officers understand their observations to be legitimate and act accordingly within the remit of the police role. Importantly, this understanding of expressive information is, as has been mentioned in a previous Chapter, a two way process. That is to say, as much as the officers need to understand the expressions of members of the public, the members of the public need to recognise the intentions of officers when they issue a threat and, contrastingly, when officers offer reassurance.

Third, there is a legitimising of the powers and authority of the police as far as fear is concerned. There is a trained competence to their ability to cause fear in others. That is to say, power can be said to be legitimate in the first instance if it is acquired and exercised in accordance with established rules (Beetham, 1991). These rules can be both formal and informal and based on legal codes as well as informal judgements (Beetham, 1991). In a sense, this final element of legitimacy follows the former by understanding that the action of the officers, in their use and management of fear, is justified, correct and believed to be correct by others. In other words, whether an officer is eliciting fear or alleviating it, the responses they get to their actions confer

legitimacy. This is true of a violent crowd becoming compliant or a terrified holidaymaker being put at ease. The management of fear, in a policing context, is guided by actions, reactions, words, powers and responsibility.

Finally, it can be said that this management of fear, having interpreted all available clues and stimuli, is integral to the policing role. It is in the communicative information derived from each and every encounter that informs the decision-making processes that the officers are required to engage with. Here, the professionally derived protocols are directly involved in accessing whether fear needs to be introduced to a scenario for tactical policing reasons, or removed.

Chapter 6) The Soldiers: From War to Civilisation and Back

Soldiers are an important group for understanding the experience of being feared. So far, some of the extremes of civilised life have been explored with the experiences of police officers. This includes engaging with dangerous situations, dangerous people and all experiences of fear and fearsomeness therein. The experiences of soldiers are importantly different. The extreme situations to which soldiers are exposed go far beyond what could be considered every day and are not experienced or witnessed by many. The rules and laws under which soldiers operate are different and the behaviours, actions and expectations of those within these situations are also different. For soldiers, life and death scenarios are not only a possibility, they can be an occupational and professional fact. It is within this context that the experience of being feared can be expanded beyond what has already been addressed. In doing so the soldiers' frame the experience of being feared in the most extreme encounters and situations possible. Understanding the experience of being feared in extreme situations relies on exploring the way fear can be used to gain advantage and the way fear is interpreted in war scenarios. In addition, the way experiences of fear and being feared within such contexts can impact on civilian life needs to be explored in detail. It highlights areas in which fear is experienced in a war and post-war context, how it shapes past and ongoing behaviour and the legacy of specific experiences that provoke particular behaviours.

The impact of fear on soldiers has been a topic of academic enquiry for some time. For example, Samuel Marshall (1947) gathered extensive evidence on fear and its effects on combat soldiers in World War II. Marshall's research sought to demonstrate the impact of fear on the effectiveness of soldiers to perform their duty. Additionally, the lasting impact of war has been the subject of concerted academic interest. This ranges from the identification of post traumatic stress to the lasting impact of personal relationships and ongoing violence (see for example Marshall, Panuzio and Taft, 2005). What is important for this research is that the soldiers were identified as a source from which a specific experience of being feared could be expressed. Of particular interest are the ways in which the soldiers have been trained to use all physical and mental tools at their disposal (including fear) in order to

achieve military objectives. Further interest lies in how the soldiers recognise and/or cause fear in others and how they engage with a social transition beyond military service. This will lead to an understanding of how being feared is interpreted and understood by the soldiers thereafter. If an experience of being feared is to be better understood, a consideration of those with experience of the most extreme interactional encounters is essential.

The Chapter utilises Goffman's (1974) *Frame Analysis*. This adds an important dimension to understanding the experience of being feared in that it provides an interpretation of how experiences are understood, given meaning and organised over time by an individual. The metaphorical frames proposed by Goffman allows the research to identify how the soldiers experience of being feared, how this fear is structured (and given meaning) and what impact this fear has on their lives. Goffman's *Frame Analysis* is ideally suited because it represents an attempt to link the micro situations of fleeting encounters with a larger understanding of how these influence the more macro structures of ongoing life and how the former can inform the latter (Williams, 1986). This is especially true of a soldier's experience of fear and being feared because there comes a point at which their experiences of war end and they engage with life in the military after deployment and eventually life as a civilian. It is in the specific situations of war that much can be learned about the extremes of being feared, the necessity of that fear in that situation and the advantages for it. In addition to this, the ways in which these experiences inform later life and the ways these experiences link to an individual's perception of being feared are of equal importance to this research. *Frame Analysis* (1974) provides the metaphor for understanding and interpreting these cumulative experiences. It allows the research to situate conceptions of the self and how an individual reflects on their changing impact and position in the world.

This Chapter introduces experiences from a former British Royal Marine, 'Pink Fairy'. There are also contributions from another soldier; 'Mr Darcy.' The Chapter outlines these individuals' interpretation of situations of extreme fear within armed conflict and the impact this has had on their ability to identify, control and cause fear in post-military life. The first participant, who gave himself the alias 'Pink Fairy', was initially chosen for interview because he fell into one of the strategically chosen

groups (gym goers), but his background and previous experience led the interview in a very different and unexpected direction. The extreme nature of his experiences form a primary reason for this case study's inclusion and the eventual recruitment of Mr Darcy to participate in the study. In addition, the impact of previous experiences and the way in which Pink Fairy identifies, organises and relates to these experiences in later life are important. This is because Pink Fairy identifies a number of areas in which his war experiences have changed his ongoing life, his perceptions of fear and his propensity for committing acts of violence.

Pink Fairy is now a personal fitness trainer. He is the manager of his own fitness business that has a broad focus such as elite level athletes, pre and postnatal classes for mothers-to-be/mothers and military style fitness classes as well as a growing online fitness business. He was formerly employed as a Royal Marine Commando. He saw active service in Sierra Leone on two occasions, Iraq and Northern Ireland. He is 6'2" medium-to-large build. Pink Fairy is 31 years old with a wife and two children.

Mr Darcy now works for a charity. His work includes raising funds and travelling to Africa to remote communities in order to provide them with clean water and sanitation. He was formerly in the British Army and saw active service in Iraq and Afghanistan. He also returned to Iraq after the 2nd Gulf war as part of a peacekeeping force. Mr Darcy is 32 years old and lives in London. He is considering a return to military service as part of the Army Reserve.

The Chapter first outlines the soldier's perspective of fear in a war specific context. This allows the research to ground the later experiences and frame the range of experiences that the soldiers have endured. Second, the Chapter introduces the experiences of the soldiers after war. It shows how their previous experiences of fear and being feared inform their ongoing life. Third, the Chapter looks at how the culmination of fearful experience is understood and structured over time.

a) Fear in War: The extremes of experience

It is important to place the experiences of the soldiers into a specific war context. The contexts from which they are able to speak are the very reason for their inclusion after all. This section addresses some of the specific details of the fear they have caused, witnessed and experienced during armed conflict. These experiences were shared, in part, to justify a lack of fear in civilian life. The extreme nature of some of the descriptions served to legitimise the fear they experienced and to demonstrate their seemingly fearless reactions to interpersonal conflict in post military life.

Pink Fairy's expressions of personally experiencing fear were polarised. He steadfastly rejected the notion that he had been fearful of anyone or any situations in his recent life. Referring to his military experience he expressed that he had "switched off" as a result of his experiences and all consequent everyday experiences were not categorised as fearful in any way because of what he witnessed in the military. This is indicative of the way he organised his concept of fear within his own life. There is a pre-military life and a post-military life. All references to fear within his personal life are held against a standard set by his experiences in the military, which, as can be expected, are in the extreme. The quote below describes a situation he encountered whilst entering a village on active service in Sierra Leone:

"...the entire village had been massacred. Cut up. We walked through the village and they had heads off, arms off, legs off. Bad. It was horrible."

His experiences cover both sides of fear. He has been in genuine fear for his life and has, as will be explained, been required to cause people to be in fear for their life for reasons of military advantage. He has taken life, for reasons of military objective and self-preservation and used these skills for intimidation, protection and violence in civilian situations. This is important because Pink Fairy has an understanding of the impact fear can have on both the fearful and the feared. In the case of Pink Fairy, the legitimacy of his own experiences of fear was not conflicted. He knows he has seen fear and, as such, he is under no doubt when he perceives fear to be present in the behaviour of others. As a result he is confident of his assessment of their emotional and behavioural state. This was a fact that he observed both in military contexts and

civilian ones. Within his military experience, he witnessed (and caused) fear in its most vivid and physically manifest states:

*“I came off of a boat onto the island, there were 8 of us, there was one lad on there, he looked at us, he had never seen a white person before in his life, and he looked at us and he sh*t his pants and started, like, peeing himself, he was f**ked. He was absolutely f**ked. We were like, ‘why the f**k is he f**ked?’”*

The above describes his Marine Troop landing on a beach in Sierra Leone and meeting an 11-year-old survivor of a village massacre. The boy was the only person left on the island and had been alone in the village for three days. The boy had witnessed his mother being forced to dance around one of his siblings, as they were burnt alive. She was then decapitated.

“That is fear. I saw real fear in that lad.”

The consequences of his engagement with the terrified young boy were significant in structuring that particular experience and, consequently, recognising the fear in the young boy was the element of the experience that left a lasting impression. It gave Pink Fairy an extreme point of reference from which to judge all fear from that point forward. Pink Fairy did recognise that, in this instance, the fear he saw in the young boy was induced by the experience he had witnessed on the island in tandem with Pink Fairy’s presence some time later. The important element for Pink Fairy was that he had recognised what ‘real fear’ looked like. This was an experience that Pink Fairy often returned to when relating the insignificance of fearful encounters thereafter. In addition to witnessing fear in others, there were several areas in which Pink Fairy described his own personal fear. In doing so, Pink Fairy articulated similar experiential yardsticks in relation to fear and they were all in the extreme:

“You go in [to a war zone] and you think, ‘I stand a good chance of not coming home here.’ That is proper fear. The worst bit about anything in my life, or anything to do with fear, is the bit before. Not while it’s happening, the bit before. I have been mortared 8 times, I’ve been shot at, I’ve been suicide bombed, I’ve had the works. You wouldn’t realise it, I’m a normal bloke. I run a business. I crack on.”

The fear Pink Fairy reflected upon here was that which was experienced prior to conflict situations. This fear is understandable but, as he later described, was not diminished by the frequency of that experience. Pink Fairy indicated that, if anything, his fear worsened the more often he experienced combat. When he was in possession of experiential knowledge of exactly the type of situation he was being deployed to, his fear would be present up to the point of first contact.

In some ways, the danger he was in was described in a quantifiable way. He was told, before deployment in Iraq, the expected fatality figures. A figure he remembered both for its chilling prediction and for its eventual accuracy. Also, the preciseness with which he describes the number of times he has been mortared indicates an ability to separate his war experiences into quantifiable, separate events. It is important to understand how these experiences relate to being feared.

Much of Pink Fairy's specific military experience that involved him being the object of fear had very clear interactional objectives. As a Royal Marine he was required to capture and detain prisoners. He variously described this as 'prisoner handling' or 'processing.' There were a series of protocols that he was required to perform within these encounters:

“So the whole thing of prisoner handling is ‘shock of capture.’ That is what you have to instil. So you do a lot [of training] on what causes fear and how to get the information that you want. A lot of it is to establish fear in someone, because they are more likely to give the information you want if they are fearful for their life or their surroundings and situations.”

Pink Fairy was given training for all elements of the protocol surrounding prisoner-of-war handling. The 'processing' of prisoners represents an encounter that is taking place in an environment in which Pink Fairy was able to control, to a certain extent, the spatial and temporal conditions in which the prisoner was kept. Pink Fairy was happy to comment on how he was able to successfully instil fear in someone:

“You wouldn’t hit them or anything like that but you’d ruffle them up and you’d make them know, you’d shout at them, you’d take things off them like their pictures and put them to one side, of their family and stuff and they would think that they are not going to see them again. You’d march them around so they wouldn’t know where they are...12 hours in stress positions, things like that.”

Here, Pink Fairy shows that he is very aware of the importance of certain temporal and spatial considerations when eliciting fear in others. He described the importance of ensuring that the prisoner has a lack of knowledge as to the time of day, ensuring spatial confusion, and sensory deprivation during ‘processing.’ Each of these factors takes on a greater significance when these elements of interaction are denied and, importantly, when they are denied within a prisoner-of-war context. This is especially the case when it was, as Pink Fairy described, for the explicit purpose of causing fear. Pink Fairy was very specific on his understanding of the boundaries of the Geneva Convention² and how he and his fellow Marines were instructed to engage in the process. He described the stress positions used in prisoner handling:

“[We would not use] horrible stress positions, just the ones you are allowed to use, just to keep the fear and the shock of capture up in somebody.”

Gaining and maintaining fear was something Pink Fairy mentioned on more than one occasion and with more than one example. For Pink Fairy this was a goal-driven or task-driven endeavour and fear was a vital part of a process to gain information. Fear, as he described, was a necessary part of establishing control, asserting authority and extracting information from the prisoner. Given that establishing fear was part of a systematic process it is important to establish whether Pink Fairy felt that prisoners were fearful of him specifically. It was important for this to keep this experience directly in the context of prisoner handling. Pink Fairy commented on the extent to which he thought that the prisoners were fearful of him:

²The four Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 are international treaties, ratified or acceded to by virtually all States. They protect the wounded and sick in armed forces in the field; wounded, sick and shipwrecked members of armed forces at sea; prisoners of war; and civilians who find themselves under the rule of a foreign power in the event of international conflict (ICRC).

“I was aware that the prisoner was afraid of me...the guy just fell to the floor in a ball crying. He had broken at that point. He didn't know where he was...but it is a job. The thing is, it is ingrained into you, that it is a job. It is a task. If we do not deal with those people efficiently and we don't get that key piece of information out of them, then people were dying. Our people were dying.”

Pink Fairy's response heavily emphasises the task-driven process for which he was given training. Much like his immediate uptake of his interview alias, this moral distancing could indicate one way that he internally justifies his actions, or absolves personal responsibility within prisoner handling encounters (Bauman, 1989; Cohen, 2001). Pink Fairy was aware when he had been successful in eliciting fear. He expanded on how he recognised that success and how that made his information-gathering task easier:

“They don't move [the prisoners]. If you tell them to do something, you have to gain control, so if you tell them to do something they'd do it. If they are scared of you and you tell them to do something they would do what you say...it is like a dog. A dog is under command and under control because it respects you, it may be fear, it may be respect but ultimately you have control.”

Here, Pink Fairy seems able to justify his actions in two ways. First, the actions and methods used to extract information was justifiably used, as far as he was concerned, to save the lives of his colleagues. Second, that he was performing a function that his job training required of him and, importantly, was performed at the behest of a superior officer. These behaviours and practices are perhaps commonplace within the military. A transition to civilian life would demand very different behaviours within a working environment. However, the relationship Pink Fairy's action had with his sense of professional duty was evident:

“It is not whether you feel or don't feel. It is whether you can get that information. Feeling didn't come into it. Which is probably, I don't know whether that is what most people would say... but I would imagine that a bouncer wouldn't have seen that sort of thing then it would be quite emotion-led. But to me, and anyone else in the service, I don't think it is. It is efficiency and it is a job.”

Pink Fairy demonstrated here that he was aware of the abnormality of his experience of fear and violence. He compared his experience (unwittingly) to a group of people that have been included in the research cohort precisely because they will have experienced fearful situations within their working life. Pink Fairy made a similar assumption regarding their level of fear-specific experience but only to effectively separate the importance his own experience.

Pink Fairy indicated that he personally did very little in the way of alleviating fear within his role as a soldier. This could be due, in part, to his elite soldier status. His primary role, within the conflict scenarios he experienced, has always been incursive. A soldier, within a combat scenario is not in the business of making those he comes into contact with feel comfortable or welcome. However, it is necessary to take into consideration the fact that there are military deployments in which alleviating fear would be functionally necessary for a soldier. Mr Darcy, a soldier of both combat and post-conflict experience, indicated that within his military experience there were important functions within the broader role of the military that can lead to situations in which alleviating fear is indeed a very necessary skill. Mr Darcy provided an insight into the peacekeeping or post-conflict policing functions that the military often perform.

Initially, Mr Darcy spoke in detail of his role in winning the ‘hearts and minds’ of the people of Iraq after the war had finished. He was very aware of the distrust many of the Iraqi people had of his (and of the entire allied forces) presence. In speaking of these scenarios Mr Darcy highlighted points at which alleviating fear and establishing friendly authority were the key goals:

“We were in (Iraq). We were pulling a guy out of a nearby school. He was part of the insurgency and had run into the school. We evacuated the school and as the children came out all these girls, there were very few girls’ schools in Iraq, as they came out they were obviously utterly terrified. Not of anyone else, but of me. They ran. They had to get passed me to get away. They ran passed me as if I was going to kill them. Of course, I wasn’t. There was a real feeling of guilt that I could inspire that level of fear in someone. It is the realisation that you are not the good guy.”

This situation is an important one. First, it showed Mr Darcy's understanding of his own part in this scenario and the changing conception of his own identity in relation to the role he was performing. He perceived himself to be the cause of fear in that situation. His realisation of being the object of fear was not based on any broader consideration of his position as a British soldier nor as a member of an occupying force and how that might be the cause of fear. His understanding of the situation focused on a reaction to *his* presence. He was feared.

Second, it is a scenario that is indicative of a notion of broader futility in attempting to alleviate the fears and win the trust of a distrustful population. This would appear true on both a societal level and on the situational level as Mr Darcy articulated. The act of forcibly apprehending an insurgent using military tactics, soldiers and weapons is both trying to give a show of force to the wrongdoers and, in the same instance, demonstrate protection for the rest of the population. These competing concepts seem to be fundamentally conflicted. So in relation to being feared, alleviating fear was a professional necessity but Mr Darcy came to realise it was situationally impossible. A fact that was not lost on Mr Darcy:

“What were they (the Iraqi people) supposed to think? 6 months earlier we'd bombed the shit out of Baghdad and rolled up in a tank. Now we're keeping them safe? You'd be scared too. After seeing those kids I questioned myself. I didn't feel good about little girls crying.”

Mr Darcy saw himself as an object of fear. Importantly in this scenario, he perceived himself to have caused fear in people from whom he was not trying to elicit fear. It was a scenario premised on adding security and safety to people's lives and not fear. The process of questioning himself involved a realisation that he was, or represented, something worthy of fear regardless of his intentions and regardless of his actions. This took the process of being feared beyond his control and hinted at the realisation that he needed to understand the wider symbolic elements of his presence. In this situation, he embodied an object of fear. The sincerity of his actions or intention would do nothing to assuage this fear. This made any attempted action to alleviate the fear of others futile. All the symbolic external features of his appearance and presence

represented an aggressor. He wore camouflage, a helmet, a flak jacket and held a machine gun. The fear he observed in others, whilst unintentional, could be predicted when considering the expectations others may have had of his behaviour (Goffman, 1959).

In relation to this, Mr Darcy suggested that he, as a trained soldier, was a fighter and not a policeman. He felt his mentality as a fighting soldier precluded, to a certain extent, the effectiveness he had in the alleviating of fear. This could be understood in terms of the training he had received and the combat scenarios he experienced before the policing role was required. It can also be understood by the ways in which those around him perceive and identify him. In the case of the girls at the school, he was a foreign face in military uniform. He was carrying a gun and participating in the extraction of an insurgent. Mr Darcy's experience of military roles were not limited to Iraq and extended to Afghanistan. This again, is a militarised situation in which the combative and protective elements of the job are blurred:

“You'd drive into a village to drop off medical supplies or meet with a community leader. You'd get combat indicators. You'd drive in and all the women and children would leave in a mass exodus. You'd think, 'we are going to get hit here.'”

As Mr Darcy indicated, their presence militarily, as both a combatant force and peacekeeping force, was hard to operate. This was true of the soldiers themselves, how they were able (or more accurately unable) to identify enemy threats, the difference between combatants and non-combatants and the ways in which they were able to alleviate the fear of the local population. The arrival of his military unit within a village would inherently make it a more dangerous and potentially lethal place for everybody. They provided a target and, to a certain extent, efforts to alleviate fear and gain trust were therefore rendered impotent. Mr Darcy described the difficulties he faced in this regard:

“We went to a smaller town and because on this day we weren't being shot at we had loads more scope for stuff like that (winning hearts and minds). We'd throw sweets and stuff to the kids. We'd open up a clinic with our medics, try and build some trust.

We have access to really simple medical services in the field. This was more than they had ever had.”

Engagement in this sort of activity was essential to the military operation in Afghanistan. Mr Darcy did see the positives in being able to provide medical support to communities that had never had it but there was an overriding sense that these efforts to alleviate fear were never successful. Whilst they may temporarily engage with jovial children and provide essential emergency services there was a fundamental tension surrounding their presence and Mr Darcy was well aware of this:

“Some kid died there. He got covered in some chemical shit; his Dad was making a bomb. They walked him passed us when they buried him and said that some hot milk had burnt him. It was some kind of explosive residue. He’d been burnt to death. It was just horrible.”

The process of alleviating fear was a confusing one for Mr Darcy. He understood that was an integral part of the overall military objective. However, the same people that would bring their child to the makeshift medical facility are the same people that would plant a roadside bomb. Here, identifying fear was neither difficult nor indicative of blame. Mr Darcy found that identifying the difference between those people that should be reassured and those that should be fought was ultimately illusive. As was, importantly for the experience of being feared, understanding when to deploy fear-alleviating tactics and when to fight. The lasting impact of this struggle was clear:

“Dead kids. Little dead bodies are never good.”

For Mr Darcy, it appeared that one lasting impact of his war experience was centred on the concept of relating his own actions to his ability to ‘do the right thing.’ He articulated the notion that he has come to the realisation that he was ‘no longer the good guy.’

“I have never told anyone this. We were doing a routine patrol through a village. Nothing out of the ordinary but this was a time of year when the Taliban were hitting

us hard so everyone was on edge. We passed through the village with no problem. We stopped for a few moments to make radio contact and then moved out. As we pulled out I got a call 'contact left!' We were receiving fire and a building in the village was identified as the source. I was on top of an [armoured vehicle] and was on the heavy gun. I wheeled it round and pumped a shit load of rounds into this building. Nothing could have survived. It was only after that I found out..."

It turned out that there had been no gunfire coming from the village and it had been misidentified. Mr Darcy, having followed orders, killed 4 Afghan police officers in their police station. This experience, coupled with his experience of scaring schoolgirls, was an important factor in his ongoing perception and understanding of fear. Any presence of fear was related to a frame of experience in which Mr Darcy was not able to control or influence the perceptions of those around him. Mr Darcy's perception of himself in later life appears constantly clouded by the realisation that he is not 'the good guy.' Fear within every interaction had become inevitable. There was an assumption within every interaction in which he noticed fear that it was his fault and that he was in the wrong. Being an object of fear was a mantle that Mr Darcy felt he was unable to shed and, in many respects, deserved. It was no longer so much to do with how he conceptualised his actions during war and more to do with a belief in his acceptance of responsibility for all wrongdoing personally. Despite this belief some of his actions frightened him and frightened those around him:

"We picked up a guy in Afghan once. He had fired an RPG and I basically, I didn't abuse him, but I ran him up to the top to be processed and I put him down on his knees, nobody else was watching, I thought 'I could just shoot this fucker now. People will back me up.' I genuinely contemplated it. 'I could drill this guy. I could say he went for me.' He just starred at me. But I didn't do it. He must have known. The way I was fingering my weapon. The guy was scared of me. He should have been. I would have been scared of me. I was seriously thinking of murdering him. I think perhaps I was more afraid of him or maybe the thoughts going through my head. I mean I've shot blokes before but this was different. I have never shot someone that close before. It was scary to think it crossed my mind."

The key element of these experiences in relation to being feared lies in the ongoing contradiction between war and protection. This ultimately left Mr Darcy with the feeling that he was someone worthy of being feared. He did not disperse the blame by way of excuse to the wider military objectives. Instead he understood the concept of being feared to have origins within his person and his character. He embodied fear by being a soldier. This was done via a long process of self-reflection that Mr Darcy had engaged with since his military service. This was a point he raised specifically when describing his desire to do charity work. Engaging in charity work is perhaps an activity that is most opposite to that of soldiering. He can embody friendliness rather than fear. It was in order to redress the negative impact he felt he had on the people he had contact with in Iraq and Afghanistan. It was neither his part in the process of causing fear purposefully nor alleviating fear purposefully that was of the greatest concern to Mr Darcy. Instead, it was that he grew to understand that being feared had become inevitable and it was uncomfortable. This was perhaps the most striking difference between Mr Darcy's perception of being feared and Pink Fairy's. Pink Fairy saw being feared as a constructed and controlled process. It was purposeful, controlled by him and driven by an outcome, which was directly related to him doing his job – and doing it well. Mr Darcy came to see being feared as a reflection on him as a person outside of any consideration of his role as a soldier. Both Pink Fairy and Mr Darcy had been objects of fear but had come to understand it in very different ways.

b) War and Peace: The legacy of experience

Having established the ways in which Pink Fairy and Mr Darcy have experienced being feared in a war context it is important to understand how these experiences impact on their perceptions of being feared in civilian life. Immediately following his return from Iraq Pink Fairy became a civilian. The impact of his experiences of fear reverberated thereafter and the impact that war had on his ongoing life had an impact both on the way he viewed fearful situations and the way he dealt with potential threats. Here, Pink Fairy was in no doubt as where the main legacy of his previous war experience lies:

“That’s how I suffer now. I have a shorter temper... and I have nightmares. You couldn’t go through what I have been through and not.”

There were a number of situations that Pink Fairy described how his shorter temper ‘got him into trouble.’ In the situation below Pink Fairy was a civilian of only 6 hours experience. He was driving home to meet his family and was involved in a road rage incident in which he was not the aggressor:

“This bloke got out of his car and took a swing at me. I had put him on the floor and was poking his eyes before I realised.”

He indicated that this was a learned response to threat or, more accurately, a trained response to threat. However, violence alone was not enough in this situation. During this confrontation Pink Fairy deemed it necessary to divulge the ‘origin’ of his response to the person on the receiving end of the violence:

*I have just got back from Iraq you f**king idiot...after I told him that he went from biting my ankle to saying ‘oh, sorry, sorry, sorry’ and he was gone! I didn’t need to do that to him. If I had just said sorry it would have been fine. But the fact was I didn’t really care. That initial response was there. I hurt that bloke. I know I did. I didn’t mean to, I just...I have got that line now. I am like a hand grenade. That’s the problem. You pull the pin and I go bang.”*

It is here where the legacy of previous experience appears to have the greatest impact on civilian interactions. The line, to use Pink Fairy’s analogy, was drawn by the culmination of his experiences in military service. The problems arise, as he intimates, when situations provoke a particular response from him – a violent response. ‘The switch’ was how Pink Fairy described his temper. Although as he explained his temper was not universally short but rather he had a short temper for specific situations. These tended to be situations in which he was physically threatened or unable to control the safety of his family. In this sense ‘the switch’ appears to be the way in which Pink Fairy self-identified the legacy of his previous experience in his civilian life. ‘The switch’, however, does not, as he sees it, represent a loss of control. Rather, situationally specific, targeted action, which in some cases can

be violent and is often designed to cause fear in others. This was not a concept Pink Fairy thought was unique to him:

“It doesn’t help a lot of marines [the need to control fear]. They take it into relationships with them. If the woman is giving them grief, you hear about it all the time that the bloke has hit their wife and things like that. That is not good. That is not the sort of thing that people need to do. But the reason they do it is to, they have a) lost control and they don’t know how to deal with it and b) they sort of they have that side of things where they need to gain control to make themselves feel safer cos they are actually very insecure people. Do you see what I mean? That helps them gain control of a partner and whatever.”

The desire for control in civilian life, as described within the interview, was a major theme for Pink Fairy. It involved the withholding of personal information in everyday friendships and working relationships. In this sense, Pink Fairy was aware of causing people fear in a civilian context:

“I think I am an uneasy person to be around at first. I don’t give away very much about myself. I think people are quite wary of that... but I think it is handy to have (the ability to cause fear) because if you need to instil fear in someone, because they cause you problems or whatever, then you could do it.”

Here the usefulness of being able to instil fear has clear benefits for Pink Fairy in civilian life. When relating back to his perception, during prisoner-of-war handling encounters, of when people were scared of him, he referred to their total compliance with his demands. When he referred to ‘causing problems’ he offered examples in both work and confrontation contexts. The ability to cause fear and the benefit of compliance was evident when he spoke of his encounters in a civilian work environment:

“I think people, it is funny actually, fear can come in any form, like when I was to sack someone, as the gym manager, when you call a member of staff to tell them off or something, you can use that fear to your advantage can’t you. I let people know enough about what I have done. Knowing what I have done, and everything else, if

they know they have got to go into the office and have a telling off, it is a bit, that does scare people.”

Importantly, the protocol for instilling fear in this scenario is different from that employed in prisoner handling. With prisoner encounters, Pink Fairy had far more control over the environmental conditions and far more extreme measures that he could take in order to elicit fear within the interaction. In the civilian case, he can control the space by calling someone into his office but there is a difference here. It is precisely because of his previous experiences, the knowledge he possesses and the knowledge his civilian colleagues have of him, limited though it may be, that helps to instil fear. The wariness with which he perceives he is treated help to maintain his social distance, control and, when necessary, fear. Being feared in this particular context is not about explicit action but about controlling perceptions and information. He has, in a very controlled manner, presented himself as someone who is worthy of fear without the need to engage with the same practices as the past. He maintains that persona to his advantage within a working environment.

However, there are areas in civilian life that he is less able to control and make preparations for these environments. Pink Fairy also continued a similar type of physical training that he had followed in the military so that he ‘can be efficient.’ These were his words for being able to perform acts of violence in the manner that he has been trained to do when he or his family are threatened. His transition from war to civilianisation, this need for ‘efficiency’, when it is summoned by particular stimuli, is a familiar behaviour but, by his own admission, is often misplaced.

His response to physical threats in the civilian context is extreme and ‘gets him into trouble’ in a way that is at odds with the rewards (and military awards) he has received for similar and, far more extreme, conduct in combat situations. As he would experience these frames of reference, threatening stimuli would be viewed in the same way, the response would be constructed in the same way but, importantly, the consequences of this response would be, and are, very different.

c) From Situation to Structure: Organising and understanding fear

For the contributions given by the soldiers in this Chapter there is a need to understand how they have been able to organise, interpret and give meaning to the situations they have been involved in as individuals. For the soldiers the use of Goffman's (1974) *Frame Analysis* allows us to understand the situations in which they were in control of the fear they observed in others and the points at which uncontrollable elements of the interaction, such as environmental or temporal elements, are involved in the causing of fear.

It helps to understand how and why these individuals would be able to assign causation or blame for the fear they have felt and the fear they have witnessed in others. It provides a template for how they were able to individually identify the most significant elements of each encounter and how these encounters impact on their ongoing lives. Understanding the way in which different experiences are given meaning allows the soldiers to engage with the process of accepting or rejecting responsibility for their actions.

The situations and experiences encountered by Pink Fairy and Mr Darcy frame the extreme range of possible fear-based experiences. The soldiers' experiences of fear, whether causing, alleviating or witnessing, are on the extreme end of any scale. There have been encounters during Pink Fairy's war experience in which he has been required to instil fear in others. Mr Darcy experienced situations in which he was required to reassure and alleviate the fears of others within his role as a soldier. There have been encounters during Pink Fairy's civilian life in which the ability to instil fear has, as he sees it, been an advantage to him. There have also been encounters during his civilian life when he has, despite reflecting on this with regret, instilled fear and committed violent acts with little hesitation. Pink Fairy made a clear link between his experiences in war and his perceptions of fear and being feared thereafter. He also made explicit a link between his past war experience and its influence over ongoing behaviour when he described 'the switch.' There have been moments of realisation for Mr Darcy that have led him to morally question his actions and thoughts and a realisation that he embodied the role of being an object of fear as a soldier.

Everyday life holds little fear for Pink Fairy and his desire to be in control often determines, to a certain extent, the cause of fear in his interactions to be self-attributed. In the case of his own personal fears, significance of temporal or spatial concerns, as might be common to Goffman's (1974) natural frame, appear vastly reduced when accompanied by a post-military context as experienced by Pink Fairy. This experience is also prominent when he attributes the cause of the fear he witnesses in others. In this sense, he is well aware of his potential fearsomeness. He is able to both passively expect a certain amount of fear or wariness for those in his presence and, importantly, is able to identify and actively employ behaviours that will elicit a fear response in those people that he interacts with, whether it is in a work or social environment.

Frame Analysis (1974) is useful for helping analyse and organise the impact fear has had on Pink Fairy's ongoing life-course and for understanding how he interprets and understands fearful interactions on a personal level more widely. Pink Fairy was reflective on the experiences he has had and the way the situational, observable and behavioural aspects of his life during war interact with the structural concerns of his ongoing life as a civilian within society. He identified ways in which it informs his current life and current interpersonal relationships. He identified areas in which he was able to give meaning and justify the actions and behaviours that he engages in, behaviours that have been present in both his military and civilian life. For example, his response to any type of personal physical threat is to respond with violence. A response that is appropriate given the identification of a threat in a war setting. The issue for Pink Fairy, as has been shown, is that this response in a civilian setting can be far more problematic and far less encouraged. Yet the frame and the stimulus are familiar to him.

Goffman's work links the idea of frames to label 'schemata of interpretation' that allow individuals to "locate, perceive, identify, and label events and occurrences, thus rendering meaning, organising experiences, and guiding actions" (Goffman, 1974, p.21). In this sense, frames are pre-existing schemes of interpretation that are used to give meaning, and define meaning, in a specific situation. Pink Fairy was able to organise and identify the times in which the existence of schemes derived from his

war experience were employed in civilian life and ‘the switch’, as he called it, had both positive and negative consequences as far as he was concerned.

Frame Analysis (1974) is about the organisation of experiences at an individual level. It is a way to structure the experiences of individuals during all moments of their lives (Goffman, 1974). ‘The switch’ represents a way that Pink Fairy self-identifies the moments at which his experiences of war are most prominent or are directly called into action during his civilian life. This is evident by the way he identifies possible reasons for people being afraid of him. He cites his previous experience and the resultant mannerisms as being the source of this fear as far as he identified and perceived it. The legacy of his war experience has also been used as a way of absolving himself of blame or guilt for outbursts of violence by suggesting that the limits on his temper are directly related. It has also been a tool at his disposal for wanting to control working environments, attributing this to the training he has received. Mr Darcy’s legacy of experience was perceived differently. Whereas Pink Fairy understood that he was a feared person and also perceived that he was in control of this process, Mr Darcy identified himself to have symbolically represented fearsomeness. Others identified him as someone to be feared but this was a label that he was not always happy to have applied to him. The meaning Mr Darcy derived from his experience of being feared was that he was powerless to control the perceptions other people had of him. He came to understand that his actions within a war setting had little impact on those that observed him. The weight of his experiences were organised and understood to render any actions within that setting to be futile. In his civilian life, Mr Darcy was able to regain control of the impressions people had of him, as the civilian frame for him, meant distancing himself from the role of the soldier. Goffman’s frames (1974) have allowed an exploration into the individual meanings derived by the soldiers within this study to the extreme experiences of fear that they have shared. This expands the understanding of the experience of being feared by demonstrating that being feared has an impact on the lives of those that experience it beyond the situational and beyond the encounters themselves. Being feared can shape the impressions people have of the world. It can also shape their perception of the impressions others hold of them.

Goffman, within frame analysis, suggests the world around us is a lot more socially organised than we commonly think it to be. The way in which Pink Fairy identifies the ways his experiences of fear and violence are most impactful on his ongoing life demonstrate this. As Goffman (1974) suggests, the same physical act in the world might be described as a couple kissing, or as a man greeting his wife or as 'John' being careful with 'Mary's' make up. In the case of Pink Fairy and Mr Darcy, the same physical act might be described as killing in self-defence, murder or terrorism. Each of these descriptions of these frames is an adequate description of an event that we might witness in the world. What Goffman (1974) is pointing to are the social and individual aspects of cognition. The same events and the same actions can be witnessed, understood and given meaning in vastly different ways by each individual. Goffman's frame analysis (1974) attempts to bring out the shadowiness of everyday life which we are blind to, much of the time. This Chapter has moved towards an understanding of experiences of being feared outside of the everyday. In order to do that effectively there needs to be a way of understanding how these experiences are organised and how they relate to ongoing life. By considering frame analysis alongside Pink Fairy and Mr Darcy's experiences it has allowed the Chapter to explore and organise extreme experiences of being feared.

Chapter 7) Bouncers: The Body in Control of Space

Bouncers are able to provide an alternative work-based insight into fearful interactions than has been explored up to this point. The night-time economy requires its security workers to control patrons and maintain order. In doing this, bouncers may be aware of the impact their presence or actions have with the people they interact with on a nightly basis. The relationship between bouncers and being feared is an important one. In many ways similarities can be drawn with the police. Bouncers are aware of, and employ, techniques and tactics in order to obtain and maintain order in certain situations. This may involve causing fear as well as threatening violence and, indeed, the use of violence. However, the order of the night-time economy is based on a less formal set of rules than that of the police. Where the police officers could be termed as a recognised authority, bouncers can be termed as a non-recognised or less recognised authority. They possess far less legal power; the inherent symbolism and identification of their role is far less defined than that of the police. With this in mind, they may need to adapt and deploy different skills in order to effectively perform the functions of their role. This is not to say that there are not similarities to be found, yet the contexts in which they are feared is necessarily different. Existing research on bouncers has suggested it is an occupation predominantly populated by men. Further still, the potential for violence, the concept of ‘toughness’ and the presence of ‘muscle’ (both actual muscle and metaphorical muscle) are intrinsic to the profession (Hobbs, Hadfield, Lister and Winlow, 2003; Monaghan, 2002c). In this sense, a focus on bouncers marries an understanding of the use of the body within fearful interactions and the necessity to maintain control for commercial reasons.

There is a need to explore the relationship between the corporeal, the financial and the emotional elements of being a bouncer in order to understand the experience of being feared in this context. The experiences of bouncers in relation to fear have been explored before. Indeed, bouncers represent an important part of being feared in what Hobbs, Hadfield, Lister and Winlow (2002) describe as the ‘economics of intimidation’. Whilst they are neither sworn uniformed police officers nor camouflaged soldiers they represent a work-force of which situational control is demanded and, as Hobbs *et al* (2002) suggest, violence is expected and often

condoned. It is condoned in the sense that they are permitted to 'police beyond government' (Loader, 2000) but these permissions are driven by the economic needs of the night-time economy rather than the legally based driving forces of the police (Hobbs *et al.*, 2002). The uses of violence are also skills that are trained and developed over time. Additionally, there is a duality to the presence of fear within a bouncer's working environment. In certain situations fear and intimidation is a useful tool, which can allow a bouncer to exert control and maintain order. In other situations the presence of fear within the cliental can be emblematic of an over-exuberance in the use of authority and, in doing so, work against the economic needs to the bar or club at which they are working. The bouncers, in this sense, tread a fine line between maintaining order and increasing the safe enjoyment of customers and exerting a level of control, which impedes enjoyment and creates an intimidating, economically hurtful atmosphere. Hobbs *et al.* (2002: 352) support this when arguing that "within these quasi-liminal spaces, mass intoxication, aggressive hedonism and disorder have become routine, whilst, in the absence of state control, private security operators have developed their own informal and pragmatic techniques of containment which conform to the demands of commercial and cultural, rather than legally justified imperatives."

A police officer's responsibilities could be considered to be more global, in the first instance, than that of a bouncer and more recognisable as a consensual power relationship. However, a bouncer takes responsibility for managing and policing night-time visitors into the disciplines and protocols of the late night leisure market (Hobbs *et al.*, 2002). It is here where Hobbs *et al.*'s (2002) suggestion of bouncers controlling a quasi-liminal comes to the fore. A bouncer controls the threshold to a private social space. Within this localised area of control they are able to grant and deny access to this space and, to a certain extent, govern the conduct therein. The bouncers at pubs, clubs and bars are, for the most part, semi-professional/part-time employees whose tasks include (but are not limited to) vetting potential customers at the point of entry. This helps to ensure that all customers meet the requirements as outlined by the commercial interests of the establishment at which they are operating. In this regard, the role of the bouncer in relation to being feared can be clearly outlined. The world that Hobbs *et al.* (2002) describe is one of revelry mixed with the need to control the often-occurring violence of the night-time economy.

To stop or disallow entry requires authority and situational control. Without the more readily recognisable insignia of rank enjoyed by sworn police officers, other means of establishing control are required; in particular, “the cultivation of an authoritatively intimidating appearance and demeanour is of crucial importance” (Hobbs *et al.*, 2002: 357). This realisation leads on to understanding the role that the body can play in the process of gaining and maintaining control for bouncers and how this can have an impact on fear. The concept of bodily capital (Wacquant, 2004) is important and the capital inherent within particular physiques is important to door work. “An ability to ‘look the part’ by possessing and imposing physical presence suggestive of potential violence allows the doorman to underline his position of authority and dominance within the milieu” (Hobbs *et al.*, 2002: 357). The Chapter will explore the relationship between the bodies, the occupational requirements of doorman and fear.

There are a number of ways in which Wacquant’s (2004) conception of bodily capital shares similarities with the bouncers within this study. First, contrary to an oft-held misconception, the bouncers are not all of a similar body type, much like Wacquant’s (2004) description of the boxer’s body as neither a structure in space nor a mechanical function. Rather, the training of the boxer’s body is a practice, which takes place through time (Wacquant, 2004). The bouncer’s bodies all had varying characteristics which, when viewed collectively, were disparate. However, they were each trained towards the common goal of control and the bouncer’s bodies each symbolised the same authoritative values. The bouncers described the process of skill development over time. Whilst the body represented the physical vessel by which they present and assert control, this was a supplementary fact in relation to the development of additional professional skills over time.

Amongst the development of pragmatic security techniques (Hobbs *et al.*, 2002) the bouncers articulated concerns over the effectiveness of certain practices. Descriptions offered by each of the participants in relation to the good and the bad bouncers involve a movement away from the basic structural and mechanical functions described by Wacquant (2004) in relation to boxers. This suggests that the superficial elements of the body (size, muscularity) that can be fear inducing represent a less subtle or less skilled element to the process of managing people, securing bars and

causing fear. Each of the voices within the Chapter described a journey away from physical violence (some more so than others) that is synonymous with the development of other skills in the management of people.

For example, Wacquant (2004) describes bodily capital for the boxer as the skills developed after months of shadow boxing, sparring, footwork and roadwork, which transform an abstract set of principles about how to box into reflex-like actions. In much the same way, bouncers' initial ability to control others with their physical presence is supplemented, in time, with a specific set of skills such as identifying trouble makers, understanding body language, negotiation, diffusing aggression and various ways to incapacitate people. Bodily capital (Wacquant, 2004) is concerned with the suggestion that the body can be used as a resource, which can be used or exchanged to produce another resource, such as cash. In the same way that a boxer considers his body his stock-in-trade (Wacquant, 2004) so does a bouncer. Whilst a bouncer is neither a policeman nor a soldier they are engaged in a certain type of security work, which can broadly be conceived as private security.

Within this Chapter there are four contributors that each shed light on the experience of being feared as a bouncer. These contributors demonstrate a variety of experiences and reflect closely, a number of the findings within existing literature. Within the next section the Chapter will go on to discuss the specific relationship that bouncers have with the experience of being feared.

The first bouncer is Big Daddy. Big Daddy is 32 years old and bounces as a part time job and has done so for nearly 14 years. He is at a managerial level for the company that supplies bouncers to his local town and his role, aside from practical door work, is to ensure staffing levels are correct for a number of venues. His full time job is as a branch manager for a home improvement company. Big Daddy's desire to be a bouncer is typical of the members of the researched group in that his chief desire to gain cash was the primary motivator. Big Daddy is married with 3 children.

Mr Mental, 36, is in many ways the antithesis of Big Daddy. He has been a bouncer for 5 years but has lost his licensed accreditation due to the use of frequent and excessive violence. He still works at a number of his local venues illegally. His initial

desire to work on the door was driven by a need for money and the motivation for continuing to work illegally is the need to support the birth of his first child in the coming months. He represents someone who has failed, or is unwilling, to engage wholeheartedly in the process of gaining professional skills and often relies on violence to control people.

Jack, 28, is a bouncer who was recruited due to his size and his desire for extra cash. He was initially approached by bouncers in a gym and asked if he would like to earn money whilst he was a student. Jack is the least experienced within the sample and has less familial responsibility than the other bouncers within this study. Importantly, Jack provides an insight in to the less experienced bouncer and how the process of 'skilling up' can be achieved over time.

Wolverine, 33, is an experienced bouncer and believed he was a good bouncer because he was good at violence. It was a key skill for him. He is a part time bouncer, full time satellite installation technician and runs a martial arts club. Wolverine underwent a transition away from violence as a tool indicating a professionalising of his ability.

The Chapter initially outlines the way bouncers use their bodies to control space and to impose their authority. This was articulated as both a reflection on their physical size and stature but also through their sartorial appearance and adherence to a dress code. This can variously be described as the way in which they presented their authority. The Chapter then goes on to introduce the ways in which these attributes are used to gain control and cause fear. This leads into connecting the body, fear and the professional or financial imperative that drew many of the bouncers to the occupation.

The Chapter moves on to explore the ways in which the body and its capacity for violence became less important than the development of skill and a professional ability. Key to this process was the increased ability to manage fear within encounters. Instilling fear enabled the bouncers to avoid physical violence whilst simultaneously being able to threaten its use. The symbolic use of the body was

supplemented by the ability to coerce others and control situations using fear as an important tool in that process.

a) Controlling Space Through the Body

Threats, Fear and Presenting Authority

There were a number of different ways in which the bouncers attempted to present authority. First, Big Daddy suggests his physical size is a very visual indicator of his authority. He is aware that people look at him and make a physical assessment. Second, Mr Mental believes his authority was gained locally via a degree of notoriety. His use of violence over time became known and he believed his authority stemmed directly from people 'seeing him in action'. Wolverine, despite his belief in his ability to fight, believes his authority originated in his sartorial presentation and a professional sensibility. He wears a collared shirt, a tie and a smart jacket alongside his visibly displayed door licence. From this point his manner and sternness are supplementary to a visible presentation of the professional bouncer. Jack suggested that his authority was derived from respect and politeness that was perhaps unexpected due to his size. This was based on a sense of professionalism and awareness that his ability to talk was often a surprise to the customers. His authority was based on a sense of fairness that appeared to be minded towards the experiences of the clientele rather than an innate authoritative duty.

Despite the apparently various suggestions for the origin of authority each of the respondents had a similar understanding of encounters in which their authority was not recognised or failing and, interestingly, similar ways of regaining this authority. Fear is important in these circumstances to varying degrees. Big Daddy was under no doubt as to the origin of his authority:

"I have been told that I am quite an imposing person. I've trained a lot. I weigh 22 stone. I am training 6 nights a week. I am naturally a big guy and I don't just want to turn to a sloth. Because of my size I have authority. It might be because I have got a deep voice, and I am quite stern. I will speak to people, as I want to be spoken to. Sometimes maybe it is my demeanour, maybe it's my size but the way you approach

people you can see sometimes that they kind of step back from you. It has that fearful affect on people. Certain people are just shit scared of me.

Big Daddy suggests that his authority begins at a visual level. This can be an advantage to him professionally in the sense that he is able to gain compliance without have to coerce or cajole. The advantage of potential intimidation is not short-lived. Beyond the point of entry there is a definite benefit in maintaining control within the bar/pub. As was seen within the police cohort, the act of policing any scenario is a simpler process when compliance is gained and maintained. Big Daddy's perceived authority is present even before he comes into contact with the potential patrons of his establishment. Specifically relating to authority, despite the presence of fear, Big Daddy did not elaborate on the necessity of fear in gaining authority. In this sense suggesting that the authority of his physical size is present regardless of the presence of fear. Whilst he is aware of fear in some individuals he is also conscious that his size represents a considerable barrier to those that would flout the rules of his establishment.

Wolverine also suggested that authority could be gained with a visual element of appearance but instead of basing this on the physical appearance as the primary factor Wolverine indicated it was a combination of things, starting with the way he dressed. His description of authority reflected very closely a Goffmanian understanding of self-presentation and the meaning derived from appearance:

“First of all, you achieve it [authority] with how you look. You wear black –a lot of black. You wear black trousers, black shirt, jumper and you wear a long black coat. I need to be visible and identifiable. It is all about how you look, how you sound and how you present yourself. You have got to be nice and neat. Some doormen have the 4 o'clock shadow, you know, the stubble and all that, I am always clean-shaven. You just talk to people. I am always polite but I am quite direct as well. I need to separate myself at the door and be professional.”

Much in the same way as the police, Wolverine wanted to present, with the way he dressed, an identifiable symbol of authority:

“[A customer] will see a guy dressed in black, in a bar, not drinking and he has got an ID badge displayed in a prominent place, you know, like when you are walking down the street and you see a policeman, that is because he is dressed like that. You see he is a policeman. You have the same with a bouncer in a club, with an earpiece in, a badge, the coat and all that.”

Being a symbol of authority in and of itself is of little use to a bouncer if they are unable to control the environments in which they police. Wolverine closely links authority and fear, suggesting that the very notion of authority, whether symbolic or otherwise, is enough to create fear and gain compliance:

“90% of people have that fear of authority. When someone comes over and says ‘don’t do that’ then they are like ‘OK, I’m sorry’ and they’ll stop.”

Jack reflected on the process of bouncing and the rituals of getting into a busy bar in a busy city:

“People know that when they come to a bar they need to get past the person on the door. They may need their ID if they are younger, they need to be dressed right and they need to make sure they’re not falling all over the place when they arrive, that sort of thing. They know there will be one [a bouncer] and it happens to be me. They need to either comply with me or fool me. It is either a yes or a no. Pretty simple really.”

There is a mutual agreement which customers enter into. They have to comply with the rules and regulations laid out for them by the in-situ authority of the bar. If they are unable to comply then they run the risk of having to interact with one of the door staff and this interaction may exclude them from the bar. This might be the cause of some tension and fear within the interaction from the outset.

Each of the bouncers had a belief in the righteousness of their authority. This was separate from their belief in whether they actual did present authority when on the door. The fact that they had been employed to do a job securing and protecting a particular venue lent itself to a sense of duty and justified their authoritative practices.

They were sensitive to the possibility of getting it wrong as Mr Mental explained:

“There is a stigma attached to it. Some people are too much. For me it was a means to an end. I needed a job. Needed the money. A lot of people are like that. A lot of people get on the door because they think it makes them hard. Being hard makes you a better person. That’s how they see it. People like that are usually self-conscious and it leads to issues. If some dickhead doorman is giving you hassle and you don’t deserve it you are going to kick off.”

Presenting authority needs to be fair and justified. This was, as the longer serving bouncers suggested, necessary to maintain authority over a longer period of time. This is related to fear in a number of ways. With the authority held by the bouncer the need to maintain order and control is pre-eminent. The unnecessary or over exuberant use of fear can cause people to fight or resist or feel too intimidated and can lead to an economic down turn for their employer. This would, in turn, undermine the professionalism of the bouncers. This is because the bouncers are required to maintain order and allow customers to feel secure but not at the cost of losing custom or using techniques, which can lead to external attention from the police. Such attention removes the in-situ authority that the bouncers have by demonstrating that their techniques could be considered unjustified or illegal. This would render their threat impotent, their authority invalid and the presence of fear (and importantly the control) would evaporate.

Controlling People Using Fear

Having established a link between authority and fear, there are a number of ways in which the bouncers used fear to control people. To start, Mr Mental was very clear about how he went about ensuring he was in control of every situation. He suggested he was prone to a degree of social awkwardness. By his own admission, the role of a bouncer would appear a bad choice for those that dislike interaction. He indicated that his normal interactions on the door were typified by a terseness and relatively unfriendly manner. Mr Mental indicated that observing a lack of fear was a precursor to a lack of compliance later in the night:

“When I don’t sense fear, especially from the lads, I think ‘these are going to be trouble.’”

Mr Mental perceives fear to be synonymous with compliance. So the presence of fear within interactions equates to him having control from the outset. For Mr Mental if there was no fear then it was something that had to be created within his encounters. This was not necessarily at the point of entry to the pub or club but could be instilled at a later point during the night. Mr Mental’s method was well practiced:

“Increasing aggression will make people afraid. If I need to I can increase my aggression in stages. I will start positive and go from there. I will not move backwards so if a guy wants to go nose-to-nose I will let him make the choice about fighting. If he has the confidence to fight me then fair enough. I have 3 stages. So let’s say that a guy has his top off in the bar. I will walk over and say initially, ‘Hi mate, can you put your top back on?’ Then if that doesn’t work I would say, ‘Put your top back on.’ Then if that doesn’t work it is time for them to go. I would put my hand on them to turn them. If they turn themselves, fine. If not then I turn them forcibly. If they resist I’ll choke them out.”

Mr Mental’s stages represent a point at which fear can have the desired effect at any point along his increments. If fear is absent or if fear alone fails to illicit the desired response then violence is a final option. Perhaps it also represents a misidentification, in the case of Mr Mental, of the part that fear can play in compliance with some individuals. An individual can have a disagreement with a bouncer on principle or avoid conflict without necessarily showing fear. However, Mr Mental was certain that he was able to identify fear and used it effectively:

You can strip down a person’s bravado by standing your ground. It’s not size or swearing. Just words, and no backward step. I take gratification when people are scared of me. I know they’re scared of me. They’ve seen me in action or whatever. I know I can make people afraid. I would be very blunt. It is up to me to draw the line. I define it. I don’t move it. As long as you know where that line is and deal with it confidently. Obviously fear comes into getting control. You have to earn that fear with your manner.”

By stripping down bravado there is a suggestion that he is able to create fear from a situation that does not necessarily have it to start with. In other words, he is capable of chipping away at a person's confidence and, in doing so, demonstrates his intentions, and achieves his professional goals with the use of fear. By 'drawing the line' Mr Mental sets a metaphorical frame of behaviour from which he will not allow the client to diverge. This line is the boundary for his control and he uses fear to shepherd people's behaviour to conform to his (and the venue's) behavioural expectations. The process of earning that fear is an interesting one. Within his behaviour and actions he instils a belief within the transgressor's perception that at each stage, violence is the end point. His belief in his ability to demonstrate this is reliant on people knowing his capacity for violence but also, as he understands it, in the way that he behaves. He has developed a reputation with the bouncers he works with:

"One of the lads used to joke that I should be locked in a cage at the back until it kicks off. But I don't think that's fair. I am a firm believer that if you have control you don't need violence. So many of my fights have been caused by bouncers abusing their authority. If you have control don't do anything different. So if people are misbehaving but stop it when I tell them, I have control then so it's the end of it."

In the professional sense, Mr Mental has achieved his aims by regaining control. Fear has played an important part in that process. There is also an awareness that there are limits and boundaries that need to be observed when using fear and threatening violence. That boundary is represented by the existence of control. For Mr Mental, if control is evident, any attempt to increase aggression, violence or fear represents an abuse of authority and threatens to undermine the professional process of maintaining order. The existence of fear in these situations is useful but it can also have an interesting effect on the persons who were the cause of that fear. The impact is not solely related to a professional endeavour and can have an impact on the individuals involved as Wolverine explains:

"When someone is afraid of me it is a positive feeling. Look, I am only human and we, the body we live in now, we still had 10,000 years ago, and we still have different

things that make us feel good. If I pin someone down and totally dominate them and they are scared of me – it's going to make me feel good. It is just written into my DNA. There is nothing I can do about it. In the same way there is nothing they can do about being shamed by that experience."

Wolverine highlights an aspect of fear and conflict that has not been touched upon up to this point. There is, for Wolverine, a process of empowerment that can come from having that sort of authority and that sort of control. These positive feelings are completely personal and are in no way related to the wider goals of his professional work. This is an important concept to consider. The process of causing fear and controlling people by using the body and social skill is very much a personal ability and very much set in the micro-interaction of person-to-person contact.

Communicative signals are given between interactants and meaning is derived between them (as discussed in Chapter 3). Both parties can attempt to manage the impression (Goffman, 1959) that they give to the other. This is something that Wolverine uses in his role as a bouncer:

"Sometimes you are looking for a reaction from some people, so you can see in a split second how they are going to react. If you say to someone 'evening, how are you? Are you having a good night?' and they are like 'yeah' and react really timidly, then it's like 'in you come' they are no problem to me. But if you get someone who talks back and they are a bit of an idiot to you, you can tell if they are drunk, some people are like comedians and just want to have a laugh with you, that is OK, but when you talk to someone and they don't even want to acknowledge you, sometimes they just don't hear you and I repeat something and they are like 'oh yeah sorry', but if they totally blank you they are probably too drunk."

Wolverine uses a combination of implied strength and intimidation and derives his understanding of their effectiveness by observing the reactions of those around him. He uses fear, and the reaction to him as a bouncer, as a way of understanding the type of person he is about to let into the bar. The presence or absence of fear is a signifier of things to come. The presence of fear or the lack of fear is not in and of itself a determining factor for their entry. Instead it is a mechanism by which Wolverine can make judgements of people and by doing so, allows himself a certain type of

knowledge that affords him more control than he might otherwise have. In this sense the presence of fear is for information rather than instantaneous situational control. It may be control that can be excerpted at a later point in the evening or it could be immediate by way of stopping entry to the venue.

Big Daddy explained that his use of fear was not related to physical dominance, but rather the way in which his body and manner threatened physical dominance. Big Daddy suggested that he was able to gain control within many situations without resorting to anything resembling physical coercion:

“I’m guessing that they have just realised that they can’t carry on mouthing off, you know, they can’t keep doing it. You know, in that respect you have just been able to stop the situation without saying a word and without having to knock someone about or anything like that. I can admit that I am not the most technically gifted at using the restraint techniques or anything like that. I generally just bear hug people or drag them out by their head. It is effective and it has never failed me. But I rarely have to do that. I am guessing that’s because the person that I am, whether they are male or female, I have got that fear factor over them. So yeah, I am guessing that that is the situation and why it happens because they are in fear of you. That goes back to the size thing and the way you approach situations.”

Jack also indicated an ability to control without deploying any physical intervention:

“Look, I don’t use force all that often. I just don’t need to but I do imply force a lot. So, there was a guy who had a bit too much is inside the bar and I needed to get him out. He resisted my suggestions to start with. I said, ‘are you sure?’ I stared right at him looking him up and down. I wanted him to see my size and then consider what that size will do to him if he pushes his luck. I wanted him to know that I had looked at him and that I knew I would wipe the floor with him. I didn’t need to lay a finger on him. Most people are afraid of a beating.”

It is clear that both Big Daddy and Jack consider fear to be the reason behind their ability to control without resorting to more violent means. What is less clear is what exactly the customers and wrongdoers are afraid of. Jack and Big Daddy suggest that

it is their physical size, which initially garners the attention of the person they are interacting with. They use their size symbolically to imply the consequences of not complying with their demands. This implicit threat, as Jack and Big Daddy suggest, is successful the majority of the time. The body represents the barrier from which a beating might follow, as Jack suggests. The body is used to cause fear and this achieves the desired outcome in a professional sense.

Using the Body in a Professional Way

There is a further point about authority to which the bouncers frequently returned. It was of little consequence to them how they were able to gain authority within a situation. It was more important that they were able to actually have authority. They all articulated awareness of when they felt they had it and when they did not. In many ways understanding the origin of their authority was something they learned about over time and grew to understand rather than it being something they were innately aware of. Instead they chose to use their bodies and their presence to represent a figure of authority and achieve the mutual aims of the businesses they are employed by to serve and their own financial needs.

The constant echo from this cohort was the need to perform the duties to which they have been tasked. This includes, but is not limited to, filtering underage people, excessively drunk people and unwanted people from the bars, clubs and pubs and preventing entry. To remove people who have transgressed the rules of that establishment and to protect those who are following those rules. Each bouncer articulated a similar sense of duty and took that role seriously. They each essentially applied their various physical and social attributes to the common problem of order within the night-time economy.

Mr Mental explained the complex and competing needs of the individual financial imperative, the late nights inherent in the night-time economy and the emotional and physical toll exerted on the body:

“I have worked up to 80-90 hours a week. I’ve got two jobs. I didn’t have time to think. I’ve got a kid on the way. I did what I had to do. It was work. The only way you

can keep that work is by doing the job they want you to do, be professional and don't piss them [the bar managers] off. It has taken its toll on me though. I have had a lot of fights and my knuckles are ruined. I used to have fear as well. I used to drink to overcome it. There is a price to pay. It wasn't good."

Mr Mental's explanation introduces a personal struggle to overcome the fear that his (part-time) professional life caused. Mr Mental took the role of the bouncer seriously and was proud of being seen as professional. Mr Mental's interpretation of professionalism was related to the sanctioned use of violence and, as will be explained shortly, not without incident. Achieving the desired professional goals with the means and skills available to him meant that Mr Mental was frequently in a position where he was engaging in physical conflict.

There is a price to pay for using the body in a professional way. Unlike Mr Mental, the price paid by Big Daddy does not have a physical component but focused more specifically on an emotional one. He is employed in both full-time work and door work with a young family. He balked at the concept of spare time:

"What does that even mean? My wife has her own little business doing cleaning and ironing so every time I am at home she's out working. It is only Sundays that we see each other. The rest of the time it is just flying visits, high-fiving as we go through the door and that's it. The kids take up my time outside work. The problem is, we have a champagne lifestyle and lemonade wages. So the hours on the door keep our heads above water. Lucky I am able to do it. If I was shy and meek we'd be in trouble."

The financial need coupled with, as Big Daddy saw it, the appropriate attributes to perform the role, were key in him maintaining his chosen lifestyle. His body and his presence are his professional tools. For Jack, his decision to use his body in this professional way stemmed from being 'head hunted':

"I was out at the University bar when one of the security staff came up to me and asked if I wanted to earn some money. I thought in that split second that he wanted me to sell drugs or something! He basically said you have got what we are looking for and I started the next week. I needed a job as a student and this was perfect. I was

picked because of my size. If I wasn't a big guy we wouldn't have had that conversation and we probably wouldn't be having this one either."

Big Daddy self-identified that he had the necessary characteristics for becoming a bouncer, while for Jack these characteristics were pointed out to him. In both senses the key for these individuals was a visibly imposing figure. Whether or not they considered their physiques to be fear inducing is more difficult to ascertain. When reflecting on this fact the language was very similar. They tended to focus on the fact that they *can* cause fear rather than a belief that they are innately fear inducing. This lends itself to the idea that, for the purposes of being professional and to achieve the aims of the role, they are able to behave and adopt a manner of conducting themselves (a Goffmanian manner) that has the potential to cause fear in others. It is a professional imperative to become fear inducing. The use of the body in this capacity is part time by its nature. To this extent, the process of managing fear and the prospect of trying to elicit fear in someone in a professional capacity is not something that they want to do when they are not directly engaging in private security.

As part of using the body in the professional setting, a number of the bouncers were far less comfortable with the idea of causing fear outside of this setting. This was important in realising the professionalising of their ability to cause fear. Being feared was not an emotion they wanted to elicit in everyday life. Mr Mental suggested the fear was only an emotion he wanted to elicit in a work based situation. Big Daddy was also keen to separate work and everyday life in the context of being feared.

These sentiments keenly reflected the Goffmanian (1959) front stage/back stage as discussed in a previous Chapter. Professionally, the front stage performance is the bouncer with 'blinkered vision' and the audience are those to whom he is directly trying to elicit fear from. The back stage to this professional performance is at the point at which he is with his family and no such response is required. However, this is not a completely smooth process and the professional audience can appear at unwanted moments. As Big Daddy explains:

"It has probably happened a couple of times. Like, I have seen a big group of lads and I have thought, you know, last night or the night before, I have kicked you out and you

were mouthing off. You have always got, it's not a fear for me then, it is a protective instinct. My chest goes out and I am constantly looking and again, you don't want to show fear, even when you are with the kids. You know, I don't want a situation where, I may have thrown you out the night before but because I am with my kids you can take the piss out of me. You want to still be that person."

It is the realisation that he has difficulty in marrying the two personas and dealing with the possibility of conflict outside of the professional setting that underpins the importance of his ability to change when on the door. The manner that he adopts at work is to achieve an outcome of control or order maintenance. When that order is not required he does not behave, nor want to behave, in that way. He does not want to cause fear in others. In support of this, Wolverine was able to explain how his professional approach and the way he presented himself during his time at work was the element that caused fear in people:

"When I am with my wife people don't fear me. When I am with her, people won't look twice at me. When I am by myself people might do a little. You know, I am a fairly large guy and I have had people cross the road in front of me to avoid me. But as I get older I don't have that skinhead look anymore. I just have a normal look. I think people can sense it [fear] naturally. If you walk with purpose and a look in your eyes then you are going to be... if you have a certain persona if you walk around and you look like you want to cause something people will smell it. They will see it a mile off."

Wolverine suggests those people that want to elicit fear from others can do so in the way that they behave and that these signals will be read and understood by an audience (Goffman, 1959). In this regard, Wolverine and the other bouncers use their bodies professionally to elicit fear purposefully. This fear is an ingredient of control and their body is a tool that allows them to achieve the aims of their profession.

b) From Body to Skills: Learning to use the body

Each of the bouncers described, to a greater or lesser extent, their ability to perform acts of violence. In understanding how they learn to use their bodies it is important to

understand the part they believe their body plays in this process, how this is related to fear and, to what extent this is a learned process and how this does and does not develop over time.

The bouncers all suggested they knew how to fight. This was sometimes related to physical size and their ability to over-power others. This is particularly prevalent with Big Daddy and Jack. With Mr Mental his ability to fight was pre-eminent within his capacity to be an effective bouncer. With Wolverine, there appeared to be a balance between the two. He considered himself to be physically imposing but it was his ability to fight that gave him confidence. The body was also a key feature from which an explanation of bouncing ability would stem. For example, Mr Mental suggested that due to his smaller physical size he was not taken seriously when he first started working. He was forced to prove himself in other (violent) ways. Wolverine, Big Daddy and Jack all suggested that their larger physical size means that a great deal of lower level conflict can be addressed by their presence with no need for further action.

For all of the voices within this Chapter there is a distinction between learning to use the body within a bouncing context and *why* they use their body in a bouncing context. The reason why they use their body is related to the need for income and the physical attributes that are stereotypically found within the bouncing profession itself (see for example, Hobbs, Hadfield, Lister and Winlow, 2002). In this regard, the importance of a learning process was not centred on violence or a capacity for physical strength. Firstly, it was centred on how they learnt to use their natural social and physical attributes to best advantage and when these attributes may be limited. Secondly, it was centred on how they learned to manage fear within interactions and how this understanding of fear led to a greater understanding of control within interactions. This is directly related to the body in the sense that fear is a readily identifiable physical emotion. For Big Daddy hiding his own fear was something he had to learn. It was something he had to learn in order to be more effective as a doorman:

“Pretty much every time you deal with a big situation, whether it is a big group of lads, whether it is someone you know of, whether it’s a bit fiery, it could be anything,

but when you go into that situation, deep down you are shitting yourself, but, as soon as you show that fear, any other doorman will tell you, that as soon as you show that fear, you might as well give me the badge because, you can't let them see that they have got the better of you. Say goodbye to control at that stage."

There is an awareness here of the visible display of emotion with the presentation of self (Goffman, 1959) and a tacit acceptance that being in control of the fear within the encounter equates to being in control of the encounter. This was a situation echoed by Mr Mental. His understanding was quite clear and his way of dealing with his own fears indicates an awareness of the power that fear can have on him:

"I am aware of fight or flight. I take measures to prevent flight in myself. I had a fight with six lads and I made sure I lent against the doorframe so I was unable to leave if flight kicked in. I channel everything in to going forward. It's dedication to being a professional doorman. I was head-to-head with one of the lads. Then he moved back an inch and I was able to head butt him and get him to the ground. People always come back to the same bars over and over. I worked at the same place for 4 years. They knew me and I knew them. Once enough people saw me in action I had very few problems."

Two interesting points come from this. First, Mr Mental predicts and, takes measures against, his own fear. This suggests that he has learnt to understand the power that fear can have over his body. He did not suggest that he has ever taken flight from an encounter but appeared sensitive to the possibility. Without encountering this level of fear he would not have learnt to take measures against it. This knowledge also feeds into his understanding of how his adversaries will feel within the confrontation. The refusal for a backward step takes the decision to have a physical confrontation away from him. He has learnt that more often than not he will succeed in avoiding physical conflict by being absolutely prepared to engage in it.

Second, Mr Mental's assertion that when enough people have seen him in action there are fewer problems, suggests an interesting mutual learning process. He bounces on the same doors regularly and this provides both him and the customers a basis for learned authority. Those that may have attempted and failed to overcome this

authority may have learnt not to try again. Equally, Mr Mental becomes aware of those people that he has gained control over and can ultimately overpower them if the need for physical intervention arises. For Mr Mental, his learning process centred on a need to show his capacity for violence, in order to have control.

Jack is the least experienced of the bouncers with less than two years in the job. His conception of the process of learning is therefore less developed than the other contributors within the research. Jack's process of learning included using the body during an encounter in which talking or his ability to physically impose was no longer effective as a means of coercion or control. Jack suggested his biggest learned skill was recognising the point at which he needed to employ the use of violence or physical force. This is very much contrary to the process of learning undertaken by the more experienced bouncers in the sense that they have learned to move away from violence having established a 'professional' understanding of when to use it and the ways in which it can be avoided whilst maintaining control. For Jack, his size was a great advantage in the early stages of his work on the door and, remained a useful visual tool for establishing authority. This visual tool did have its limitations:

"These lads came to the club and were giving me a load of mouth. I've had that a load before but these weren't backing off. They had been OK at the door but were starting to kick off inside. I had to get them out. Talking to them wasn't working. They just weren't afraid of me. I had never had that. There was this moment before I grabbed one of them when I thought, 'I am going to have to fight this lad.' I was shitting myself."

Despite Jack's learning being centred on the use of the body as a violent tool rather than the ability to talk or coerce, as is the case with the others within the cohort, it did still develop from this early realisation. The absence of fear was a key to this learning process. With Jack's physical attributes he had not experienced an encounter in which he was not able to elicit fear. In order to gain control there was a line that Jack needed to cross, the line between verbal to physical coercion. This use of the body as a violent tool was not without further development. It also moved away from more macro or extreme uses of violence to more subtle or practiced methods:

“The first time I got physical with these lads I think I was a bit over the top. I only needed to get them out but I was proper fighting. I don’t have a background with that and I had only used the restraint techniques in training for the badge. I was just swinging and grabbing. It was a lot of effort. It was effective though don’t get me wrong. The other lads had a word though and I worked on other methods.”

These techniques were methods of moving people out of the way or moving them out of the building without resorting to fighting. It represents a process that Big Daddy explained:

“I am at the advantage where I am 6’3” and 17.5 stone, so I can pretty much not say anything or, at the most, talk people out with little need to get physical. I’ve not thrown a punch in 6 years. Other guys who work for me are a bit smaller and they have to physically deal with it. Other guys that are small can talk people down it is very difficult to do if you don’t have that skill. It is a very grey area when you are a doorman, can you do the overall job? Can you work inside a club where you have got 500 people maybe 1000 people? Can you deal with that situation and also can you work on the front door and be polite and turn away your idiots and your knob heads? If you can combine both, you have pretty much got a job for as long as you want it. But, it goes back to the fear factor, as soon as you show fear, your confidence is gone and that person always will know that.”

Here Big Daddy highlights what can be understood to be the bottom line for a bouncer: Control. It is of little consequence how one goes about learning to use the body or which attributes are most naturally advantageous within the profession. It is important to develop a diverse skill set in support of the physical presence that a bouncer has when they stand in a doorway. It involves the development of a professional ability, which will be discussed shortly. The skill set that Big Daddy speaks of is inextricably linked with an understanding of fear, how to use it, how to instil it and how to hide it.

Going Away from Violence as a Practice?

A common theme amongst the bouncers, was the sense that the more experienced they became, the less and less they needed to, or indeed were willing to, engage in acts of violence or physical confrontation. The reasons given for this were various. Some indicated that there was increased attention given to the use of violence by private security providers by the police. Others suggested that violence at work had become a tiresome experience and should be avoided. There were also suggestions that the use of violence, whether successful or unsuccessful, was painful and that over the course of time the injuries led to a dislike for engaging in physical conflict (this is not to be understood as a lack of willingness). Perhaps most importantly, as the bouncers became more experienced, the existence of violence became indicative of a loss of control rather than a sign that they were gaining control. It was, as far as being feared is concerned, a demonstration that they were not able to elicit an appropriate fear response and had not been successful in coercing via non-violent means.

Mr Mental came across as the most readily violent of the bouncers. He has lost his accreditation due to excessive violence and continues to work illegally. Mr Mental was aware that the use of violence has only limited application in the role of the bouncer. This was largely reflected in the efforts within his local area (and eventually nationally) to professionalise or, at the very least, certify the bouncers³. Despite the admittance of violence having limited applications, Mr Mental commented specifically on these changes in door work and the inevitable impact this would have on the type of person this would attract.

“Most of the use of violence has gone out of door work. Most of these lads straight from Uni security have never had a fight in their lives. They are not as prepared or as professional. They go on the door and then get chinned. Then they are just replaced with more of the same.”

³All individuals working in private security are required to have a valid SIA (Securities Industry Authority) licence demonstrating their right to work as a security professional and in order to obtain an SIA Licence they must have a SIA certificate.

Whilst Mr Mental perceives his strongest asset to be his ability to fight it is a part of door work that he perceives to be changing. In its place, the use of fear specifically and the *threat* of violence become key tools in controlling the space to which he has been tasked. The movement away from violence for Mr Mental was not an easy or desired transition:

“I took a path. I knew how to fight. I needed a job. That was the end of it for me. I wouldn’t use violence anymore. I have developed beyond it. I mean I have lost my licence because I used it too much. I had to move on. If I’m working illegally I can’t go around hitting people anymore.”

Mr Mental had his bouncer’s accreditation removed due to excessive violence. It was at this point that he developed an understanding of the importance of fear above and beyond that of violence itself. His ‘wake up call’ came when Mr Mental punched a man in the face for a second time shortly after paramedics had revived the man. The man was being revived due to the first punch that Mr Mental had thrown. All of this violence was caught on CCTV and, upon viewing the footage Mr Mental realised how close the man had come to falling into passing road traffic. Mr Mental looked upon the situation pragmatically:

“You’ve got to be able to develop yourself in these situations. If I just told you to come outside and if you’re not scared you’ll just tell me to fuck off.”

The ability to be able to elicit fear, for Mr Mental, is a skill that needs to be acquired in order to be professional. In Mr Mental’s case specifically, a reduction in violence and an increase in more coercive uses of fear was a necessity in order for him to continue to work illegally without raising the concerns of police. For others, the transition away from violence was also apparent but for a variety of reasons. Big Daddy, for example, worked more frequently than the other members of the cohort. To this extent, he grew tired of the violence and developed techniques to avoid conflict of any kind.

“I could probably have a fight every night of the week if I wanted to. When you have done this for as long as I have you just get tired of it. I haven’t got anything to prove. I am just doing a job.”

Big Daddy, had developed, what he called, the ‘respect all arseholes’ method:

“I don’t know if people know this or not but it is very hard to explain. If you talk to people and don’t shout, don’t start slanging and don’t start swearing at them, they’ll actually listen to you. If you explain it to them, ‘I am trying to help you, I know you have been thrown out, you were fighting inside, whether you say you were or not, my colleague thinks you were. It’s his decision. I am not going to argue with him or overrule him, so you are done tonight. Come back tomorrow.’ It does work.”

Despite its name this was a different use of fear to that of Mr Mental. For Big Daddy fear and conflict tension (Collins, 2009) are elements of an interaction that require removal. In the scenario offered by Big Daddy the physical process of throwing a customer out of the bar has already occurred but the possibility of ongoing violence or conflict is possible. In light of this, Big Daddy developed an understanding of the ways to avoid conflict from the start. Again, fear is a necessary tool at his disposal:

“I mean, years ago the way I learned how to get anything was the way we used to ask people to leave. You go into a situation and many times you have gone in and the guy has shut up straight away. You know, he has gone from being the mouthiest arsehole in the world to being just like a little mouse. That is the desired impact to instil fear into them. It works in that respect.”

Wolverine’s view on violence involved a set of principles concerning the use of certain types of violence and a view on door work:

“When I go for somebody, like, physically to get rid of them, I never throw punches at them. I don’t believe in punching people. I believe that everyone is entitled to go out and have a good time. That is fine. I believe that if you do get out of line, you shouldn’t be beaten to a pulp for it. Everybody makes mistakes. You know, everyone can make mistakes, making mistakes should not get you beaten by someone who

knows more than you do. It annoys me when I hear that a doorman has beaten someone. It gets on my nerves because there is no need for it. There is just no need for it. You are sober and in control, there is no need to beat someone. So I don't believe in throwing punches that way. What I do believe in is immobilising someone."

Wolverine reflected objectively on his position as a bouncer and, rather than consider the role as an ongoing conflict with customers he considered the role in the round and understood the economic imperative as well as the simple desire of patrons to be social. This being said, whilst he does not throw punches the methods he does employ are still violent. They were considered, practiced and effective and all directed towards gaining control through physical force and fear:

"When you get your free will taken away from you, you will get scared. How I would do it, is if somebody is like, the same size as me and I put them down and they are struggling on the floor and what-not and I take every arm and leg and I pin them in place and they can not move and at any point I could strike them to within an inch of there life, and don't, that will terrify someone."

Wolverine was aware of the fear that such a technique would cause. Yet, he regarded these techniques as a process administered to gain control. It was neither revenge nor bravado but a method of gaining compliance in particular situations:

If someone is really going nuts, I will cut off their airway a little bit, I will choke you a little bit, nothing nasty, but I am going to close your windpipe for a split second and you won't have any oxygen, you will not be able to breath until I have released my hand. If you do that, people are terrified. If I carry on they will die. Something in the back of their mind goes 'I should stop now. Not only am I on the floor but I cannot move and this person can stop me breathing whenever he wants, and can pummel me whenever he wants.' At that point people just change. They turn to butter."

Wolverine's development as a bouncer does involve a greater capacity to avoid violence. He considers himself to be adept at reading the signals of trouble and stopping them at an early point. However, when physical intervention is required, Wolverine has, at best gone away from certain types of violence rather than violence

as a practice. The ways he does use violence (holds and chokes) are more dominating and represent a greater level of control than would a punch. The resulting fear is something he is aware of and uses to his advantage:

“When you control someone’s oxygen supply, they will comply and will be like ‘I’m sorry, I’m really sorry.’ I have heard that before so many times when I have thrown people out. I am just like, ‘don’t worry about it, we all make mistakes. You just can’t come back tonight and you can’t go to any other bars because you have had too much. Go and sleep it off.’ I have had people come back to me the next day and say ‘I am really sorry about last night, I was out of order.’ Part of that is shame and fear.”

Big Daddy saw the virtue in the ability to use other means of coercion beyond the physical. However, there was a degree of nostalgia for a time when violence was more readily accepted as a practice for bouncers and more readily used as a means of control. This was also a lament on the respect formerly afforded to those on the door as result of violent practices:

“Back then; the door staff had a lot more respect than we do now, a hell of a lot more respect. You knew, when I was growing up, I mean, I was in pubs from 15 years old, luckily they were all my brothers friends, so they all used to look after me, no matter how much you hated someone, you had ultimate respect for the door staff. You knew if you pissed them off they would take you round the corner and they’d just kick your head in. It was as simple as it was. The police would turn up and ask what happened and that was it. Very rarely did a doorman get arrested. It was just a case that you’d get a kicking for being mouthy.”

This apparent nostalgia is connected to the methods available to the bouncers to cause fear. If the use of violence is commonplace, then the tacit threat of violence is a more readily available tool at the disposal of the bouncers. If violence is likely, the threat of violence has a greater impact. Conversely, if the use of violence were reduced then the threat of physical intervention would appear to have less validity within an encounter. The end result of the reduced impact of threat would be that control is harder to gain.

“Nowadays, it is completely the opposite. We are the ones scrutinised in everything we do. Every single person we kick out has got a lawyer or has a law degree or some shit, they know what we should or shouldn’t be doing, we have used too much force, we have no rights, it’s ridiculous. Every single fucking person you kick out. I mean, I instruct all of my guys that when they are throwing someone out they explain why they are being thrown out. No matter how drunk that person is or how high they reckon they are they walk them out, or throw them out if needs be, they always should explain it. They always explain to the person why they have been thrown out, whether they are barred or whether it is just for that night, or what it is. That, kind of nullifies a lot of the situations. But you have to do that also. If you just throw someone out they’ll be going to the police they will be going to the pub manager, they’ll be making complaints, they’ll be doing this and that, complaining to my company. It is ridiculous what you have to do nowadays.”

The circumstances surrounding the environment that each of the bouncers practice in now appears very different to the picture painted by Big Daddy. The recollections of violence from each of the voices within the study suggest that violence is still used as a means of gaining control and excerpting authority. However, there is a realisation that a propensity for violence does not constitute the entire role of the bouncer.

The Development of Ability

Big Daddy, in his role as a manager, has to recognise the faults and deficiencies in other bouncers and develop them. A failure to develop the bouncers he works with can lead to violent conflict and loss of contracts with the various bars and clubs under his management. This security skill development is not just related to a financial or business need. It is also related, more importantly, to the management of fear within interactions on the door. This is not just the fear of those the bouncers come into contact with. It is also concerned with the manner in which the bouncers are able to hide their own emotions.

Previous sections within this Chapter outline the awareness the bouncers had of their own bodies, their own fears and the measures taken to adapt within potentially violent and fear eliciting situations. Big Daddy was able to outline the ways in which a well-

skilled, or poorly-skilled bouncer, is identified and developed within his capacity as a regional manager for a door firm and how that relates to fear.

For Big Daddy, fear plays an important role in the process of developing professionally as a bouncer. He identified people within his employ whose fear was impacting on their ability to perform the door security role. It was articulated as the presence of genuine fear on the part of the bouncer during confrontation. It was also more specifically articulated as the visible displays of fear. It appears important, for Big Daddy's understanding, to separate these two concepts. Being afraid appears to be a common phenomenon within the bouncer cohort. However, visibly showing that fear and losing any situational or emotional advantage within an encounter is considered a fundamental flaw. It is considered a key area of development to hide this fear. Mr Mental explained how important learning to control fear was:

"I have seen people show fear [fellow bouncers]. You have to have word then. They got to get it under control. They got to learn. I had to learn as well, I'm not a robot. You have got to help them through it before someone gets chinned."

Jack held a similar view:

"I had to be stony faced. I had to hide all the emotions when dealing with people. Your face is cold but the heart is pumping. If they think you are going to back down they've got you. Have I had to hide fear? Yeah. Plenty of times."

The areas that require development in each bouncer very much depends on the skills or abilities they innately bring to the job in the first instance:

"We had this young lad come to us. He is very green. It is dangerous. He's coming on leaps and bounds. He put himself through his door badge so he came to us fully qualified but he is very green, he is only a young lad, he has not got the physical presence. He is just less than 6 foot tall. The disadvantage of it is that people will take the piss out of him, and they don't know when to stop and they keep going and going and going."

To underline the dangerousness of the 'being green' Big Daddy explained a scenario in which the young bouncer had become involved in a serious altercation with three men armed with knives. During the altercation a number of people were hurt. Big Daddy explained that the young bouncer's lack of physical confidence lead to him disengaging from the physical conflict and running inside the club leaving colleagues to deal with the situation. Big Daddy felt it was unnecessary for the young bouncer to prove himself able or leave the job. A number of bouncers had pinpointed the young bouncer's lack of experience and development and suggested a course of action:

“Now the last two weeks all we have had is, sort of, confidence building with him, one of our staff actually teaches MMA [Mixed Martial Arts]. So we sent him away with him, he has had three or four lessons with him one on one. It is improving him but we don't want him to come back thinking he is a thug so it is a fine line. You have got to make sure they can be polite but also have the minerals to back it up and it is as simple as that. That is our job.”

This outlines the disparate set of skills within the job. This set of skills are not exclusively related to fear or the use of violence but can cover a plethora of points such as manner, politeness, physical size, ability to fight and so on. Without physical presence and the ability to visibly impose within an encounter there are other skills that need to be present or be developed in order to be effective. The confidence building that Big Daddy had thought necessary for his young bouncer was that of building confidence around the skill of fighting:

“We give him (sic) the one-on-one lessons with the MMA fighter not because we wanted a fighter. We needed someone less afraid when violence is there. It is about confidence, yeah, it is about not taking a backward step and doing your job.”

In this instance it is not the use of violence that Big Daddy is looking to develop. Instead a certain familiarity with fighting and physical conflict that can diminish the visible fear and tendency to run away that is prohibitive to door work. Despite this shortcoming, Big Daddy did outline the strengths of young bouncer:

“So he is not a big lad, but he does have an advantage in that he can talk to anyone, he can do it politely. That was something that took me time to learn.”

There is a need for fear in some instances from some people (customers) and there is equally an important need to remove fear or develop the ability to hide fear when performing the role of a bouncer. Jack indicated that whilst part of his own development came when learning how to restrain people without fighting, the key development came in learning how to read the signs of trouble and know when fear was present within an encounter and also to know when there was a genuine potential for violence within an encounter. The key point here is that, for Jack, the ultimate aim was to impose authority without resorting to violence. This played on his strengths as a bouncer. His size and his verbal ability were important assets, yet being able to maintain control in encounters when there was a lack of compliance took time to develop:

“I learnt the hard way. It took time really. You learn the signs, the flash points and the things you can and can’t say to people. The things that will get the right response and the things that will send people over the edge. I got it wrong a few times and I saw other bouncers get a pasting when they’ve messed up. You have got to learn to stamp trouble out before it starts. That takes skill. It’s a certain interpersonal skill but it also means you have to impose your will over people at times.”

Wolverine took this point further. He adopted a standpoint of ‘never letting the trouble in.’ This was dependant on the ability of him and his fellow bouncers to be able to identify this ‘trouble’ and how they went about addressing potential problems. Wolverine was very assured of the efficacy of his method. He outlined this ability in detail:

“I make an assessment of someone when they arrive. I have to look at them as they are walking up. I have to judge people. That is my job. I wouldn’t be a professional if I didn’t. As they walk towards me, where people can hide on me is when there is a queue. They can join the end of the queue and they don’t have to move very much at all. If there is no queue they have to walk towards you before they come in and as they walk towards me I am judging as they do it. I am looking for whether they are

walking in a straight line, are they stumbling all over the place, are they looking at me or are they looking at the door? What are they doing? There are ways of telling. If they were too drunk, they would not look at me. Their eyes would be all over the place and they would be looking at the floor. The reason they would be looking at the floor is because they would be trying to concentrate on walking in a straight line.”

This process was based on a body of experience during which time mistakes were learned from and a working practice was developed. This practice was married with the aims and desires of the establishments at which he was working. Some would have specific dress codes; others would have different age and capacity restrictions. All of this experience has led to a very Goffmanian-style assessment of presentation for every customer that comes to his club:

“There are several levels of how I judge someone as a doorman. One is how they look. One is how they talk. How they talk to me. At the end of the day, I am the doorman. I get to say yay or nay as to whether you get to come through the door of that bar and have a good time or whether you have to go away. If you talk to me like I am a piece of shit, and I am the person that gets to tell you to go away, how are you going to talk to the people in the bar? How are you going to talk to the bar staff when all they do is sell you drinks? So if you already talk to me like I am an idiot, why would I want you in my establishment? Once you are inside, you are a problem. When you are at the door, you are not really a problem to me. I don't really care. You are not in the bar and I have lots of open space to work in, where I am not going to annoy people whilst throwing you out and you are not going to annoy people whilst being thrown out. When you get in, that is when you can be an issue to me. You have to dominate people when you are on the door. They have to know that you are in charge.”

Wolverine, understands that when he comes into contact with a person in his capacity as a doorman, that individual will attempt to control or guide the impression that the bouncer might make of him by changing or fixing his or her setting, appearance and manner (Goffman, 1959). This may be to appear less drunk or to be polite in order to gain entry. At the same time, the person the individual is interacting with, in this case

Wolverine, is trying to form and obtain information about the individual in order to make an assessment as to whether they should be allowed in or not (Goffman, 1959).

There are limits to the vetting process for even the most experienced of bouncers. Knowing the limitations of the process means that, as Wolverine suggests, he is always on guard for flashpoints of violence and unseen issues:

“No matter how much ability you have as a bouncer there are things you can’t predict. You might have a group of people who have a premeditated problem with each other. You don’t know the life story with everyone that comes into your bar. They may have had a previous problem and they go out and something breaks down and they have a fight. They may be having a heated discussion at a table and it would just look like me and you talking, someone gesticulating with their hand and boom! It results in violence. It doesn’t happen very often but it can happen. My vetting just doesn’t see that level of communication.”

Mr Mental equated the development of his professional ability to the development of his role beyond violence and saw the job more in the round. In this sense he was concerned with achieving an appropriate result for the establishment he was working at regardless of the methods employed in most instances:

“Fear is useful but if you are professional you have to be approachable. You have to do a professional job. I think being nice to people on the way in can have an impact on the way they behave when they are in. It’s all about judging. It’s all about being professional for me. I want to be seen as professional. I don’t cut corners. Shirt, tie, badge. People need to see that. Don’t let the trouble in.”

In the case of Mr Mental, his understanding of professional development was outcome driven rather than process or skill driven. If he was able to maintain control then he was doing his job. Regardless of his transition away from using violence (a transition forced upon him due to his excessively violent past), his continued illegal work or his increased understanding of how to communicate, the outcome was recognition of his ability as a professional.

Despite Jack's desire to be professional and develop his skill he was aware that he had limitations as a bouncer. This was unlike the other bouncers in the cohort and provided a more reflective understanding of his professional development:

"I can't be something I am not. I am big, yes. I am strong. I am an imposing figure physically and that can really help but I am not a dumb thug. I have a University degree and I know how to talk to people. I know I can cause fear and have control over some people because of the way I look but I am never going to intimidate some of the people we get in here. They are hard people. They don't take any shit. That's why my biggest issue was conflict. I had to learn how to handle it. I needed to stop it happening and needed to be on top when I couldn't stop it. That was hard as it is not in my nature."

There are a number of different areas in which the bouncers expressed a level of learning, understanding and development over their time working the doors. Perhaps the biggest development each of them has made is to develop an awareness of their deficiencies. Being feared was an experience that the bouncers took for granted in a number of ways. It was often the absence of fear and, therefore, the breakdown of control that caused the introspection and the development of supplemental skills beyond their natural or most frequently used abilities.

Conclusion

The underlying imperative for the bouncers appears to be a combination of financial needs, a belief in their own ability to control people and the obligation of their private security role. The means by which this belief is manifest varies. However, the ability to instil fear in someone plays a major role in each of those manifestations. Some believed it was physical size, others dress and the presentation of, as far as was possible, a legitimate authority figure, others suggested it was being known for violent outbursts. Whilst the imperative to earn money appeared to be ever-present within the working lives of these bouncers, the ways in which they were able to control people was less static.

The bouncers enhanced and developed their ability to control people. The tools required changed and developed over time. Wherever their starting point for their perceived authority stemmed, there was a common theme of development within their professional skill. In relation to fear, this can be interpreted as a development of their ability to use fear as a tool for control in different ways. The effectiveness of this ability was honed and understood over time. Where violence was initially commonplace for a bouncer, the ability to imply or threaten violence and achieve the same ends might develop over time. Wolverine, for example, was confident of his ability to fight. It was an element of his door work that he relied upon in the earlier stages of his career. His ability to learn other methods of control did not diminish his ability to fight. Instead, it was a signal that his skill in presenting authority, coercing and controlling people around him was less reliant on the application of violence. It came to rely more on the tacit threat of violence, the possible consequences of this violence for others, and the fear that would be present within these encounters. In this sense, for the bouncers, the need to use fear and intimidation does not diminish. The ability for the bouncers to deploy fear as an effective tool increases as a need to engage in violence decreases. Importantly, it was the way they used fear and how this developed over time. They develop to the point that it was regarded by some that resorting to physical violence was a failure, on their part, to elicit appropriate levels of fear, and therefore compliance.

Wacquant's (2004) description of bodily capital suggested that the skills developed after time, transform an abstract set of principles into reflex-like actions. Where violence was the first resort, over time the management of fear becomes a reflex-like action. For the bouncers within the study there was a disparate set of characteristics that were developed over time. This initial ability to control others with physical presence or violence was developed over time. This continued to a point where a specific set of bouncer's skills were evident. The development of these bodily skills increases the financial capital to which the bouncer is able to access (Wacquant, 2004). A professional relationship with fear and how to use it then becomes as recognisable a skill in the process of bouncing as the body is.

Chapter 8) The Body as Defensible Space

Understanding the role of the body is essential to exploring the experience of being feared. The body is the vessel from within which every individual explores and experiences the world. It is a point from which we look out upon the world and a way in which others are able to recognise and judge us. It is an ever-present in each encounter we experience. This is the reason why the body and the way individuals understand it, is so important for understanding being feared. Every individual made reference to the body in relation to fear to a greater or lesser extent. This Chapter's chief concern is the role that the body can play in causing fear. The communicative ability of a person's outward bodily appearance will be explored and the specific relationship the body can have with being feared will be elucidated. This Chapter visits Goffmanian themes already introduced in the form of appearance and manner. Importantly, it focuses towards an understanding of the specific role of the body in fearful encounters. It moves beyond symbols of rank and power (Goffman, 1959) and towards a body specific experience of being feared. This exploration will take into account the awareness people have of their own physical appearance and the motivations and measures taken to enhance this appearance. It is also apparent that there is a balance to be struck between the development of a muscular physique for defensive purposes and the impression that this gives to those that may observe it as an offensive tool of a would-be attacker. It is therefore important to explain how fear is achieved when it is wanted, how it is assuaged when it is not and the ways in which this relates specifically to the body.

For some, the body has been an instrument with which they can elicit fear in others to a social or material advantage. For example, a person of large physical size may be able to, without direct force or verbal articulation, intimidate a weaker or smaller person. Here the disparity in physical size and the potential for confrontation are enough to cause fear within those that could potentially be on the losing side of any violent disagreement (Collins, 2009). For others, the body will be a barrier within an interaction when unwanted fear and its subsequent reactions impedes or impacts on their lives negatively. For example, a person of a large muscular build observes that there is a frequent tendency for people to cross the street to avoid walking past him directly. They notice that people avoid eye contact and appear reluctant to engage him

or her in conversation. Other people will not perceive their body to be fear inducing in any way. For such a person, if they are intent on causing fear then they will need to engage in behaviours and activities beyond the immediately physically intimidating. For example, various people within the study identified themselves as physically small or unthreatening yet, they were able to illicit fear. This was done through action or coercion and engaging in a more specific focus within the interaction (Goffman, 1974).

The importance of outward physical appearance is clear in Goffman's (1959) *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Goffman (1959) distils the importance of the role a performer and an audience play within every social interaction. In the case of fear it is understood as the role of the fearful and the feared. Goffman (1959) conceptualised different areas of an interpersonal interaction and this Chapter will focus on the importance of the body in this process. The audience consists of other individuals who observe the role-playing and react to the performances (Goffman, 1959). The term 'performance' to refer to all the activity of an individual in front of a particular set of observers (Goffman, 1959). Through this performance, the individual, or actor, gives meaning to themselves, to others, and to their situation. The 'setting' for the performance includes the scenery, props and location in which the interaction takes place (Goffman, 1959). Different settings will have different audiences and will therefore require the actor to alter his performances for each setting.

In this respect Goffman (1959) suggests, 'appearance' functions to portray to the audience the performer's social statuses. Appearance has the capacity to tell an observer of the individual's social state or role, informal recreation, or a formal social activity. Appearance also communicates status, occupation, gender and age. Where a muscular or trained body is concerned, the status of this muscular frame has a widely understood status within particular settings, the gym, for example. It would denote strength and a dedication to particular forms of exercise. Outside of this setting, on the street, this status may be viewed very differently. A large muscular build could be seen as threatening or intimidating. An observer may consider that a person with such a build is capable of overpowering them, should they choose to do so. The status

assigned to the muscular person is that of physical superiority and the observers would consider themselves to be vulnerable.

It is through Goffman's (1959) understanding of 'performance' that the activities and experiences of the gym goers can be affected by the various sets of observers that come into contact with them. The performances of the gym goers, the social and situational context they find themselves in and the various meanings derived within their encounters, demonstrates the complexity of the body's impact on fearful interactions.

This Chapter uses the experiences of two people. Jam is a black male, and is 28 years old. He works as an engineer on aircraft. He began to use the gym at an early age. He goes to the gym 6 days a week. Jam demonstrated an awareness of others' perception of him from an early age. He equated the changeable reactions to his size and his stature, as he grew older.

Frank is a 35-year-old white male. He is a gym owner and competitive bodybuilder. Other than running a business he has 3 children. Frank was aware of the impact his size and strength would have on those around him. Frank's awareness also extended to the ways his children's friends behaved towards him. Frank is at the gym 7 days a week. He follows a strict workout and eating regime. Frank even cooked and ate two chicken breasts during the course of the interview.

It is necessary to understand the specific role that the body plays within fearful encounters. The Chapter outlines the motivations for enhancing the body, the ways in which these individuals perceive their bodies to be the source of fear in others and the ways in which they adapt their behaviour to cause or alleviate fear within encounters. The Chapter then goes on to introduce the ways in which the body can instil fear in others. Exploring the way the body can symbolise the potential for violence, ward off would-be attackers and create fear without intension. The Chapter finally explores the way that being feared is recognised and adapted to in relation to the body. The contributors to this Chapter recognised that having a fear inducing body can have an impact beyond their own personal interactions.

a) Fear, Motivation and the Body

There are various ways in which fear is related to the body. How the body is adapted for the purposes of defence and offence within interpersonal encounters is an important area to understand. To do this an exploration of the various motivations behind the creation of a trained body, how those motivations are related to fear and to what extent the motivation and subsequent actions have been successful, is necessary.

A very useful place to start is by taking into account the personal motivations of Sam Fussell (1991). Fussell authored a now infamous account of his life's transition from an extremely fearful Oxford graduate who moved to New York to work in publishing into the world of competitive bodybuilding.

Fussell's (1991) work informs, in detail, on the different ways the physical appearance of the human body can be perceived. Taking into account his own self-perception as well as the perception he has of others and that they possess of him. Fussell (1991) candidly describes his journey towards the culture of bodybuilding and the social imperatives and personal safety-oriented motivations that influenced his desire to embark on a journey of extreme bodily transformation. These imperatives were based on a desire to feel '*less assailable, less vulnerable*' in a city that was a constant source of personal fear. Fussell (1991: 20) explained, "The problem, you see, was NYC. It terrified me...As soon as I admitted it; the facts and figures came tumbling out of my mouth. The rapes, the muggings, the assaults, the murders. Those were the majors but the minors where just as bad."

Fussell's concern was not only with the oppressive feeling he felt in a new, massive city but, as his list of concerns suggests, the interpersonal interactions that were forced upon him and the feelings of fear and defencelessness that resulted. The importance of this fear within his life was in little doubt. Fussell (1991: 22) suggested, "My New York days I spent running wide-eyed in fear down city streets; my nights passed in closeted toilet-bound terror in my sublet. My door triple-locked."

However, for Fussell, there was apparently a way out of these feelings of fear. Fussell (1991: 24) describes the moments that led to his life-changing discovery. "I was

ducking for cover, as usual, when it happened. This time it was a man with a crowbar and a taxi medallion [a licence to operate a taxi], worth \$50,000 at the going rate, which he had just ripped off the hood of a New York taxicab. Spotting me as a likely customer, he'd advanced upon me, brandishing the crowbar for emphasis. I quickly sought shelter in the nearest building, which turned out to be the New York landmark, The Strand bookstore. It was an appropriate refuge – I'd used books all my life for protection... as was my custom, made way to the autobiography section (I frequently found myself wondering how *they* coped with life)."

For Fussell (1991: 24), a life with less fear was becoming clear. "It was in this aisle, in this store, in September 1984, that I caught 'the disease.' Here is where I came across '*Arnold: The education of a bodybuilder by Arnold Schwarzenegger.*' A glance at the cover told me all I needed to know. As for his body, why, here was his protection, and loads of it."

At this point Fussell (1991) discovers the methods by which he could achieve his goal of being 'less assailable.' It was within the walls of a gym and in the building of his body that Fussell (1991: 24) saw a future without fear, a future where he would have protection. "What were these great chunks of tanned taut muscle but modern day armour? Here were breastplates, greaves, and pauldrons aplenty, and all made from human flesh. He had taken stock of his own situation and used the weight room as his smithy. A human fortress - A perfect defence to keep the enemy host at bay. What fool would dare storm those foundations?"

Fussell (1991:24) highlights a desire to acquire a physique that could provide "a certain indemnity against the uncertainty of urban life." In doing so he recognised a particular type of social insurance, a visible deterrence, in the shape of the professionally muscular frame of Arnold Schwarzenegger.

There are important points to note at this juncture. The 'capital' Fussell (1991) saw when viewing the pictures in the Schwarzenegger book was a capital based on physical invulnerability. This invulnerability was attributed to, or at the very least linked to, a hyper-masculine muscular physique. He viewed this capital as flesh and blood insurance against violence but also against those people that are tempted to take

advantage of him. Fussell's initial perception of the muscular body as a fortress of safety was the very perception he wished to impart on his observers. Here Fussell (1991) interpreted the usefulness of the muscular body he saw within the pages of the book as something that could help to assuage his constant feelings of fear within New York City. As he suggested, "Nothing else has worked for me. The Harvard Club tie and The New York Society Library card had done nothing to ward off attack. As for Tai Kwon Do, one had to actually engage in street combat to use it. But muscles... they were something else altogether. Surely a quick appraisal of my new gargantuan body would guarantee me immunity, even from the criminally insane. Wouldn't four hours a day of private pain be worth a lifetime of public safety?"

There are many areas to draw on here. First, being fearful within New York City was an overbearing experience for Fussell (1991) and he went to great lengths to assuage these feelings and avoid fear-provoking encounters. It can be suggested that his chief motivation was to avoid fear. There is cause to think that the choices he made thereafter were made because of a necessity to find an answer to his personal fears.

Second, the choice to undertake bodybuilding was not an offensive or assailant-focused endeavour. It was for defensive purposes. To *appear* like he cannot be beaten or taken advantage of was his chief motivation. In this regard there is clearly a fine line to tread. His motivation and the task he needed a muscular frame to perform was specifically to ward-off people that may attack. It was not to cause fear in the people he encountered simply walking down the street. Here the fear experienced is fear of personal safety but the defence is based on building a physique and using it as a deterrent. Fussell's (1991) transformation was targeted. It was aimed at relieving his own personal anguish and advertising to certain people that he was not to be trifled with.

The notion of having a physique for defensive purposes is important. The title for this Chapter has been chosen as a deliberate play-on-words with Newman's *Defensible Space* (1973). Whilst Newman (1973) focuses on estate design and the creation of a secure built environment there are a number of parallels that can be drawn between the relationship the body has with fear and Newman's (1973) concept.

There is a theoretical assumption within Newman's (1973) work that design within the built environment can influence crime levels. Some designs would encourage crime and others, if designed appropriately, would discourage crime. This concept is also reflected in Fussell's (1991) desire to build his body. Fussell saw his body as weak, and vulnerable. Importantly, Fussell believed that his would-be attackers also saw these shortcomings. He represented an easy target to assailants and presented no physical challenge. In this sense he lacked the specific symbols of rank and power (Goffman, 1959) that would discourage attack. Within an encounter the body can represent a real and symbolic barrier to both encourage and ward off crime. In Newman's (1973) concept this is a clear demarcation of public and private space that can imply a boundary beyond which intruders may be reluctant to step. The body can be a flesh and blood boundary that can restrict interaction, cause fear and prevent attack.

The motivations for the purposeful augmentation of a muscular physique, as far as Fussell (1991) is concerned, were to deter attackers and ensure his personal safety. In effect, the muscles and the visible strength of the trained body very much symbolise the walled territory of the safer community. The idea that a larger physique makes a person less assailable is a potent one. Simultaneously, the larger physique, for the observer, can represent a better-equipped attacker and therein, be a major factor in causing fear.

Here, it can be reflected that there is the possibility of competing motivational aims as far as the body is concerned – both involving a symbolic navigation of fear. Whether the motivation for building a muscular frame is defensive or offensive, there is an inherent ability to influence the expectations of others within an interaction (Goffman, 1959). On the one hand, the body is a tool for defence. It can be constructed as a formidable target and one that should be avoided. Much like Newman's (1973) defensible space, a defensible body can have a similar impact. Under these circumstances, warding off would-be attackers as well as instilling fear in others achieves the same end. That is to say, they have avoided conflict and an impression was created which suggested that an attack would be unwise.

In light of the above, it is important to explore the origins and motivations of the gym-goers to engage in the process of building their physique. Jam, a 28-year-old gym goer, reflected on a number of encounters during which he has personally felt fearful. It was the resulting motivation for improving his physical strength that led to an increased awareness of the role of the body in managing fear (both his and that of others) within interactions. Jam did not reflect on defencelessness per se, like Fussell (1991) did. Instead, Jam was confronted with a situation where his ability to physically impose his presence on a situation was tested and he was faced with a realisation that, in certain contexts, there are limits to his ability to protect people whom he believed required his protection. Here, Jam's fear reflected a more altruistic or vicarious fear (Snedker, 2006) than was experienced by Fussell (1991). In other words, his fear in this situation was focused on the defencelessness of others and his worry for them rather than a fear for his direct personal safety. It was importantly combined with his apparent inability to impact on the situation physically, which ultimately links back to his motivations. Jam's situation refers to an experience when he was on a train with his partner and he felt threatened by a large group of football supporters:

"I think I was fearful because perhaps being in a position where I felt that I couldn't protect my partner. I wasn't able to do my job as her protector. I felt weaker, less of a man in that instance."

Here there is a sense that Jam felt emasculated within his relationship and within his own perception of the gender role he wanted to be able to perform. Valentine (1992) suggests that the social construction of masculinity has defined the male partner as a potential protector. This was a role that Jam clearly felt he should play but was unable to play here. Yet, in not being able to ward off a large group of football fans he was also not in a position to demonstrate his role as a potential threat (Valentine, 1992). He was not able to cause any fear within the members of the group and his fear for his partner and his lack of capacity to protect her were his chief concerns. Here, Jam's body was not one that was able to impose physically on the situation. He perceived weakness within his personal appearance as a result.

Jam identified that there was a motivational link between the concept of being able to protect others, of being able to defend himself and his decision to go to the gym and become stronger and bigger. In others words, he had made a link between feelings of vulnerability, fear and the body. Jam reiterated the concept of his gender role alongside these feelings and motivations when describing situations in which he had been an object of fear. He also, importantly, expressed the reasons he had identified the presence of this fear and in doing so reaffirmed the link between fear and the body:

“People react differently to me now that I am a man. Now that I am bigger.”

Jam expounded on his experiences of being ‘bigger’ as he saw it. Jam described a more nuanced experience than might have been evident at first glance. Whilst he acknowledged being treated differently as a man than as a boy, it was not a static identification for him and the identifications are directly related to the body and others’ reaction to it. He strongly felt the way others reacted to him was dictated by his physical size at the point of the encounter rather than an ongoing age-related process:

“I am treated differently (when bigger). Massively. I have noticed because in the last year or so, 8 months, I’ve actually focused on slimming down. When I was bigger I found that a lot of people, a lot of guys as well, gave you a lot of respect for being sizeable. I would say some feared it as well. Nowadays, it’s not so much and I get a bit more grief and lip. But like I said with those guys on the train, when I was a bit bigger I wouldn’t have taken it. I wouldn’t have had them anywhere near me.”

Jam’s assertion that he would not have countenanced the football supporters on the train had he been bigger is an interesting point. Here, Jam indicates that a larger physical size had a level of associated benefits. A generally less impeded existence is one example and being able to instil fear is another. Having a smaller physical size, within the train encounter, was both the cause for receiving more ‘grief’ and a reason for him lacking the confidence to confront the group of people on the train. He lacked the capacity to cause fear because of his lack of physical size.

However, Jam explained that this was not as simple as ‘bigger is better.’ The impact that a fear provoking body can have on those that observe it was a double-edged sword. At times it could be very helpful socially and at other points, a hindrance, as Jam explained:

“Being bigger is kind of like a deterrent. People worry about being hurt by you. There are advantages to it. At things like festivals and things like that when you want to get through a crowd. Some people wouldn’t want to let you through a crowd but then they’d turn around and see what I looked like and let me through. You see their eyes look you up and down. They see what I look like and then decide they don’t want to hold me up. They want to avoid a confrontation with me.”

The advantages in being able to pass unimpeded through a crowd are, as Jam later reflected, trivial. Yet, despite its triviality it was a frequent enough occurrence for it to be worthy of mention and, as some of Jam’s comments have indicated, this holds a noticeable social capital within his life. It is certainly noticeable enough for Jam to be able to identify its cause, its existence and its eventual absence. Key to this process was the way people reacted to his body. The eventual absence of social advantage within the train incident demonstrates, as far as Jam is concerned, that the motivation for maintaining a muscular body is a continual process. As Jam suggested it is a process that has both successes and failures. In each case he related this to his body, the reactions people had to it and, the subsequent affirmation of his motivation to build a muscular physique.

b) Instilling Fear: ‘I look like I can take care of myself’

For Frank, the appearance of his body was a part of interaction that often prefaced conversations he would have. This demonstrated that, beyond anything else about his person, his size was something that was noticed. It also carried an expectation or presumption about his personality and/or capacity for violence. As Frank explained:

“I always get little remarks. It doesn’t bother me but it shows that people notice the muscles. People are aware of it. Sometimes it just comes out, like when you bump into someone. They might say, ‘Oh! I wouldn’t want to meet you in a dark alleyway’, they

actually say that shit. Or something like, 'You don't want to piss Frank off, he'll tear you a new one.' Crap like that."

The body, especially the muscular body, for Frank is inextricably linked with a capacity for violence. Or, at the very least, an object around which to exercise caution. It is assumed, even in jest, that Frank's body is an object worthy of fear. Not only this, but it is given a status that precedes and guides social interaction to the extent that others may actively avoid confrontation. The body alone is capable of causing this and no further action is required from Frank to achieve it beyond his presence.

Jam looked upon the causes of fear differently. There appeared to be a number of areas that he felt were of significance when considering the reasons that people feared him. First, there is his age. A considerable amount of Jam's responses reflected on a transition from being a boy to a man and the way he tended to relate the differences between these seemingly separate existences within the dynamics of his interactions. There was a sense of 'before I was feared' and 'after I was feared' when articulating his transition from boy to man. His age came into his thoughts frequently when comparing the outcomes, feelings and motivations he had within various encounters.

Second, Jam identified physical size and this was, understandably, considered synonymously with age. Both were reflected upon and served to highlight Jam's own age/size transition during the process of getting older, growing bigger and, eventually training to get bigger still. Jam's personal confidence very much grew alongside his physical development and this was mirrored by the way he often verbalised his journey from boyhood to manhood and even a journey from causing no fear to the potential for causing fear frequently, and understanding his body's role in this process:

"When I was younger and that in a town centre and I'd be walking down to meet friends, I just never linked these things together. It just happened. It was only when I was older that I have been able to start understanding this, people's behaviours and their relationship to you and all that. It was after I grew into my later teens. Not when

I was young. When you start becoming a man and you start putting size on people start to become wary of you I guess.”

Third, Jam identified his race as a factor for causing fear in some situations. Though he intimated at people’s tendency to be judgemental (including references to his gender and size) he stopped short of explicitly stating that he believed people were racist. Rather, that his skin colour was uncommon and separated him from the norm. Jam was born in Nigeria and grew up in the UK. This was a point at which he considered that both men and women had an equal potential to be fearful of him. This was, as he saw it, a point at which his visible difference stood out against his peers and was an ever-present in his life and was not related to any sense of transition.

For Goffman (1959) physical size, age and gender are all important parts of understanding the role and status of an individual. Race is static or fixed over time whilst age has a linear and standardised progression. Physical size, even when taking into account the natural growing process is far more transitory and mobile (Goffman, 1959). This demonstrates the importance of the body within fearful encounters because it represents an element of appearance that is open to manipulation and change by the individual. For example, a person can decide that they want to go to the gym and increase the size of their muscles or their strength through a training regimen. Jam demonstrated that when navigating fearful encounters there were points in which he has played an accidental or incidental role in the causation of fear. There were also points at which he has purposefully sought to cause fear in others:

“I want people to be fearful of me in some situations, yeah, no doubt. In sport or in the gym or anywhere really, on the street, maybe not knowing what I can produce [in terms of physical violence] and stuff, what sort of thing I am capable of. It could be a lot of things. It would be an unknown factor, you know?”

The importance for Jam in attempting to provoke fear is that there is a specific and intended audience for these performances of fear provoking behaviour. For the gym-goers this was very much centred on the gym and the role physique has in the world outside of the gym:

“You want them to be fearful of your abilities, if someone is fearful of you then it improves your own confidence. It would be the same if you had a confrontation in the street.”

Jam spoke of how he would go about achieving this fear, if it was not immediately obvious to him that there was an existing wariness:

“Just with, you know, eye contact, just sort of, starring at them. You know, just being quite dominant, strut, walk, confident walk, chest out, walking tall, being relaxed and things. I have just noticed that that makes people fearful. It has worked in the past. People don’t really focus so much on what they are doing so they may try and get out of your way. So you know it works.”

This desire for situational dominance and an awareness of when it was working and when it was failing was not unique to Jam. Frank, a 35-year-old gym owner and competitive bodybuilder discussed his physique in relation to fear within the gym-specific environment. Frank used the term fear interchangeably alongside respect. This fear/respect was an important part of his gym experience. This was manifest in the way he treated others around him, especially those that he considered weaker or less worthy of respect, and in the way that others treated him. Frank related fear/respect to the degree to which he could prioritise his own workout at the expense of others and this took the form of using certain equipment for a long time without sharing; possessing a degree of authority regarding other’s use of equipment also came into it:

“I don’t like it when people drop the weights unnecessarily. I know they are intimidated by me because I will stare at them when they do it. They stop doing it then. They know I don’t like it.”

Frank suggested that he imposed his own standards of behaviour within the gym setting with various passive-aggressive techniques. This was not just a matter of maintenance of etiquette, however. Frank understood the specific role that his body played in obtaining this authority and was aware of it’s capital (Wacquant, 2004)

within the gym environment and took advantage of this. The reason for this authority was obvious to Frank:

“I am one of the strongest in here. People know that, they can see that. I think I can get away with more because of it. I have earned that respect. People, especially the new ones, are afraid of annoying me.”

Frank’s size and strength was a tool by which he could gain and maintain situational power. However, his awareness of a personal need for this fear/respect was most evident when he noticed it was not there:

“I am not sure whether it is fear or respect. Whatever it is it’s needed. I notice when people don’t have it and it annoys me. Really annoys me.”

There was, as far as Frank was concerned, a sense that this fear was earned and deserved and an absence of deference, or submission, towards him within this environment was a signal of disrespect. When others did not recognise the environment-specific capital that Frank believed he possessed, it impeded the flow of his work out and, more importantly, challenged the self-perception that Frank held. This held deeper social connotations for Frank:

“Fear in the gym is important. With the kind of people we get in here, if there weren’t some kind of authority we’d have problems. People would take advantage of you.”

This suggests that despite a tendency to describe fear as a necessary element of his gym experience, there is a relationship between Frank’s desire for fear/respect and a safer environment within which he can exercise. This is not an explicit defensive viewpoint per se, but nonetheless indicates a desire to avoid being taken advantage of. This forms, at the very least, part of the motivation for causing fear in others in the first place.

For both Jam and Frank there was little doubt that in certain situations they were able to cause fear in others. There was also little doubt that their bodies were a large part of what caused that fear. The performance aspects of the attempts to cause fear, in a

Goffmanian sense, became clearer when Jam explained what he thought his observers were afraid of:

“I can see it happen. They look at me and then they look at themselves. I am bigger. I am stronger. If push comes to shove I can overpower them. The might is right! [Laughs]. I don’t even have to do anything. They weigh it up and they figure they’ll lose. A little stare and a grunt can help things along. At the end of the day I am not going to do anything. They don’t know that.”

The appraisal of physical capability works in both directions. Jam would have to observe a weaker person to identify that he was stronger and vice versa. Jam ultimately perceives people to be afraid of his physique and the potential violence that he may be capable of. The suggested aggression and the intimated potential for violence are key to this process. Success for Jam in such a scenario involves the observer playing the appropriate submissive role and coming to the conclusion, as Jam does, that he is the stronger and bigger of the two.

The fear elicited by Jam (with contributions from Frank), to this point, has focused on purposefully orchestrated fear by using the size and strength of the body as a catalyst. Jam identified drawbacks to this fear provoking body and all masculine associations. These drawbacks were far more impactful during particular interactions:

“There is a fear factor with women. You know, it’s when, you’d be walking through town and it would be dark and someone would walk on the other side of the road and things like that. I think a lot of big guys would experience that.”

The body that can ensure a safe passage whilst walking home at night by visibly providing a large and strong body, is the same body that can generate unwanted fear in other observers. The body that symbolically represents a flesh and blood version of defensible space, providing muscled barriers to ward off would-be attackers, is the same body that can typify an attacker for other observers. As Jam explained:

“There are loads of times when I have found that others are fearful of me...I was out on a Christmas do with my work colleagues. I was in a nightclub and I just went to

move past a female who must have been in her early 20s and I said to her, 'excuse me' and she leapt as if she had leapt out of her skin. She screamed at me and I felt, at first I felt like, 'wow, I'm really sorry', I mean, I thought to myself that she obviously couldn't see me because it is really dark in here. So initially I thought it was an accident but then I thought it might have been an issue that she had, that I was a big muscular guy, that I was a big black, you know? I don't understand why. I thought, 'hang on, why are you screaming? You can quite obviously see me. I'm big. I'm black. That's all. What is your problem?' It's just weird how that first thought – 'oh I'm sorry' and then I just thought, 'hang on.'"

In the immediate reaction and subsequent self-analysis it is evident that there is a conflict of interpretation for Jam. On the one hand, in the immediacy of the situation Jam was keen to assuage the fear of the screaming woman. In doing so, accepting that it was him and his presence that had caused this reaction and it was therefore his responsibility to alleviate these feelings. On the other hand, and on reflection, Jam felt that the reaction to his presence held connotations that did not sit comfortably with him and, as he saw it, intimated to potential actions that did not accord with his own interpretation of his behaviour or desires. Jam explained further:

"[There were] two aspects really, she may have been fearful of me but may have also wanted to have that behaviour seen. Because, you know, it is not rational behaviour to scream out of your skin when there are plenty of other people in the club, I mean, for a start there was deafening music and hundreds of people! What am I going to do? If I was intent on doing something, what was I going to do with loads of people there? It's just not rational. Sometimes they over react, just to get a response or reaction from you."

There are points at which Jam's perception of his body and other's reaction to it can seem at odds. When he is performing before a particular audience (usually other males in the street or gym) he is happy to adopt an assumption that his body and/or his strength are causing, at the very least, wariness and in some cases fear. In other instances, when the fear he notices in others is out of his control and is incidental or accidental there is belief that the reaction is either disingenuous or irrational. It suggests that the observer will derive a meaning within the interactions they have

regardless of the degree to which Jam believes himself to be in control of the encounter and the fear within. This is an important point. It highlights the importance of the body as a symbol of threat in and of itself beyond the control and influence of the individual and regardless of the behaviours they adopt.

A degree of discomfort with accidentally being feared was shared amongst the gym goers within situations similar to that experienced by Jam. For Frank, the presence of fear in interactions outside of the very specific gym environment have been a hindrance to his life and, as he lamented, the lives of his children. Frank reflected on the moments when he believed fear had been problematic for him. It was centred on the presence of fear that had manifested accidentally:

“My son and daughter’s friends are all scared of me. I don’t notice it but my kids tell me. I don’t try to scare them, you know, I don’t know what it could be. I mean, I have a shaved head, tattoos and my body shape. It could be that, but I don’t know. I am a stereotype I guess. That’s what it is. Shaved, tattoos and muscles. I suppose I am meant to be scary, right?”

Interestingly, when speaking of fear within a gym-based context, he referred to his size, muscularity or strength as a source of tension and fear. A fear that is desired and integral to his gym-based existence. Yet when talking about the origin of fear that was evident within his children’s friends he was initially very reluctant to attribute these feelings toward his body, much like Jam, he chose to centre on the fault of the observer. This underscores a previous point. For both Jam and Frank the body is a symbol of threat and a cause of fear regardless of the actions they take or the audience that observes it. The difference for Frank in being feared at the gym and being feared by his daughter’s friends is his social need for that fear to exist. In the gym it is a necessity for him. Within his family life it is a hindrance. Accepting that his body was the cause of fear in both scenarios was uncomfortable for Frank.

c) Beyond the Body? Adapting to the presence of fear

As with any encounter in which interpersonal fear exists, the presence of fear can be a desired response, an unwanted response, a usual occurrence or a very rare one as the

previous section attests. The ways in which people assign meaning to the reactions of others and the methods, behaviours and motivations they have prior to, during and after these scenarios is hugely varied.

For those that perceive that their body, or an unchangeable part of their physical appearance, is the cause of fear there are some very obvious areas in which they might be limited in comparison to those that are feared for more behavioural or operational reasons. For example, if a person of a heavily muscular build notices that someone is afraid of them and interprets this as a reaction to their appearance they are unable, within the moment of that encounter, to *appear* any differently. As Goffman (1959) suggests, appearance in this sense is something that a person takes with them wherever they go. Should they wish to alleviate this body-induced fear, they are simply not in a position to appear less muscular, for example. The same can be said for those that perceive the origin of fear to be down to their gender, their age or their ethnicity. Despite some concerns regarding the authenticity of the fear within the nightclub scenario and its wider connotations as far as he was concerned, Jam did actively engage in trying to alleviate the fear for the young screaming woman. He did so, however, with reservations:

“The worst part for me afterwards was that I did apologise to her and I did try to, sort of, put her at ease. But then I just thought, ‘why should I?’ So after that I just didn’t bother. Because, you know, I was quite disgusted at her behaviour. But you always adapt and you know, try and put people at ease. It is just in my personality to do it.”

The concept of adapting behaviour for Jam did not end there. He described his personal tendency for needing to put people at ease and how he went about doing this. Importantly, for Jam, this involved breaking down the visual barrier of the body, of his race and engaging on a more focused level:

“[I put people at ease by] talking to them. I find that generally that’s good, you try and talk about things that they might be interested in, ask them about themselves, tell them a little about myself if they ask, tell them what I do and they’d be like ‘wow, oh OK, you are not a drug dealer or whatever they think black people are.’ So it is a portrayal. An expectation they hold.”

However, this willingness to engage can have drawbacks, not in terms of maintaining fear but in that certain barriers are broken and certain taboos are transgressed that maintains Jam's self-assigned status as a 'racial outsider':

"Some of the people I work with now have that mentality because they have not come into that much contact with black or ethnic people. A guy lived in [a town in the South of England] and you know he has just lived there, and he comes out with all these comments and he thinks it's OK to say the "N" word and that doesn't even come out of my mouth. So, I speak up. I have the confidence to speak to them and say."

Despite Jam's confidence in being able to speak up when there are situations that are obviously uncomfortable for him these situations are a point of frustration. He describes a day in which there were two encounters in which he felt that he had been the object of fear:

"It's not really frequent, but there is like, fear, when, especially now that I am in a new place. I've moved to [a different region of the country]. I was just walking to meet the guys at work, at a curry house in the village, just walking, and there was a woman, she was with her dog, and she just crossed the road, it seemed, so that she didn't have to walk on the pavement with me and didn't want to make eye contact. Also, I was walking along a bridge, on the footpath, and there were two girls and as they saw me, they went in the opposite direction as soon as they saw me. And this was in broad daylight. That is two examples from the same day!"

Jam did offer a suggestion as to why he thought this fear was present but he stopped short of being certain about his opinion:

"I just think, perhaps, that they don't come into contact with, like, you know, people of a different ethnic background and stuff. I think that until, I get it a lot of times, because until I talk, people are quite fearful. It's strange."

Despite this, Jam was clear on the way that he felt in the moments immediately following these encounters and, indeed, what the longer-term impact of experiencing being feared is for him:

“At first I thought, ‘oh my goodness, what is wrong with these people?’ you know. ‘What is the issue? I don’t know what the issue is! Why are you scared? Why are you crossing the road?’ but then I thought ‘pft, that is the way of the world. That is the way the world is. I can’t do anything about it.’”

Crucially for Jam, within his own life he has been able to identify the ways in which he is effectively able to alleviate the fear he perceives in people. This does not reduce his frustration at being identified as a threat or, as he sees it, being identified as the ‘black other’ within a new setting but he was explicitly aware that he has the potential to refocus an interaction away from the potentially awkward or threatening ‘otherness’ of his size or race and onto something totally different:

“Well, as soon as, people always comment, as soon as I speak they are like “wow, very English” and it is something instantly they identify with and it instantly stops me being something they would be fearful of. Suddenly I’m not this scary muscular person and they can perhaps rationalise with me or something like that.”

For Jam, there is a degree of inevitability about being feared. Equally, he has an understanding of the methods he has at his disposal to alleviate such fears and the assumption that he makes of those he comes into contact with and, in turn, the assumptions they make of him. Jam identified that there was a common trend within the people that were fearful of him:

“Well, um, they were all white people, for example. Some were old, but generally women.”

This impression very much conforms to an expectation of fearfulness within society and one that Jam recognises within his own experience (Pain, 2001). It also underlined his self-identified position as the ‘other’ within many of the interactions he has. This was remarked on again with disappointment at the surprise that some of the

people that he has verbally interacted with display when they specifically remark on how English he sounds. Jam indicated that within every interaction he has, whether at work or with different groups of friends, needed to adapt and put people at ease. It seemed a well-practiced part of his life:

“For me, it’s just something that happens. I don’t really make an issue out of it, you know? It’s just like, I am in a position where, with my job, I always have a, sort of without knowing about it and without, like, conscious realisation, I have always naturally put people at ease. I think that is one of the things I adopt, the way I speak, the things I talk about, the jokes and things like that. Because sometimes I joke about things that, perhaps I don’t want to joke about but I do it, you know, so unconsciously, to put people at ease, so that they feel they can communicate with me.”

A deliberate process of adaption of behaviour, or deliberately attempting to break down barriers of visual appearance was an important part of Jam’s interactions. This is both in the form of identifying or perceiving a barrier and the need to act upon those perceptions. At times these barriers were observed in the reactions of others and at other times they can be expected or anticipated. He explained:

“Of course I adapt my behaviour. I feel like I have to do that. Otherwise, I’d become, and I am still that sort of person, I am ‘the big black person.’ That’s the thing. People sometimes don’t seem to be able to see past that, I am ‘the black person.’ I have a special smile for when I think that sort of thing is coming. I call it my ‘white people smile.’ It’s as non-threatening as I can get.”

Jam’s reactions to situations of this nature and his desire to adapt could be interpreted as an attempt to dispel the confrontation tension/fear barrier within interactions (Collins, 2008) at the earliest possible point. Frank’s reaction to the prospect of adaptive behaviour was very different to Jam. Frank accepted that his manner at the gym was very different to his home life, but he would not countenance adapting his behaviour to alleviate the concerns or fears of others. Even though he had been uncomfortable at the thought of his son’s and daughter’s friends being scared. He was unequivocal and blunt:

*“Adapt my behaviour? F**k off. I knew what I was getting into when I started training. I have to accept every other twat walking about so they can twitch at the sight of me all they want.”*

Jam’s sense of otherness was profound and was centred more on his race than his gender or body size. This perception links with other elements of ‘appearance’ outlined by Goffman (1959). Each of these elements of the person serves to impart information about the individual’s social status and can govern the expectations of others. It was clear that in many situations these elements of Jam’s external appearance were inseparable. In other words, Jam believed there was a link between perception of his body (and reactions to it) with race and gender in line with Goffman’s (1959) presentation of self. Whether putting people at ease during an interaction or making them afraid from afar, the necessity for adapting is something that does not sit comfortably with Jam. For him it is clear that the body and all the inherent gender and race and aging features, whilst being identified as a tool for gaining confidence and epitomising a transition from boy to man, was more often an obstacle to be overcome during everyday interactions. These obstacles were a source of frustration:

“I don’t think it is fair. I don’t think I should [have to adapt], it’s not a problem for me because I have done it all of my life. However, I don’t think I should have to. But what I do get, and I understand now, other black people go through the same thing as me but they don’t adapt as well.”

However, this sense of unfairness was tempered, or even contradicted, by a sense that his ability to adapt has been an advantage to him when he compares it to colleagues or friends of a similar background:

“There are people [at my place of work] that struggle in the job because they are black and they don’t adapt the same way as me, they don’t have the change of accent, they are not able to blend so much into the traditions, the British ways in the same way that I do and they don’t understand, you know, people generally don’t think a lot of them, because they don’t speak English as well, that they are not as clever. They

get frustrated and get aggressive because they are not understood. People will avoid working with them.”

Jam separates himself from colleagues from a similar background because of his ability to adapt to situations in which he noticed fear as well as a more general ability to communicate clearly. He was critical of those that were unwilling or unable to adapt. Jam’s suggestion here is an important one for understanding the experience of being feared. The actions of others can impact upon the perception others have of him. That can be in a work environment or in a wider context. If people associate those with similar physical characteristics to be aggressive, then this is an expectation they will have of any interaction with a person of that kind. Goffman (1959) suggests ‘appearance’ has the capacity to portray to the audience the performer’s social status or role, informal recreation, or a formal social activity. This has both positive and negative implications within the experience of being feared. When fear is desired, fearful interactional expectations are favourable. When fear is not desired, it is unfavourable and can be an obstruction.

This realisation brings together an important point that can help to understand how being feared is related to the body and how the body as defensible space can be used and misunderstood. Above, Jam laments at the ability of friends to adequately adapt to situations where they are misunderstood and can create fear as a result. Due to Jam’s ability to adapt his behaviour and his tendency to put people at ease, whether he feels he should do so or not, he is able to overcome the symbolic barrier of his physique and navigate his way through different encounters. He is able to manage the expectations of others and in doing so, manage fear within those encounters. Those people unable to adapt, the symbolism of their muscular bodies and all of the possible connotations that come along with that, become real barriers within interaction and can cause confusion, frustration and fear.

Conclusion

This distils the relationship with the body and being feared quite succinctly. Fearful encounters experienced by those with a gym-going body or a muscular physique represent a balancing act between causing fear within a selected and appropriate

audience and alleviating fear within an audience whose fear is accidental or unintentionally generated. This balancing act is played out, as far as Jam was concerned, within the context of his own personal fears and desires to be able to protect others and to pass through life feeling less personally threatened. In this sense the people he would like to cause fear in are exactly the kind of person that he is trying to develop himself away from. When the symbolic element of the muscular physique is misunderstood, Jam employs adaptive behavioural techniques in order to alleviate the fear of others. Jam, without being aware of it, recognises that the performative elements of any encounter can be understood and managed in different ways (Goffman, 1959). Both Jam and Frank are aware that their ‘appearance’ and ‘manner’ are highly communicative within encounters. Often these communications can be managed to achieve a desired outcome or response. This includes being feared. It is also true that at other times, the fear generated within an encounter as a result of their bodies is unmanageable and beyond their control. This Chapter has moved towards an understanding of the experience of being feared within the specific context of the body. In order to do that effectively there needs to be a way of understanding how these experiences are controlled and understood. This is true of how the situations are controlled within an encounter but also the motivation to build the body in the first instance. The body represents a symbolic barrier in the management of interpersonal fear. The body is both a weapon and a shield in the process of managing fear. Those people that are aware that their body causes a fearful reaction navigate this within many encounters and many different situations. The body is both help and hindrance in managing the experience of being feared. There are audiences whose fear can be managed or manipulated by the gym-goers. They can intimidate, coerce and console depending on the circumstances. There are also audiences whose fear is beyond their control. The experience of being feared for the gym-goers is a balancing act – but it is an act that is always prefaced by the connotations derived by others of their appearance.

Chapter 9) Students and Young People: Being Feared in Everyday Life

Students and young people are an important group for understanding the experience of being feared. Much in the same way that fear of crime research has identified those that are most afraid, it is also clear who is most feared. Men, as might be expected, are overwhelmingly more feared than women (Day, 2009). Young people, particularly young men and ethnic minority men, are also considered to be the objects of fear. Findings in this regard are dependant on neighbourhood composition but there are a number of studies which suggests if an experience of being feared is to be understood, a consideration of young people is essential (see Day, 2009; Chiricos *et al*, 1997; Mahoney, 1995; St John and Heald-Moore, 1995; Taylor and Covington, 1993). The reasons posited for this fear within the research are various. What was important for this research in particular, was that the group was readily identified as a source from which an experience of being feared could be expressed. In consideration of existing research, it was considered that the experience of being feared was likely within this group of people. Of particular interest is the physical, mental and social transition that these young people and students have experienced/are experiencing.

This Chapter will look at the awareness young people and students have of fear in their everyday lives and how this fear informs them of their place in the world. This will include an understanding of the things they fear as well as the reasons they believe themselves to be feared. The Chapter will also consider areas in which the students and young people learn to adapt to changing perceptions and changing reactions to their presence. This will initially focus on situations in which the students and young people have accidentally caused fear and then move towards situations of more purposefully elicited fear. The Chapter as a whole emphasises the way in which the students and young people experience a process of transition and evolution with regards to fear. The process involves an increasing awareness of fear and it's possible causes and the eventual management of fear within encounters. For some it is a management away from fear. For others this is a management of fear for advantage. The Chapter also tracks the process by which the students and young people are aware of, and interpret suspicion from the people they encounter. This informs us as how suspicion and fear are related and appear part of a continuum of understanding.

There are 10 contributors within this Chapter. They are a mixture of male and female voices and range between the ages of 16 and 23. The students are all in formal education, ranging from GCSEs to university level study. The young people are no longer in formal education and are either working or unemployed.

Lebron is 18, black and studying law at university. He describes his home neighbourhood as 'rough' and suggested he had to grow up fast in order to stay safe. Going to university was rare from his neighbourhood.

Spiderman is 16, black and about to sit his GCSE exams. His family place a great deal of value on politeness and his experiences of being feared are a source of confusion for him.

Sophie is 16, white and about to sit her GCSE exams. She has noticed that the way people react to her presence has changed a lot over the last 2 years. She comes from a large city and lives in a 'safe area' which borders a 'rough neighbourhood.'

Shelley is 20, black and about to enter her last year of university study. She describes herself as a nice person but that she has a tendency to be aggressive. She finds it hard to relate to other students on her course.

Lola is 17, black and looking forward to going to university after her A-levels. She has experienced being fearful and being feared but does not believe it to be a significant part of her life.

Judge Jaffa is 18, black and studying law at university. He has experienced fear growing up around gang culture and has used fear to his advantage when committing crimes.

Max Powers is 23, Asian and is very aware of people fearing him. He has developed an understanding of the different ways in which he can try to alleviate the fear of others.

Tyrone is 20, black and is informally training as a barber. He did not complete his formal education. In the past he has used fear to control others when committing crimes. He has been involved in muggings and drug dealing.

Joseph is 17, white and an A-level student. He has experienced an increase in fear and distrust, as he has got older. He believes that age is a key component to the way he is treated by others.

Robert is 16, white and is an A-level student with Joseph. They both share similar views on how people respond to them and are good friends. They both want to go on to university education after A-levels.

a) Finding their Place in the World

An Awareness of Fear at a Young Age

The students and young people group showed an awareness of fear from a number of different social, educational and racial perspectives. This was reflected in the way they articulated and interpreted their own experiences of being feared within encounters and their own personal fears. As already stated, this group of people ranged from 16 to 23 years of age. It was very clear that their awareness of interpersonal fear was initially formed at a young age and continually developed over time. Much like the experiences of Agent X in the gym goer's Chapter, the students and young people equated their experiences of being feared with a transitional process. Often this process involved a transition from being the subject of fearful encounters, through a period of learning and adaptation and ultimately to an understanding of their place in the world, how people react to them and the role that fear plays within these reactions. Inherent in this transitional process is the growth in social understanding and sensitivity to the world around them. Perhaps more important, though, is the inevitable impact that growing older will have physically and emotionally on this group. They go from an essentially non-threatening (and seldom threatened) child and become, over a number of years, an adolescent and eventually a young adult. During this time their awareness of fear grows alongside

their understanding of the role they play in its presence. Within the group, fear is often related to age and the process of growing older amongst the contributors within this Chapter. Here, the students and young people also grow to recognise that they are viewed with suspicion. Their ability to understand the reason for the existence of suspicion and how this develops further into fear is also important. This is because understanding their place in the world is a developmental process, which is linked to various stereotypes and expectations of behaviour (Goffman, 1959). There is also a growing awareness, for some, of their ethnicity and the expectations others may have of their behaviour in connection with their ethnicity. This is true of both the personal fears that the students and young people have but also of their increasing awareness of a need to adapt to their newly acquired status as young people and students. Young people and students have an apparent and newfound ability to simultaneously be objects of fear and fearful for their own safety.

Inherent in a growing awareness of fear, is an understanding of the dynamics of interaction and the shifting sands of interpersonal encounters. Learning and experiencing the consequences of fear and being feared must be explored in the positive and the negative sense. Max Powers, a 23-year-old student, had suggested that his personal awareness of fear was initially shaped by experiences at school:

“I was picked on a lot at school for race reasons. I can’t really blame anyone. We were so young; you don’t really know what you are saying. It happened all the way through to my late teens. It happened when I was isolated. They got around it because they were always in my lessons. I was the whipping boy of the group. I had accepted this as normal. Living in fear was normal.”

For Max, the important point for him was being able to identify the reasons he was picked on, as far as he was able to understand it. It was a learning process and he was able to absorb the behavioural cues and develop an understanding of the causes and consequences of fear in that social environment. In addition, he also learnt the impact of isolation in the instances of bullying. Much as Collins (2009) suggests, instances of violence and aggression are most likely to occur when there is an overwhelming imbalance of strength within an encounter:

“My behaviour changed when I was getting hassle. I wouldn’t communicate. My friendship group was very small and I actually hung out with people that were more vulnerable than me. It was a purposeful selection at the time. If the bullies could find something in me they would definitely find something in them.”

Max’s learning process included an identification of those that were in a similar or worse position than he. This was perhaps a more astute understanding of the dynamics of interaction than it may appear at first. Max’s experiences of fear were not static. They developed over time. This development was synonymous with age, size, strength and a developing social standing:

“[As I grew older] I realised, ‘wait a minute, I am stronger than these people.’ I got into a few fights and really beat some of the bullies up. Never had trouble since then. I had to take that step. I was scared to take that step. I used violence to counteract violence. For years I would get randomly punched and pushed. I would just take it. This one time I turned. I’m glad I did it. It was all because of my race.”

From a Goffmanian standpoint, Max’s presentation of self was able to change in significant areas. He grew and he became stronger. He realised that this posed a far harder target for those that would desire to physically hurt him. His social standing within his school environment grew as he found sport and other social activities to develop his social circle. These characteristics, these vehicles for conveying the signs and intensions of the individual, are relatively transitory. They can, particularly where young people and students are concerned, vary widely over time. However, the source he identified for his victimisation was his race. This element of his ‘personal front’ (Goffman, 1959) is fixed over this time and does not vary for the individual from situation to situation.

“The problem was, as soon as I realised these guys couldn’t stand up to me anymore I became like them. I would pick on others. I didn’t do anything physical. Just verbal stuff. I was just glad it wasn’t me anymore. It was only when I looked back I could see what was happening. I grew in confidence. I also realised I could verbally outsmart them. I was too big now and they couldn’t punch me anymore. It was just a verbal battle and I was smarter than them. School was ruthless. Kids can be arseholes.”

Max's transition included an awareness of what caused fear and how to go about eliciting this response from others. Max went from a fearful person to being feared and in doing so became aware of what made people afraid. In relation to Max Powers' situation, his increased physical size and his increased confidence served to reduce his vulnerability and his fear. Collins (2008) would suggest that Max's increase in physical size would present a harder obstacle to overcome and reduce the tendency for assailants to attack. However, it did not remove the motives his assailants possessed regarding his race. Max's chosen methods of managing fearful experiences, both accidental and purposefully elicited fear, are directly related to the awareness of fear developed from school.

The growing awareness of fear was shared with many of the students and young people within the group. The concept of a transitioning or changing sense of the dynamics of fear was also shared. However, there were some differences in how this process occurred. Judge Jaffa, an 18-year-old student, suggested his initial awareness of fear was a more generic fear of authority:

“The older I got the more afraid of authority I was. I feared men the most. I think this was because I didn't have a male presence in my life. It was just me and my mum growing up.”

This fear of authority was initially based around his experiences at school. Teachers and other authority figures were all important to Judge Jaffa's understanding that men are objects of fear. As his age increased he was exposed to authority figures of a different and less formal kind:

“When I was young I was fearful of gangs and gang culture. I was in a bubble at that age where I thought everything around me was nice. The older I got the more I realised it wasn't. The gangs had control and if you were younger you needed to be careful.”

Judge Jaffa's awareness of interpersonal fear remains focused on a fear of men or older boys. This informal authority was gained through the use of fear and violence.

Judge Jaffa's awareness of fear grew from a generic fear of authority to a specific fear of situational power. As Judge Jaffa suggested:

"I was on the wrong end of muggings when I was a kid. I've been mugged a few times. I've been held at knife point and stuff like that."

Here Judge Jaffa's transition appears to have moved a long way from experiencing fear of formal authority to experiencing criminal victimisation. For Judge Jaffa, fear has been a big part of his life. However, it is a part of his life that, upon reflection, he considers to be outside of the norm. Judge Jaffa's familiarisation with fear in every day life has led him to certain conclusions:

"I see it as a parallel world to the real world [gangs and gang culture]. That is why I don't fear them anymore. They are not really bosses. They don't run anything real. They do not have real world respect. They might be feared but not respected."

Judge Jaffa's understanding of the fear he experienced as a victim of crime developed from a local or situational conception of power and control to a more expansive and wide-ranging view on life. This ability to see a *bigger picture* was the catalyst for becoming less fearful:

"As I got older and I knew I wanted to go to University I saw a world outside of their world. These people were after phones and iPods. I am after a law degree."

However, an ambition to study law and an ability to see beyond an immediate social climate is not necessarily enough to assuage these feelings of fear and the resulting insecurity. Judge Jaffa's transition away from a fearful person required more:

"I was afraid at first but I just adapted. If you are not a certain way, I mean look a certain way, you will get it. You have to act and behave in a certain way."

This is an important point in Judge Jaffa's awareness of fear. By suggesting 'a certain way' in both look and behaviour he is aware of the mannerisms and the appearance of those that cause fear. He articulated his ability to assimilate into this local cultural

identity. By doing so he was able to avoid being mugged. However, by associating with this ‘certain way’, however tentatively and however sincerely, he is adopting the behaviours that can cause fear in others. He was becoming the figure of authority to which he had been fearful as a younger person. In doing so he was moving from a fearful individual to a feared individual. This was a process that Spiderman, a 16-year-old student, articulated succinctly:

“When I was younger I used to be scared of this big group of boys. They were older than us and bigger than us. They would all come along and hang out. I always thought they were up to no good. They would all wear hoodies and baggy jeans, hoods up. But when I look back and then think about what my friends and me do and wear now, then we are the same. I am just hanging out with friends. Maybe I cause that fear now. Maybe it is just a misunderstanding all along?”

For Lola, a 17-year-old student, interpersonal fear was something that she was ignorant of to a large extent. The point at which her development and understanding of fear was most pronounced was when reflecting on past events with her peers:

“There was a time when I should have been really afraid but I just wasn’t. I was with my sister and we had just bought pizza for the whole family so we were carrying the boxes back home. A guy tried to mug us. He shouted for us to give him our purses and our phones. We looked at each other; both of us had our hands full with these pizza boxes so couldn’t reach for our stuff. We just started laughing. The guy shouted again. The more he shouted the more we laughed. I suppose he was trying to scare us.”

It was only when explaining the scenario to her mother and father that Lola realised the seriousness of her encounter. However, the lesson learnt from the encounter left an impression and echoes some of the elements of being feared that have already been shared within this research. Fear is often equated with control. The unexpected reaction from Lola and her sister rendered the assailant’s attempts to cause fear impotent within that encounter:

“It just wasn’t working. It was clear he had no other plan. He didn’t seem to want to hurt us so he just left! We got home and laughed for hours.”

For some of the students and young people there is a steady transition from a position of vulnerability to one of suspicion and, in some cases to being feared. Not everyone perceived themselves to have been vulnerable, however. For some, the experiences of fear were articulated from the perspective of being feared from the outset. In this regard they lacked a certain dimension of fear and this made it hard to empathise with those that are fearful. For Shelley, a 20-year-old student, this provided a sense of fearlessness and power within interactions with her peers but, as Shelley suggests, the presence of fear was a source of confusion:

“People have always been afraid of me as long as I can remember. When people at school were scared it made me laugh. I really didn’t understand why. It is easier when people are afraid of you though because they won’t cause a confrontation. I seem to have the ability to intimidate people.”

Shelley’s ability to intimidate does not appear to be a tool, which she has used for offensive purposes nor a tool that she has purposefully developed. Instead, it appears that the presence of fear has been useful as a defensive tool allowing her to avoid conflict or confrontation. However, this can depend heavily on her audience.

Shelley’s awareness of fear changes depending on the people she interacts with. In this sense, with her school colleagues fear is present any time she interacts with them. It is not something that requires effort and Shelley is aware of this. She attributes this to her physical strength as much as her personality. She has a muscular physique and stands at 5’9”. However, she went to school in an area some distance away from her home. In encounters near her home a different and more purposeful response is required from her if she is able to maintain control and this is also an element to the use of fear that Shelley is aware of:

“I am not scared of any girls in my area. We [Shelley and her group of friends] are a step above. We dress nice, we’re not ghetto. The other girls are just hood rats. The way you look and behave is important. People are afraid of me. I can just tell. They just seem like, they get shaky around me. Sometimes they get mouthy and when I get

going they'll just back off and apologise. I guess I am just an aggressive person. I just get in their face. I will push them away or push them to the floor."

Shelley's awareness of fear and its uses are not just situated in the mechanical and physical methods of causing fear. They are also present in the way she identifies the social differences and targets for this fear eliciting process. The presentation of self (Goffman, 1959) is important to Shelley. Setting (the local area), appearance (the clothing) and manner (behaviour) are all identified by Shelley as a way of separating herself socially from others. This does demonstrate a development in her awareness and use of fear. This includes her unwitting ability to understand and manipulate Collins' (2009) tension/fear barrier as introduced in Chapter 2. She recognised that the ability to cause fear in others was a mechanism through which violence could be avoided. Shelley's key personal transition, however, is from being feared to someone who is more accepted by peers and overcoming the fearsome perception:

"I realised that people just don't like me. It was weird. So more recently I have been calmer. I am hot headed. I know that. I am trying to be more considered. It is because people just don't like me. I don't want that feeling for no reason. If they've got a reason I don't mind. Being aggressive doesn't win you many friends. I got tired of people not talking to me."

Shelley's ability and a tendency to intimidate has been a barrier to her social life. She explained that her aggression had led to distrust from her peers and an ever-decreasing friendship group and resulted in her questioning the elements of her person that would cause such feelings in others. Questions of this nature suggest a desire for understanding the reasons why each of the students and young people believed they had become objects of fear.

Inherent in a process of transition is a point at which a person realises that there is a difference in the way they are being treated or reacted to in relation to fear. At which point they may question certain aspects of their interaction in order to understand or reflect upon the fact that a transition is occurring, what this process means and how to cope with it. For many of the people within this Chapter there has been an awareness that fear and their experiences of it have changed over time. This change is reflected

in the meaning that fear has within their interactions and the ways in which it impacts on their lives. It is for this reason that an understanding of why they are feared is important.

Being Feared: Why Me?

The possible reasons for being feared within the students and young people group are complex. They are growing physically and they are learning to understand their bodies, their age, their sexuality, their friendships, their cultures and their race. All of which can be understood to contribute to being feared. For some of the students and young people, the reflections of fearful experiences are articulated from within this process of learning and growing and are yet to be fully formed. Others are reflecting on past experiences and draw upon a more varied perspective. This is particularly true of the university students who have, by the nature of being older, experienced different environments. Ultimately, as far as the experience of being feared is concerned, there is a desire from the participants within the Chapter to understand what elements of their physical appearance, their personality or their manner causes people to fear them. For Max Powers, the reason he believes people fear him is the same reason he was picked on at school. For Max, the focus of his understanding is his appearance. In this sense the key experiences of fear are less about behaviour or manner and more about appearance, stereotyping and prejudice:

“I think people can be afraid of me. Being Asian has a lot to do with it. Having a beard as well, being tall. It never helps with all the negative media and all that jazz. I do think it is race, the main reason for part of it. I think people believe that the majority of muggings are either black guys or Asian guys. I don't know what the stats are.”

Importantly, this shows that Max Powers has moved from fearful to feared and is aware of the impact he can have on people. His confidence and his physical attributes have led him to understand his ability to intimidate. He also holds an expectation that concerns how others perceive him. He believes himself to be identified as a potential criminal in the eyes of others. Max's understanding of his potential criminal label, centre on his ethnic identity. Here there are similarities in what Ruddick (1996)

describes as the experiences of fear for ethnic minorities, suggesting that experiencing being feared “inscribes into the very bodies of people their understanding of themselves and their place in a racialised hierarchy” (Ruddick, 1996: 136). However, it is not everyone that Max Powers comes in contact with, that impose this perceived label:

“I find that Asian people are not afraid of me at all. I think white people would be more afraid. It annoys me to the point where I dislike Asian people. They try to live up to their stereotype. I think I get judged on a stereotype others inhabit, not me. I can’t break that visual barrier. I am in an odd situation where Asian people actually call me coco⁴. A lot of that is, according to them, I am trying to act white. I speak well, I’m educated, and I have a multicultural friendship group. I have always been able to get on with people.”

This does echo Day’s (2009) idea of ‘learning to be feared.’ Day (2009) suggests that some individuals learn to move between feared and safe identities. This means, the feared identity is present when they are amongst those who are racially different. The safe identity is when they are with their own racial group. However, Max’s understanding of his place in the landscape of fear appears more complicated than a binary conception of race and fear. There is a point at which he is unable to break the visual stereotype he perceives others to have of him. However, the imposition of this stereotype is not one he believes he inhabits nor is it one he wishes to be associated with. This leads to a lack of acceptance in a number of areas in his life, not least when he is identified as a coco. Max’s expectation that his appearance is problematic extends beyond fear:

“There are situations in which I have predicted fear and have avoided the situation. So when I have white girlfriends I avoid taking them home to my parents and I avoid going to theirs. It’s just because I think it would cause problems. It wouldn’t go down well. I think, I reflect on my own grandparents and they would be less accepting so I can see the same thing happening for them.”

⁴Max Powers defined this term, “It is short for coconut; someone who is brown on the outside and white on the inside. It is not a nice thing to be called.”

For Max the issue of his race and how he identifies with it is the source for much of the fear he perceives in others. The fear others have of Max does not, as he suggests, stem from a behaviour, gesture or manner. Instead the suggestion here is that it is from the meaning and possible criminal connotations that others might expect of his race. For Shelley the source of fear has not always been so clear to her. This has caused her a degree of social anxiety and allowed a negative opinion of herself to manifest over a period of time:

“When I go to certain places people seem to be unwilling to talk to me. So in order to make friends I have to make the first move. I have to break down the barriers by smiling. I have to do that at Uni and I have to do it at work as well. Just smile and be nice. I have to behave differently to start with. I have to be all nicey nicey.”

The barrier to interaction, as she understood it, was fear. Interestingly in the case of Shelley she was able to develop a strategy to cope with the fear of others before she had understood the reasons for its presence:

“I think being black has a lot to do with people being scared of me. I think people would be less intimidated if I wasn't black. But it could be the way I was brought up and carried myself as well. I think that is just as important. I think maybe if I was slightly smaller. I am strong. Most scrawny little white girls wouldn't say anything to me.”

Whilst Shelley's initial reaction was to identify her race as the predominant catalyst for fear there are other key elements to consider. Her appearance and her manner provide others with expectations, rightly or wrongly, of her behaviour (Goffman, 1959). Some of the elements of her visual appearance have been present for her entire life, such as her ethnic origins. Others have been present for a far shorter period of time, such as the way she dresses. Her physical strength, her size and the way in which she 'carries herself' are developed (and developing) over time.

In light of this, the reactions others have to her and the inherent meanings within fearful encounters also develop over time. Part of this development, much like Max's,

was to identify the type of people that were most likely to be afraid. For Shelley this seemed to focus on people that were smaller than her and white. Much in the same way that others may have expectations of her behaviour, she does of others. When these expectations are met, it is to the core causes for fear provoking that Shelley turns for her answers. Judge Jaffa, an 18-year-old student, also identifies race as a key element of being feared:

“Being black has a lot to do with being feared. I am light skinned so it is not so bad. If you want to look like a ‘bad man’ you can, you just adopt that style. When I am in my own area no one is scared of me. When I am outside of my area people can be scared of me for no reason. They don’t know the ins and outs of my situation or me. They just see a black guy in a hoody.”

Race was not a focal point for all of the contributors in the young people and students group as a cause of fear. Lebron, an 18 year-old black student, suggested that people were afraid of him if they were unable to relate to him. He suggested further that an inability to relate would lead people to make false assumptions about him as a person and their expectations of his behaviour or intentions within an encounter would be impacted. In identifying this he was able to predict the type of people that were unable to relate to him:

“It’s mostly middle class white people that show the fear. It’s people that aren’t like me. People that I don’t have that much in common with initially. I don’t think that race is such a big issue. Some make it out to be a big deal. I know black people that get along just fine. I think it is a background thing. If you come from a rough neighbourhood people assume that you are rough. A few people that are white and from my background have the same issues as me. People thought they were thugs. It is an attitude thing.”

Max’s experience of being feared is primarily centred on a racial explanation. However if this was entirely the case then it might have been noticed at an earlier age. As soon as others are able to identify him as racially different then fear would have been present. Max does suggest there are other factors to consider beyond his racial identity:

“I do think race is the main thing with fear. But it comes with age as well. When people look at a 10 year old Asian kid they don’t think he is going to rape them. When people look at a 20 year old Asian kid they may think differently. I think there may always be a lack of trust with people... but you get all the way to my Dad who’s 60 and nobody is going to worry about him.”

This suggests that being feared is something that can be transitioned into and eventually transitioned away from with the passing of time. Young people between the ages of 16-24 are the most likely to commit crime. With this in mind, experiencing fear when encountering people of this age range would be a common occurrence. Children are not often identified as possible criminals and thus would not be exposed to experiencing being feared in this way. It is along the same lines that older people are not seen as a physical threat nor are they likely to be committing crime at that age. The transition into being feared needs to be considered from both the experience of the feared individual and how they learn the responses of others and the meanings these responses have. Part of this process is learning how the expectations that others hold in relation to their potential to become a perpetrator is not static. It changes over time. For the young people and students it is perhaps within this age range that the fear of others is at a peak. Despite the potential for this peak in fear, this does not guarantee that the presence of fear is understood. For some, the reasons that others were fearful of them was not yet clear and was a source of frustration and confusion. As Sophie, a 16-year-old student, suggests:

“I have noticed more recently that people avoid me and my friends when we are in the park or walking down the road or whatever. There was a lady round the corner, an old lady that I used to say hello to when I came home from school. Now she doesn’t even look at me. It makes me really sad. I don’t think I have done anything wrong.”

Sophie is one of the youngest of the contributors within the group of young people and students. Her confusion could be emblematic of her age and her current position into her transition towards understanding the role of fear within encounters. Here Sophie equates the lack of eye contact as a possible fault of her behaviour rather than

a process of growing into and becoming a member of a stereotypically feared group of people. Lola also expressed similar feeling of confusion when she first addressed the question of why people feared her:

“It was really strange at first. It really hit home when I moved schools. I went to the high school and had a different uniform. As soon as I had that blue uniform on then people changed. I was a tall girl at a young age so I suppose that didn’t help. Eventually I came to expect certain reactions from people. ‘These people think I am this or that.’ It was confusing, yeah. But I just thought people were judgemental about my friends and me. At that age everyone is against you.”

Lola’s confusion was shared by a number of the people within the group. It is at this point that a distinction should be drawn between those that experience and recognise fear and those that experience and recognise distrust or suspicion in their presence. Many of the people within the group experienced or expressed moments at which they feel negative judgements are being made about them. This is related to a general feeling that they are not to be trusted and that their presence is the embodiment of potential criminality. This is not always identified as fear as Joseph, a 17-year-old student’s, scenario suggests:

“A friend and I once went into Marks and Spencer and wanted to buy some food. We looked up and there was a security guard there on his radio. We were like ‘oh dear, what is going to happen now?’ In the end we made our choice and walked over to the counter. By this point there were about 6 security guards, they followed us over to the counter. They asked us to turn out our pockets. It made us feel pretty uncomfortable. We just hurried and got out of there.”

It is scenarios similar to this one that reinforce the notion that, as a group, the students and young people are worthy of suspicion. Or, to put it another way, they experience fear, suspicion and distrust with such frequency that they come to accept and expect this to be the case. It is a role to which they become accustomed over time. It is a role to which the author is still aware he plays (even at the age of 33) when entering certain places of business. Robert, a 16-year-old student, was with Joseph during this experience and offered his explanation of why they were treated in this way:

“I think it is because we are young, you know? I mean people my age do all kinds of things. So I guess I am associated with that. He doesn't know that I am an A-level law student or that I have money to pay or anything, or what I am like, you know, he sees a teenager, and a teenager is a thief or a pest or something.”

It is the blanket association with criminality that is most disturbing to Robert. His age represents a visual barrier through which the substance of his person is unable to escape. The chief realisation from this experience was that he is not judged as an individual but as part of a ‘teen’ collective, which echoes findings from Day (2009). Others are not judging him for his values, his intellect or his individualism. Rather a generic association forms the expectations of behaviour that others have of him (Goffman, 1959).

The contributions within this section express the early experiences of being feared and distrusted in terms of two clearly delineated audiences. First is an audience of peers of whom they are aware of fear and either embrace the power or marvel at the apparent misjudgements of the behaviour of others. Second is an audience of elders or unfamiliar people. This appears to be a broad group of people comprising of anyone that happens to be outside of their immediate age range or acquaintance. It is the fear from this audience that the young people and students experience a world of ever-decreasing trust. It is also the de-individualised experiences of each of the people within this section that bring the experiences together as a collective. Some describe the fear or lack of fear by outlining key individual characteristics or behaviours. Yet it is the perception or realisation that they are placed into racialised, age or gender groups that is of importance to being feared. As soon as they are identified within one of these groups then the expectations others have of their actions and behaviour are set. It is within the complexities of these processes that the young people and students learn their place in the world.

b) Fear and Adaptations in Everyday Life

This section introduces the ways in which the students and young people group notice and articulate the changing reactions to them over the course of time. This forms part

of the process of transitioning from a fearful or un-feared person to a person who experiences being feared more frequently. There are reflections on the different ways they cope with the changing reactions to their presence and the strategies employed by each individual. A great deal of the fear experienced by the students and young people is fear that is unintentionally generated. It is the unintentional or accidental fear that this section will focus upon.

Changing People and Changing Reactions

This accidental fear has, over the course of time, become a cause for concern for some members of the group. The frequency with which some of the contributors have experienced being feared has allowed them to develop an awareness of the types of people they expect fear from. It has also informed them of the type of situations in which fear is likely to occur. Such knowledge and such expectations can be used and understood in various ways. For some the knowledge of their apparent fearsomeness makes social situations uncomfortable and leads them into associating solely with people from their own neighbourhood. For others, their expectations of fear have led to a more circumspect view on their place in society but, more importantly, a somewhat weary outlook on the judgemental way in which the people they encounter view them. Lebron typifies the weariness when encountering unwanted fear. He described scenarios and situations in which people had avoided eye contact in passing and instances in which his seemingly intimidating appearance was referred to by others in conversation.

Reactions of this nature were neither wanted nor earned as far as Lebron was able to articulate. This fear was present amongst his direct peers. The situation described by Lebron was one of judgements experienced at 6th form college. Lebron suggested that this was a source of stress and a certain amount of social isolation. Within this situation Lebron appears helpless against the judgements formed about him. His actions do not warrant this fear and he has not sought to create it nor augment it. That is to say, Lebron has not actively engaged in behaviour designed to elicit fear. However, his assessment of the reasons for causing fear reflected on elements of his appearance. These were standards of dress, which he was not prepared to alter despite his belief in the part they play in the reactions to him. Lebron's experience of being

feared was not an occurrence limited to his peers. There were other instances of unwanted fear:

“Sometimes when I am on buses and that [I experienced being feared]. A lady was struggling to get off. So I got up and tried to help her. Initially she panicked. I actually had to tell her to calm down and that I was there to help. She thought I was robbing her. She said thank you but also ‘do you understand why I was so scared?’ She was backing away from me. It made me think ‘why do I even bother?’ If people are just going to be afraid of me I won’t bother. So I don’t really try to help now. It’s easier that way.”

It is here where the weariness of misunderstood good intentions surfaces for Lebron. This was not the only scenario proffered with a similar outcome (see Chapter 10). It is not to the individual elements of Lebron’s appearance that are important to this section. Instead, Lebron’s experience of being feared has led to a change in behaviour. This change recognises the way in which he is perceived and he has taken steps to avoid similar scenarios at the expense of his obvious desire to help those in need. It is important to recognise that being feared is not an experience solely situated within a world of bravado, confidence and coercion. Despite Lebron’s articulations of confidence and a lack of fear even in some very dangerous situations, there is a sensitivity to the misjudgements of others that has left a lasting impression. This impression has led to a restriction of social movement and an unwillingness to engage with people. Lebron’s experiences and resulting actions are not unique amongst the voices within the students and young people group. Judge Jaffa articulates a very similar interpretation of the fear of others and the judgemental nature of their reactions to him:

“People are afraid of me with me just walking the streets. They’ll look at me and think I am a certain way. People won’t look me in the eyes. You can see the fear and the judgements. Like, I can’t just approach an adult. When I have you can see that they don’t think my approach is innocent. They think I am after them. That is even when I am on my own. When I am with a group of friends it’s even worse.”

Judge Jaffa appeared less bothered by the connotations inferred by the fear experienced by others. He was confident that he would be able to verbally communicate any intentions if needed. As a result of this he is perhaps less inclined to change his behaviour in such a drastic way as Lebron. He was very aware of the visual impact he can have. Similarly to Lebron, Judge Jaffa was aware of the changes certain elements of his daily dress can have on people's reactions to him:

"I don't really care if they fear me or not. Once I start talking they can understand my intentions. Although it does depend on what I am wearing and what accessories I have got. If I wasn't wearing my glasses people would fear me more. People attribute intelligence with wearing glasses. They see glasses and they think, 'he's OK.'"

Spiderman, a 16-year-old student, had a very similar experience to Lebron and Judge Jaffa. However, there is a difference within his reaction to this experience. Both Lebron and Judge Jaffa are older and, by their descriptions of fearful encounters, have had a wider range of experience to draw upon. This is relevant because Spiderman's reflection on his experience was a more positive one in spite of the type of encounter he described. This perhaps reflects the stage of fear transition that Spiderman is experiencing. It is also worth considering, regardless of any process of transition, that this individual reflects on these experiences differently and less personally than Lebron and Judge Jaffa despite the nature of the encounter:

"There was one man, he was really drunk, who just started shouting and swearing at me. 'Don't bloody come near me' and that. He then started to say racist things to me. He was mega drunk. So the whole thing was that he was laying (sic) on the floor, we were walking past and I just thought he needed help so I tried to help him up. 'You leave me alone you black bastard.' So he must have thought I wanted something. I think he was just a drunk asshole."

Spiderman was insistent that this experience would not stop him from assisting people in a similar predicament in the future. This was not the case with Lebron and Judge Jaffa. The experiences of fear they had and the ways in which they have been reacted to over a period of time has resulted in a degree of apathy towards the judgements of others within fleeting encounters. There was a degree of detachment to their

experiences, which appeared centred on the predictability of being feared. This predictability was based on an expectation they developed of the behaviour of others. There was also reluctance, shared by Lebron and Judge Jaffa, to continually engage in behaviour to assuage the fears of others. The concept of the feared person's apathy was not always shared. Max Powers, for example, empathised with those who experienced fear:

"I am really aware of the fear I can cause. There is always the prospect of fear late at night when you are coming home from town or university. I don't always dress smartly, I will be walking behind someone and I just gauge my distance. I always think to myself, if I saw me walking up behind me I would look twice or move out of the way."

There is a definite sense of impending fear within Max Powers' description yet his empathy allows him to adopt a coping strategy, which is absent from Lebron and Judge Jaffa. Much like Judge Jaffa and Lebron, Max is aware that elements about his dress and physique may cause fear. There are situations in which fear is definitely expected for Max Powers and efforts to reduce it are regularly employed:

"If I am behind someone I will make them aware that I am there. One thing I do is the good old-fashioned foot scrape. Just a couple of scrapes on the floor so they can hear. To them I hope it looks like I've just tripped or something. For me, I just want them to know that I mean them no harm and I am just trying to get past."

The empathy shown by Max Powers is an important element to the experience of being feared. From Max Powers' own experience of being fearful it is only logical to him that others would experience the same fear in a similar situation. To this extent he recognises that he is the object of fear within this encounter. However, for this particular scenario, it is not a specific element of his physique or manner causing this fear. Instead the fear is caused by the circumstances of the encounter. Max has been able to articulate situations in which *he* was the cause of fear and situations in which *his presence* was the cause of fear. In either case, Max makes an assessment of the likelihood of fear and makes changes and adaptations accordingly:

“I think it is necessary just because it makes me more comfortable. I don’t necessarily care about the person much. If it was me, I’d want to be aware that they are there. I don’t make any difference for gender or anything. I do it equally for men and women. I just want people to be aware of my presence.”

Changing one’s actions and reactions in fearful encounters is not just for alleviating fear. For some, the changing actions and reactions involve avoiding potential victimisation. The identification of changing reactions is not just for people who are afraid of them or suspicious of them. There are also people who may identify them as potential targets. Importantly for the young people and students group they are simultaneously the group most likely to commit crime and most likely to be victims of crime. In light of this, a number of individuals within the group were very aware that, alongside the fearful reactions others have of them, they are readily identifiable as potential targets for would-be muggers. Their experiences of change cover both sides of the fearful experience and a number of individuals within the group have confronted this double-edged sword. As Lebron explains:

“You had to be careful where you went. You know certain areas that certain people would be out at, at certain times. So you would literally plan your journey around that. This time don’t go there, this time don’t go here. You learnt due to past experience but if you live in an estate environment then you just learn these things.”

This is a reaction inspired by his awareness that his age and his social habits may draw the attention of others around him. When he was a much younger person he would not be out at the times when muggers would be operating. He would also be too young to be a potential victim. He would not possess any of the items they desired nor would he have any money. As a result of this he would appear to be a very unworthy target. The very fact that he became aware of the good and bad times to go to certain areas is demonstrative of both a change in him and a change in the way that others view him. Lebron’s identity as a viable target for victimisation was a turning point for him and his experiences of fear. This has come at the cost of being victimised but Lebron has developed particular coping mechanisms:

“I have made mistakes and I have been mugged because of it. I’ve lost my phone and got held at knifepoint. I gave it to them straight away. If you give them what they want then they go away. If you resist then you are in trouble. Once you have been in conflict a lot of times you get used to it. You are not as fearful. It’s all about how much you have experienced. If a guy moves up on me, I know what to do. I have been through it. I’m not afraid. If you are a kid that has not been through it you’ll be petrified.”

From his first experiences of mugging Lebron was able to form an understanding as to the reasons he was victimised and, the ways he could change and adapt to avoid any repetition of these experiences:

“It depends on your appearance. I was never part of a gang. If I dressed a certain way they would think I was lying if I said I wasn’t part of a gang. So if I was wearing a hoody or a cap then I look like a gang member. They would see the clothes and assume. You have to act confident. If they approach you, you have to seem like you are one of them.”

For Lebron there was a need to address the changing reaction others had of him in these situations. He had become assailable and was victimised as a result. His approach was not necessarily a lifestyle changing one but more one of visual assimilation. He was aware of various visual clues and ways of ‘carrying yourself’, which is much akin to Goffman’s (1959) manner and presentation of self. Alongside his knowledge of places to avoid and times to avoid them he also took it upon himself to be more immediately aggressive within interactions and appear a more difficult target. This was a reaction mirrored, almost exactly, by Judge Jaffa:

“When I got mugged I was upset and angry. I think more angry. It changed me. Next time they tried to do it I wasn’t having it. The next time you just need to act like you are one of them. Sometimes if you act like that they’ll think you are a challenge. Other times they will think you are just another brother out there. It’s not always aggression; I just had to behave like them. It’s how you react to certain circumstances and how you carry yourself wherever you go.”

This behavioural change adopted by both Lebron and by Judge Jaffa is important. They both adopted ways of acting, which appear in line with the type of people that are likely to mug them. They have sought to create or maintain the confrontation tension/fear barrier in order to avoid violence (Collins, 2009). At the same point, they have grown weary of the unwanted reactions of others to their presence that, rightly or wrongly, also identify them as potential assailants within encounters. One side of this purposeful change allows for a greater chance of avoiding victimisation. The other side of this change is the constant associations with criminality and, inevitably, a greater chance that they will be feared. Some of the people within students and young people group actively avoided any situations that involved people they feared and, for the most part, people that feared them. Spiderman was very clear about his own ways of avoiding potentially fear-evoking encounters:

“I have probably been the person that takes action to avoid people who cause me fear rather than the other way around. I see people that I know are into something dodgy and I will cross the street. I can do it in a way where they won’t notice or won’t know why. I can also get myself out of situation where people fear me. I just leave and then it’s better for me.”

For each of the individuals within the students and young people group the spectre of change or adaptation is never far away. This is true of their physical appearance, their social groups, their school/college/university and, importantly, their desire to manage fear. For some this need for change and adaptation within encounters weighs heavily on them. For Max Powers this was a particular point of frustration:

“I just feel like I shouldn’t have to change who I am to fit into the mould of what everyone expects. I don’t want to be afraid and I don’t want people to fear me unnecessarily. But I will not conform to what everyone expects.”

Judge Jaffa was also frustrated by the expectations of others and his desire to avoid being labelled. Mead (1934) suggests that the self is socially constructed and reconstructed through the interactions, which each person has with the community. For Judge Jaffa, the formation of his label can come from both those that seek to cause him harm and from those that fear him. Interestingly, his annoyance was more

focused towards his peers than anyone outside of his age and social group. This relates to the management of fear in the sense that, within his own peer group, he perhaps feels he has a greater capacity to manage the expectation others have of him:

“Because I am clever I got called a ‘sweet boy’. Because I am not gritty [tough, streetwise, possibly a gang member] because I am not out there stabbing people. They would always try and put me into a box but they couldn’t. While they are selling drugs I am studying. We are just in different worlds. Other people can’t see the different worlds. They see me and they see them and we are the same.”

For the members of the students and young people group there are a number of areas in which the management of fear needs to be given consideration by each individual. However, following this consideration there will always be a shortfall in one area or another. Engaging in efforts to appear less assailable (Fussell, 1991) will lead to false impressions for some observers. Coping or management strategies for fear have been articulated by a number of the contributors. Yet there are always limits to the effectiveness of these strategies as Lebron suggests:

“There will always be times when I unknowingly make someone afraid. To get rid of fear I just smile or nod and ask a question to get them to relax. Just something to make them feel at ease. Like, even if I know where the toilet is I will ask them and they relax. But if they are scared they are scared. Nothing I can really do.”

There are difficulties inherent in these coping strategies. For Lebron and for others there is an expectation that attempts to manage fear are as likely to fail, as they are to succeed. With each interaction and encounter come different difficulties, which need to be addressed. Lebron would need to be aware of the geographical areas he is in, aware of his own judgement of the individuals or people he is encountering and understanding the visual and social cues within the encounter. It is a difficult balance to strike. For some people they spend their time looking less assailable but other times when they don’t want to make a little old lady afraid. The more an individual attributes the fear of others to themselves the more they are able to understand the difficulties when breaking down the barriers of interaction.

The necessity for the employment of a coping or fear management strategy does not mean that the strategy is easily used or readily accepted. The impact of the potential failures to manage fear has wide-ranging social connotations, as Lebron explains:

“People tell me I have a ‘screw face.’ It means I look at people aggressively. Girls tell me I look aggressive. It worries me because if I want to get to know a girl I don’t want them to think I am going to do something else. I had to change. I had to re-evaluate how I was. I had to think about why people were so afraid.”

The problem Lebron faced was that identifying the aspects of his person that are the causes of fear is not a simple task. Different people he interacts with may have a different reason to fear him than he has experienced before. For this reason the ability to recognise and adapt to fear takes on ever more personal significance:

“It’s not one thing that does it. It could be my walk, my stance, and my posture. It could be what I am wearing. A lot of this can dictate how people react to me.”

The success or failure of a fear management strategy is also dependant on his ability to correctly recognise the existence of fear whilst simultaneously establishing the most effective way to alleviate that fear. In Goffmanian terms this would be the development of a dramaturgical awareness and understanding the reactions and meanings within every interaction. However, understanding and interpreting the meanings of interaction does not imply that these reactions can be controlled. Judge Jaffa indicated that managing fear was often futile:

“Sometimes you could do everything in your power to calm someone or whatever. It just won’t work. Some people are going to be scared no matter what.”

Herein lies the chief difficulty for many of the individuals within the students and young people group. Their ability to recognise their status as a possible criminal, as a victim of crime, as Good Samaritan, as potential boyfriend/girlfriend and so on, is subject to their ability to understand the meanings in the reactions of others. Even at points when these fearful reactions are understood there is often little chance, and sometimes little will, to impact any change within these fleeting encounters. Often the

fearful reactions to the students and young people can be misplaced, ill judged and hurtful to those whom experience it. However, there are situations in which fear of some kind would be very appropriate. For all of the accidentally generated fear, there are scenarios in which fear is welcomed and augmented for some individuals within the students and young people group.

Fear, Violence and an Awareness of Context

It would be wrong to assume that all fear experienced in relation to young people and students were unfounded. It is certainly true that amongst the individuals within this Chapter there is a large amount of accidental and misplaced fear. These experiences have been noted at length. However, some of these same voices have also used fear purposefully within interactions and the reasons and contexts in which they employ the use of fear are important. Having established the high levels of awareness young people and students have of fear and being feared, it is important to ascertain the ways in which fear is understood in a wider context. Fear can be a measure of social success to some people in some situations. It represents a reference to power and status that allows the feared person to enjoy unfettered passage through social situations and can assist in being able to avoid victimisation.

To others fear can be indicative of a less successful social life and can have a negative impact on the way they relate to others and the way others relate to them. Some people within the Chapter express a desire to be accepted and that fear is a barrier to the process of inclusion. In such cases being feared represented a move away from bullying or other forms of victimisation to a greater level of social power and control. There is a wide variety of engagement in, or experience of, violence within this group. Some from very low-level school yard encounters to more serious and violent encounters with knives and other weapons. This section will explore how the contexts in which use of violence and fear equates to social status and how some of the young people still use these tactics and how others have grown away from it. This will help to demonstrate the way that young people and student's understanding of fear and its uses can expand and develop over time. For Lebron, fear was something he was subjected to in the early part of his teenage life. The experience of being fearful for his safety and for his possessions was something he learnt to deal with:

“Most people will only rob you if they sense the fear in you. You had to be careful where you went. You know certain areas that certain people would be out at, at certain times. So you would literally plan your journey around that. This time don’t go there, this time don’t go here. You learnt due to past experience but if you live in an estate environment like I did then you just learn these things.”

The most important part of Lebron’s experience is the concept of learning and adaptation. He did not dwell on the behaviour of others but rather focused his attention on how he could learn to avoid any repetition of his experience:

“I felt defenceless. That situation played on my mind for some time afterwards. How did I get myself into that situation? What did I do differently? It sort of changed my behaviour. Sort of like a turning point. I became more aggressive after that.”

It was this change in behaviour that held the key for Lebron. He understood that fear played a large part in his victimisation and in order to combat this potential victimisation he needed to act. He decided to use implied violence as a tool for his defence:

“I would act in an aggressive manner. If someone came up to me I would square up to them straight away. No hesitation. After I experienced certain things I stopped being afraid. I just behave differently when I notice certain things. It would be another male of my age or around that [who would be attempting to mug him]. I can tell if they have that intent. It’s all how they communicate with you. How they dress, hood up and cap down. Trying to intimidate you. They will try and conceal their face to intimidate you.”

This tactic was not without problems. In some cases he was able to avoid potential victimisation. At other points he was drawn into conflicts, both verbal and physical, that may have been avoided. Lebron did identify the behaviours demonstrated by other that were indicative of potential attack. There is a striking similarity to those elements of himself that he believed caused accidental fear in others. So for Lebron, it is his awareness of the context of the encounter and his own role within each

encounter that can allow him to interpret the meanings and intensions of others. His awareness of the ways in which fear can be elicited go a long way to helping him understand these encounters.

In light of this it is important to ascertain what it is that can cause fear in others and how the students and young people understand this. Each of the individuals within the students and young people group expressed their own experiences of being fearful and they articulated reasons why they fear certain things and certain people. This awareness of fear allows them, in some cases, to use the knowledge gained from their own experiences and apply them to different contexts in which being feared is the desired outcome. However, there are some different interpretations of what it is that is most likely to cause fear in people. Judge Jaffa suggests that the way he dresses and ‘the look’ he has can have the effect of causing fear:

“If I was wearing dark clothing and baggy jeans, there is just a certain look that would cause fear. Like, if you wear a certain hat people would be like, ‘oh, that’s a Peckham hat.’ If you are wearing a certain coat you will see where someone is from. Clothes will also indicate status. ‘Oh, you’re wearing that coat? You think you are a bad man?’”

In saying this, Judge Jaffa situates his understanding of instilling fear within a very visual, appearance-based context. As Goffman (1959) would suggest there are certain appearances and ‘costumes’ that would cause the observer to develop an expectation of the wearer’s behaviour. In the case of being feared this is no different. As a number of voices within the students and young people group have asserted, certain looks can cause fear. Judge Jaffa expands upon the subtleties and layers of the type of fear caused here. First, there is a degree of local knowledge from which an observer can derive certain information. Particular types of clothing can signify the neighbourhood that someone comes from. This was a concept echoed by Lebron:

“Gangs have certain colours for different areas. Peckham is black and Brixton is green.”

Specific to the experiences of Lebron and Judge Jaffa, being identified with an area can cause fear for a knowing observer. A person who is aware of gang or area affiliation, someone who is outside of their normal area or someone who is a rival may recognise this clothing and be aware of its significance. Second, a person who observes someone wearing this clothing may be entirely ignorant of the specific geographical connotations of the clothing being worn. They may, however, have an impression as to the intentions of an individual through a generic impression of the behaviour they may expect from someone wearing such clothing. The situations described by Lebron and Judge Jaffa are from those of the knowing observer/wearer. Yet the capacity for this 'certain look' to illicit fear goes far beyond this and is applicable to a wider audience.

Goffman's (1959) presentation of self is of great use here, specifically the use of the term 'teams' can help to explain this important point. Goffman (1959) suggests that individuals do not act solely for themselves, but they also unite. Members of a team (in the situation highlighted here it can be a gang or group of friends) cooperate in enforcing a shared definition of a situation. This may be the informal control of a geographical space for a gang. It may be a set of shared values or interests for a group of friends.

In order to understand being feared one of the teams (the gang) is more active and has the major role in establishing fear within an encounter with a particular audience. This audience may be a passer-by, a rival gang member or simply someone from another neighbourhood. The performers try to make an impression upon the observers in an attempt to elicit fear. The identification and authority of gangs is informal and the specific elements that signify gang membership may not be universally understood. The gang members will maintain certain informal standards and claim to embody certain values, which can be appreciated by a knowing audience.

However, as discussed above, the fear within situations such as this can be manifest regardless of whether the observer is aware of the symbolic connotations of the clothing or space they are in. Therefore the forms of dress for the students and young people group have an impact on a far wider audience than may be intended. The wearing of a certain type of hat is meaningless to the casual observer yet the

impression given can be generically fear-inducing all the same. The preceding sections of this Chapter attest to the ability for certain forms of dress to be identified as a cause for being feared. The difference between the reality (the intension to cause fear) and the fostered impression, leaves space for many possible disruptions of the impression. In other words, the success or failure of the attempt to illicit fear can depend on the observer and their understanding or interpretation of the situation. There are a number of suggestions proffered within this Chapter for how fear can be elicited. Some, as Judge Jaffa suggests, have very clear ideas about how to cause fear:

“Some things are bog standard that will make people afraid of you. They are transferrable to any situation. Be assertive, be confident and convey that with eye contact. The tone and volume of your voice are also important as is how you stand and how you walk. It is a different type of walk. Everything contributes to that validity.”

The concept of validity is an important one. If a person is attempting to instil fear they need to be believable. This is never truer than when attempting to excerpt control or gain advantage. Given Judge Jaffa’s experiences of being the victim of mugging he is in a very good position to explain the processes and usefulness of fear in such situations. His experiences in this type of situation are also enhanced because he has participated in muggings as victim *and* perpetrator. Judge Jaffa believed that the ability to cause fear was universally known amongst his friends:

“People are really aware of what makes people fearful. We were very aware of what would make people fear us or not.”

In support of this, Lebron articulated his method for eliciting fear. Amongst seemingly simple behavioural changes is the notion that understanding the meaning of the reaction of others is very much an important part of being feared:

I would stare at someone and not blink. I’d give them a piercing stare. You can do a lot with a stare. You can read someone. You can see whether they want to fuck with you. I’ll move fast and make people flinch. Keep them on their guard. I need to make them scared. I know fear. I can see it.”

An awareness of how to elicit fear was something Judge Jaffa decided to put into practice. It is something that can be put into practice in a number of scenarios of varying seriousness. However, the scenario chosen by Judge Jaffa to exemplify this process was a serious one:

“[I was] Going on a grind [looking to rob or to come home with something]. We saw a guy who wore what we had but he wasn’t walking in the right way. So we approached him and got talking. He started to cry. He was scared. We allowed him [let him leave without being robbed]. Knowing he was afraid of me made me feel powerful.”

Such experiences have allowed Judge Jaffa to develop an understanding of how to cause fear but also an understanding of when these intentions have been successful. The resulting feeling of power is something that was also experienced by Lebron:

“It made me feel that I was glad they were afraid. It was an interesting feeling to think that they were powerless against me. It was a sense of pride. I wanted people to be afraid of me.”

Feelings of power echo the control and compliance that other groups have expressed. Fear is a useful tool for the would-be mugger. Judge Jaffa indicates that fear is necessary for success. Addressing the various ways to cause fear and the relationship between fear and control in another person is a further example of the process of transition from being fearful to being feared. For some, the fear elicited within encounters is not always accidental. The ability to use fear and to make others afraid is a confirmation of a transition from a fearful individual and a method by which these individuals can seek to control their lives. This leads on to an important element of eliciting fear. If there is an intention to illicit fear, then the ways in which this is achieved have to be credible. Judge Jaffa has already used the term validity. He was keen to explain further:

“If I was trying to get someone’s money they have to fear you. They have to fear you as an authority figure. Of power, yes but also intelligence. That frightens people as well. That is what I am into now. You have to be credible.”

Credibility and control are important points here. For some voices within the students and young people group the desire for instilling fear is for the reason of personal safety and, in effect, through the symbolism of affected confidence appear a harder target. Or, As Fussell (1991) suggested, appearing less assailable. However, amongst the experiences are those that seek to cause fear for illegal gain. As Judge Jaffa has shown, fear can be used to extort and deprive people of their belongings. Judge Jaffa’s use of fear represented the limit of his interactional coercion. He did not divulge any scenario in which he resorted to the use of violence. Judge Jaffa’s technique for causing fear was heavily dependant on the implied use of violence within the process of eliciting fear. The threat of violence has to appear to be sincere even if the intension to use violence is false. If there is no credibility, there is no control.

There are instances within the group where fear is desired, attempts are made to elicit it, and violence is both threatened and used. Tyrone used fear and violence as a matter of routine. During the long summer holiday from school he would spend time with his friends engaging in various interpersonal crimes:

“When I was younger we used to go out robbing people. Like, we’d stop someone and there’d be a group of us, about 9 of us. We’d sneak out, in a black hoody, black trackies, hood up, meet up with my mates and just go walking the streets, roaming the streets robbing people. Whoever we saw. Well, not women. Just men. It helps if they are afraid of you and people were terrified of us.”

In order to maximise the chances of being successful in eliciting a fear response from the people approached a considered selection of a victim has to be made. This selection takes into account a number of important factors. Chief among which is an ability to match ones own (or one’s group’s) capacity for causing fear and the likelihood of victory should fear alone fail to gain the desired outcome. For Tyrone the selection of a victim was important:

“You have to weigh up your options. ‘How easy is this person going to be to take down?’ But it’s more than that, it’s the way people carry themselves. You can, if you are walking down the street and you can see if someone is timid by the way of how they are. So it is, seeing that, and noticing that, basically taking advantage of that. It means you don’t really have to do anything. They’ll be shocked and you can take advantage of that. They will do what you say. You just know who you can and can’t do certain things with.”

Judge Jaffa also suggested that the selection process was considered, purposeful and not random. The selection involved choosing a person or a group of people from whom they could gain control. Fear played a large role in this selection. Social context was also considered. The victim needed to understand the process to a certain extent. The victim needed to understand the meaning of the situation and comply with their demands. The attackers needed to have the physical upper hand:

“Certain people would get mugged and certain people wouldn’t. If I was with a group of trendy white kids looking like skaters they would have no chance. They’d get mugged straight away. If I was wearing a business suit I’d be fine. That’s because you are from the other side. A totally different world. If you are in a hoody and stood in a big group it unlikely that you are going to get moved to [mugged or considered for mugging] unless it’s a really big group doing the attacking.”

Tyrone, a 20-year-old young person, engaged in muggings as part of a group but also attempted muggings on his own. This introduced a very different dynamic and required a more active role in eliciting fear as the physical upper hand was harder to gain and harder to maintain:

“You feel like when you are on your own you would be more ruthless about it. If there is a group, you do not have to be as aggressive at first. You would just talk to them. You know. When you are on your own, you have hood up, balaclava on and run up, ‘What the fuck have you got for me? Tell me you don’t have something for me and I will knock you the fuck out!’”

Tyrone was unequivocal about what was necessary when fear was not present in an attempted mugging:

“We’d beat them up. We’d literally all jump on them.”

The consequences for the victim appear stark in this situation. So far in this section of the Chapter there has been discussion around how the contributors understand fear, the cause of fear within their interactions, the need for validity when attempting to elicit fear from someone and the choices made in selecting a target. This can lead on to a more specific discussion about the uses for fear. As Judge Jaffa and Tyrone’s accounts suggest, fear can assist in criminal endeavours. Being feared, for Tyrone, is a key ingredient to this process:

“People are afraid of me. People have pleaded with me. People see me, I am big. Some people go for the meek and some go for the challenge. Your conduct is the thing that will make people most afraid. It doesn’t come down to size or race or clothes on its own. It is a combination of things, your conduct. I use fear to help me.”

Fear assists in gaining control and coercing someone in order to take property or to threaten/commit acts of violence. However, this is not the only use of purposefully instilling fear. Alongside the criminal purposes there is a social element to causing fear. Shelley, a 20-year-old student, explains how fear allowed her to navigate her social environment without challenge:

“It [fear] means they will avoid me in the future and it will make my life easier. Most people will back down. As soon as I turn around I will know whether someone will back down. I still go ahead and have a go to intimidate them. Just so they know whose boss.”

Shelley’s use of fear was not passive or accidental. She perpetuated the fear that others showed. She was not seeking to extort or commit crimes but just enable her to go unimpeded in her social existence. Shelley’s scenario was based at Sixth Form College. Lebron reflected on a similar social use for fear:

“So you want someone to be afraid of you so they know their place. If you see them on the way to a lesson then, if you feel like it, you hit them. If you feel like it you just do it. It’s part of the process of letting them know their place. They need to fear you.”

Lebron’s scenario moves forward from an unimpeded social existence to a more demonstrative expression of situational power. The fear perpetuated here is based on informal social hierarchies and the use of violence. However fear is used it is necessary to consider how being feared made the individuals within the group feel. By doing so it is possible to address another stage in the transitional process of learning and understanding fear. The feelings that eliciting fear was able to provide is not static over time. It develops and changes when more experiences are evaluated and more contexts are considered. Max Powers remembered the feelings he had when he went from fearful person to feared person:

“Having one over on someone is an amazing feeling. You can see it in their faces. They won’t want to get eye contact with you.”

Shelley also reflected on her happiness at the presence of fear:

“I’ll happily let people be scared of me. I’ll be happy about it, especially if I’m out. In everyday life I want people to think that I am an aggressive person. They don’t mess with me then.”

There were a number of other expressions of happiness at the presence of fear. All relating to the ease with which they were able to go about their lives without being impeded or without being spoken to. For some this feeling did not last and their opinions of being feared developed as Judge Jaffa suggests:

“I would change my behaviour in each situation. It is an active choice to do that. I did feel guilty for feeling that way. But I felt that there is a lot worse that goes on in my area. People get stabbed. So a mugging isn’t a big deal.”

Judge Jaffa related his own conduct and feelings of guilt to the wider social environment to which he grew up. His context for fear was very different from other

voices within the group. He was exposed to greater levels of danger and had used fear in a more explicit and illegal way than many of the other contributors. Tyrone, the only person within the students and young people group with similar experience of being feared for illegal gain was similarly reflective but equated moving away from a life of crime and causing fear with growing up:

“That’s when I was a kid [using fear and mugging people]. You grow up and I am not the same person that I was when I was younger. So if someone was frightened, I don’t know. That is not a nice feeling. I don’t want anybody to be scared of me now. They have got no reason to be now.”

Lebron also reflected on the way he has used fear and equated his movement away from its use as an indication that he was growing socially:

“As time went on I thought it’s not something to be proud of. I had to break down these barriers. I was quite isolated deliberately. Then I had to change and broaden my horizons. It was time for a change. If I kept this isolationist mentality I would not move up in the world.”

It is in understanding the context of fear that is perhaps another milestone in the process of transition for this group. For some, fear will remain a useful social tool at their disposal as and when they see the need to purposefully use it. For others, being feared is a part of their life that has passed and they have developed an awareness of context and consequences that mean they no longer feel the need to purposefully engage in eliciting fear within encounters. This is not to suggest, for these people, that fear is absent from their lives. Fear can be and, will likely be, present within some encounters. However, during their learning and development process they have been able to understand the different ways in which they can manage fear as well as the ways in which they are unable to. The process of transition does not culminate a destination or an end point per se. Rather it is a fluid and ongoing process to which all experience of being feared can be added and interpreted. The important element for the students and young people is understanding and interpreting the world of fear around them, how they fit into it and what that means to them and the people around them.

Conclusion

This is a group of whom the judgements, stereotypes, their place in the world and their understanding of the world around them are developing. Herein the meaning they derive from encounters can set an expectation of others and from others, which is difficult to understand. It can also resonate over time and can set an agenda for their understanding of fear moving forward. This group, perhaps more than any other, has a greater capacity to elicit fear within an encounter without trying to do so. The expectation of fear weighs heavily upon some of them within their daily lives. As Day (2009) suggests, they are willing to imply that individual characteristics play a large part in the fear they perceive in others. The meanings associated with individual characteristics such as body shape and size, dress, physical stance and facial expression can play an important role in how this group is regarded by others. As Young (190: 143) suggests, “it is the ordinary, purposive orientation of the body as a whole towards things and its environment that initially defines the relation of the subject to its world.” Young (1990) further indicates that this orientation can vary depending on socio-historical circumstances. The way that a young black man orients and learns his place in the world is necessarily different from that of a white female woman of the same age.

Young people and students will often be viewed as part of a larger group, of which expectations of danger and criminality are assigned. This by-passes the individual characteristics of which they have often espoused. This can be as part of a racialised group or one based on age, gender and social status. This is as true of their interactions outside of their age groups as well as within. As a result, they represent a group of people who can simultaneously live on both sides of fear. They are fearful and they are feared. The fear they elicit is accidental and purposeful. They use fear and their growing dramaturgical awareness for offensive and defensive purposes. They evolve from unknowing individuals to knowing individuals in their use and understanding of fear and its management within everyday interactions. They can cause fear for selfish purposes and can alleviate it for altruistic ones. The students and young people group quickly evolve an understanding of fear which remains relevant for the rest of their lives and can shape their understanding of their place in the social world for some time to come.

Chapter 10) Bringing it all Together: The Importance of the Body and Pillars of Fear

As the preceding Chapters have shown, there are considerable and significant similarities in the experiences, expressions, and situations within the research related to the experience of being feared and the strategically selected groups within the study. Whilst the contexts of these experiences vary widely, as was the intention within the design of the research, there are thematic overlaps that require analysis and expression. The core purpose of this Chapter is to draw these similarities together in a cumulative analysis of connected themes. This will ultimately aid in the clarity of the research findings. Up to this point, the Chapters have sought to explore the integral aspects of being feared in relation to the contexts and experiences of those within the strategic groups. The participants of each group have, for very obvious reasons, focused on their own circumstances when making sense of the world around them. They see, report, legitimise and make sense of the world through their own eyes. In doing this, the study has highlighted the nuances of each group and each individual in turn and how being feared relates to them and their lives. The impact and understanding of being feared has been, at times disparate. It has been articulated variously in the long and short term, transitional, situationally specific, fleeting, life changing, incidental, coveted and avoided. However, as should be clear at this point, the interest here is not situated necessarily with the individual or the groups, but with understanding an experience.

There are core elements of this experience that draw considerable similarity and form more clear cut and unifying themes within the experience of being feared. Whilst individuals and groups may make sense of these circumstances differently, the *ingredients* appear very closely related when expressing the micro-dynamics of being feared. The process of drawing these similarities together involves looking at both the situations and the contexts presented within the data, as well as the ways in which the participants chose to interpret and make sense of the fear they have caused or have become aware of. This process is best achieved by drawing out the core themes within the research. This will be done within this Chapter by initially addressing the importance of the corporeal within fleeting encounters. This then leads to the four distinct areas of similarity as derived from within the data. These areas can be

organised into four pillars of being feared – purposeful fear, accidental fear, alleviating fear and competent fear. What has become clear is that these pillars do not exist independently of each other. It also provides a Goffman-like set of sub-groups that help to draw attention to the ways in which being feared was explained by those that experience it. It is to this point that the rest of this Chapter will be dedicated. That is analysing and expanding on these core and constituent themes within the experience of being feared.

a) The Importance of the Body – The Presentation of Self

As has been the case from the outset, the way in which the research has framed its boundaries has been to limit the focus to interactions between people in each other's presence. The body, within that specific frame of reference, is the vessel through which all communication (verbal and non-verbal) is given and received. In this sense, there is an important commonality here between every single encounter. Goffman's framework has given the analytical grounding from which this can take place. In doing so, this framework helped in providing the ingredients and tools from which to legitimise these experiences. Given the nature of the cohort and the variety of people and contexts that were divulged, physical appearance and fear was a strong common thread from within the research. It was reflected in the reasons for attributing fear, in the literal and the symbolic sense, as well as in the description of those most likely to be fearful. The physical presence of individuals, their actions and their reactions all build towards understanding physical appearance as a core area of understanding the experience of being feared.

First, it is important to understand the body within these encounters as an element that is constantly with those that are being feared. It is a vessel upon which the outside world gazes and observes. It is something that can define aspects of a person in a literal and symbolic sense. It is a simple enough thought but it is an important factor. As discussed in Chapter 3, Goffman uses the term 'personal front' to refer to the expressive equipment that is more intimately associated with the performer themselves and that which would follow the performer wherever they go. In relation to being feared, this is centred around the corporeal. 'Personal front' can include: insignia of office or rank; clothing; sex, age and racial characteristics; size and looks;

posture; speech patterns; facial expressions; bodily gestures; and the like (Goffman, 1959: 24). Goffman (1959) suggests that some of these characteristics, these vehicles for conveying signs, are relatively fixed over a period of time and do not vary for the individual from situation to situation. Jam, a gym goer, perhaps expressed this most succinctly:

“People notice me. I don’t blend in. I can be in different situations and people react differently and that, but I am noticed. When I notice people are afraid, I can put into place all of the talking and trying to put people at ease that we talked about. But I can’t disappear. So if none of it works then that’s that.”

There are other, subtler examples that show a recognition of the body within encounters. A tacit and micro-conversational reminder that acknowledges the attributes of the interactant, as suggested by PC Endeavour:

“You get used to it but a lot of interactions have an element that remind you. So I will get things like, ‘alright big fella’ or ‘you’re a bit of lump, aren’t you.’

Here it is possible to see that for many encounters, the body has the capacity to precede any other type of communication – it is noticed. It can set the tone for the need to recognise and alleviate fear and develop an ongoing expectation that there will be a reaction of some kind to an individual’s presence. This is an overarching theme between the groups, but not always articulated in the same way. Participants, as has been discussed in previous Chapters, tend to speak to their own context. Whilst there are obvious ways in which this can be a criticism of the sampling, it does bring into focus the interconnected core themes within those contexts. In terms of Goffman’s (1959) definition of personal front, the participants from each of the strategically selected groups covered every element of this when referring to the importance of the corporeally related elements of fearful interactions. Police officers, bouncers, gym-goers, soldiers, young people and students referred to all or some of; insignia of office or rank; clothing; sex, age and racial characteristics; size and looks; posture; speech patterns; facial expressions; and bodily gestures (Goffman, 1959: 24).

The body and the inherent presentation of self is undoubtedly an important vessel of communication. This can be in wanted and unwanted ways and, as eluded to, is something that is a constant within the interactions of its owner. However, certain elements of personal front can be changed or manipulated on purpose. As will be expanded shortly, this is something that is integral to all of the pillars of fear. It is true of those that seek to cause fear and of those that seek to distance themselves from it, or alleviate it. It is something that is shared, without exception, within every strategic group in the research and with every individual.

PC Fleming, a police officer, indicated as much when articulating his approach to any policing situation he went into:

“You change your body language. That has to happen. It’s just a basic communication skill. You have to adapt to your audience whether it is a single person or many people.”

PC Fleming, unwittingly, uses Goffmanian phrases to explain both his presentation of self and a degree of dramaturgical awareness. The adaptation he speaks of refers to both the ability to cause and use fear and the ability to dissipate it. Again, this theme was strong to the extent of being almost universal. The awareness each of the groups had of their impact physically was shared and well understood for the most part. In some senses it was in expressing an imposing physical presence, especially for the gym goers. In others, it was the symbolic insignia of office that allowed their presence to be augmented and enhanced, this was particularly true of PC Leeds as well as Thelma and Louise (see Chapter 5).

In this sense, a fundamental part of being feared could be considered to be controlling the body (controlling self) and using the body for control (controlling others). As the previous Chapters have shown, this can be done in a number of ways. It is best understood from a conceptual point of view by looking again at personal front. Goffman (1959: 32) further sub-divides personal front into ‘appearance’ and ‘manner.’ ‘Appearance’ refers to those stimuli which function at the time to tell us of the performer’s social statuses. Expectations about appearance are often regularised or normative within a culture. ‘Appearance signs’ are selected. For example, police

uniforms are easily identifiable but the importance of this sub-division doesn't end there. It also works ritualistically to tell an audience of the performer's status - formal or informal, conformity/individuality. Dress, in this sense can serve as 'props' (clothes, body posture, facial expressions, gestures) that serve to communicate gender, status, occupation, and age. All of these factors have served as a backdrop for fear attribution within this research. They do not exist in separation but can act in combination in order to present the object of fear.

These 'props' can serve to demonstrate group validity in formal and informal group collectives. For example, a suit and tie can signal a person's validity in a professional occupation. It is exactly the same type of prop (to choose a simplistic example) that can signify that a hooded tracksuit on a person of a certain age falls within a particular informal group and has the potential to symbolise something altogether different for some audiences. These stimuli also tell us of the individual's temporary ritual state: that is, whether they are engaging in formal social activity, work, or informal recreation (Goffman, 1959). The experience of being feared can add to this an expectation of crime and/or violence (on the part of the observer) and the presence of fear. As a good example from Chapter 9, Judge Jaffa, a student, was aware of the importance of props within his daily dress and the impact these can have on people's reactions to him:

"I don't really care if they fear me or not. Once I start talking they can understand my intentions. Although it does depend on what I am wearing and what accessories I have got. If I wasn't wearing my glasses people would fear me more. People attribute intelligence with wearing glasses. They see glasses and they think, 'he's OK.'"

This was further expanded by Judge Jaffa when he suggested that the way he dresses and 'the look' he has can have the effect of causing fear:

"If I was wearing dark clothing and baggy jeans, there is just a certain look that would cause fear. Like, if you wear a certain hat people would be like, 'oh, that's a Peckham hat.' If you are wearing a certain coat you will see where someone is from. Clothes will also indicate status. 'Oh, you're wearing that coat? You think you are a bad man?'"

The second sub-division, 'manner' refers to those stimuli which function at the time to warn us of the interaction role the performer will expect to play in the oncoming situation. Manner, simply put refers to how an actor plays the role, the personal touch. Again, this is demonstrated and referred to throughout the previous Chapters and serves as another reminder of the importance of the body and its props as a tool for giving expressive information. Within a fearful interaction, manner works to warn others of how the performer will act or seek to act in role (dominant, aggressive, yielding, receptive and the like). An aggressive manner may give the impression that the performer expects to be the one who will initiate the verbal interaction and direct its course (Goffman, 1959: 33). This is perhaps best typified by Casey Ryback in his role as a police officer. He expressed the importance of gaining the upper hand within an arrest. His use of the term 'game face' very much reflects Goffman's manner and his kit as appearance props:

"Fear makes your job easier. Show aggression and you can neutralise people that would otherwise be empowered. It's bread and butter for us. Some will kick off until you get right on them. Then they comply. Fear is definitely useful...Intimidation is important in a lot of these situations - threats, aggression, that sort of thing. [When you go into a situation] you've got your game face on. Get there, get the kit on and go. You have to mentally document everything. So if I knock him out, I need to know what I've seen, what I did, what I said."

In contrast to the aggression shown by Casey Ryback, a meek, apologetic manner may give the impression that a performer expects to follow the lead of others or at least that he can be led to do so (Goffman, 1959: 35). If there is a person observing you, like Tyrone, a young person within the research, this could lead to your victimisation. As Goffman (1959) and Mead (1934) place the importance of the self and the giving *and* receiving of expressive information, this is important to the experience of being feared:

"You have to weigh up your options. 'How easy is this person going to be to take down?' But it's more than that, it's the way people carry themselves. You can, if you are walking down the street and you can see if someone is timid by the way of how

they are. So it is, seeing that, and noticing that, basically taking advantage of that. It means you don't really have to do anything. They'll be shocked and you can take advantage of that. They will do what you say. You just know who you can and can't do certain things with."

Tyrone again goes as far as to use similar language to Goffman when expressing what could be interpreted as a very good understanding of the dynamics of appearance and manner:

"People are afraid of me. People have pleaded with me. People see me, I am big. Some people go for the meek and some go for the challenge. Your conduct is the thing that will make people most afraid. It doesn't come down to size or race or clothes on its own. It is a combination of things, your conduct. I use fear to help me."

This acknowledgement of the potential complexity in the expressive information has been important within this research. There is potentially an inclination to distance oneself from the apparent complications of Goffman's use of categorising and layering the sub-group style of analysing the very smallest ripples in social interaction. Such a desire could place the body on its own as a source of fear. Yet these combining elements of intention communicated via personal front, are evident within nearly all of the expressions within the data. There is a fascinating understanding from those that have been feared that exemplifies this. As Lebron, a student, suggests:

"It depends on your appearance. I was never part of a gang. If I dressed a certain way they would think I was lying if I said I wasn't part of a gang. So if I was wearing a hoody or a cap then I look like a gang member. They would see the clothes and assume. You have to act confident. If they approach you, you have to seem like you are one of them."

Goffman suggests that we often expect a confirming consistency between appearance and manner; we expect that the differences in social statuses among the interactants will be expressed in some way by congruent differences in the indications that are made of an expected interaction role (Goffman, 1959: 35). That is to say, if an

observer imputes a role upon someone that they will be helpful and honest (like asking a police officer for directions), they will assume that this expectation will be upheld. They have formed this expectation by relating the police officer's appearance (as a person in uniform) and their expectation of the role they perform.

Likewise, this imputed role, and therefore expectations, can be negative. If a person observes someone wearing the insignia of a youth gang, they would expect the manner of this person to be in-line with the expectations they have formed of such an appearance. Goffman (1959) does illustrate that there is a possible conflict or contradiction between appearance and manner when these expectations of interaction are not fulfilled. It is at such a point that the protocols for alleviating fear can be best utilised. Jam, a gym goer, expresses this well. He described his personal tendency for needing to put people at ease and how he went about doing this. Importantly, for Jam, this involved breaking down the visual barrier of the size of his body, of his race and engaging on a more Goffmanian-esque focused level:

"[I put people at ease by] Talking to them. I find that generally that's good, you try and talk about things that they might be interested in, ask them about themselves, tell them a little about myself if they ask, tell them what I do and they'd be like 'wow, oh OK, you are not a drug dealer or whatever they think black people are.' So it is a portrayal. An expectation they hold."

In the same way that there is an expectation of a degree of consistency between appearance and manner, there is also, according to Goffman (1959) an expected coherence among setting, appearance and manner. Inconsistency with appearance and manner may confuse and upset an audience/observer until enough information is gathered to decide what is coherent or what is not. Jam's employment of alleviating techniques is a recognition on his part, that he observes the worry or concern in the people he comes into contact with.

The body is also a conduit of violence, both potential and manifest. Within every group this was a linking theme. This covered all elements of personal front, but particular attention was given to aspects of the physical being and its impact on being feared. This can be expressed in a way that demonstrates exasperation at the

perceived spectre of fear and violence. Likewise, it may be the individual's desire to create or augment the impression of violence within an interaction. Lebron, a student, reflected on this:

“There are a lot of people that have been afraid of me. People make a judgement and assume I am violent. They’ll look at the floor when I pass. I’ve heard through third parties that people are intimidated by me and they are afraid of me. Saying they think I am some kind of thug.”

Here Lebron gives an example of the expectations people have of him, the degree of consistency between his appearance and manner Goffman (1959), and their own judgements on who will likely be a violent person. The basis for being feared here is simply Lebron's presence and a person willing to make such judgements. This was something Lebron articulated in a number of scenarios:

“This happens all the time. Little old ladies like I said. Men as well. I was heading out to meet friends and walking through a carpark. I saw this old boy trying to park his car. He was going to hit something. So I thought I’d help him out and back him in. So I stood near the space and started to guide him in, you know? He just locked the doors, mate. Wouldn’t get out. There’s just no point for me.”

There is an alternative view to the body being a conduit for violence. Pink Fairy, a soldier, reflected on his physical potential for violence as something specifically trained for and desired. As discussed in Chapter 6, this desire was not necessarily for the want to commit acts of violence, but for personal and familial safety. Yet, as was discussed, being feared was a useful by-product that ensured vulnerability was kept to a minimum:

“To me the body, I think the problem is, is that when you have been fit and it has been for a reason, you want to be fit for that same reason - To feel safe and secure. I know that if I can’t do that thing that I used to be able to do 10 years ago at war then that puts me a bit more vulnerable. That is why I get so much motivation from it. To keep myself on top of the game. If I need to defend myself, I can. That is what I like.”

It should be noted that some elements of the body (in relation to being feared) change over time and some do not. This is true of the controllable and the uncontrollable elements of personal front. Above, Pink Fairy is seemingly aware that his powers to intimidate and effectively commit acts of violence are finite. Personal front is not universally fixed. Some of these vehicles, however, are relatively transitory like facial expression. This can vary during a performance and, from one moment to the next (Goffman, 1959). This variance, as described by Goffman, from one moment to the next has been experienced by every group within this research. The police officers, it could be argued, have the greatest level of variance during the execution of their duties. For example, apprehending and arresting an offender at the beginning of the day and helping a lost child find their parent at the end of the day. These could hypothetically require the officer to instil fear and use violence as well as alleviate fear. In each of these scenarios there are elements of the personal front that cannot be changed in situ, such as gender, age, race and, physical size. Yet there are elements that can be adapted to meet the needs of the situation, such as posture, speech patterns, facial expressions, and bodily gestures (Goffman, 1959).

To conclude this analysis and cement the importance of the body within the experience of being feared, it is worth returning to the fundamental framing of the encounter as set out in the early stages of this research. That also means a return to the parameters set out with the conceptual framework. This process can be helped by repeating a key thematic question: How can we best explore and begin to understand being feared? As many of the accounts within the data suggest, there is one immovable implicit fact that in order to understand being feared it is important to observe that it is not only a spatial or temporal concern but one that includes a living object of fear – a person. The corporeal themes between the groups help to amplify the importance of the object in this experience. Goffman (1961: 17) conceptualised an area of specific interaction that metaphorically frames a situation within which it is possible to analyse fleeting encounters. Here the personal perceptions of specific interactions has created the experiences on which this research has engaged and analysed. The participants have given their own meaning, attributed cause, applied reason and described and structured these experiences. It is within these cumulative narratives that the connected themes have come, and the frames within which the

pillars of fear can be set. This realisation of the importance of the corporeal, leads succinctly on to the final section of data analysis within the thesis.

b) The Micro-Dynamics of Being Feared – Pillars of Fear

Having restated the key thematic question above, there are further key questions to draw upon. The previous Chapters have highlighted the experience of being feared in a wide range of contexts. Analysis has covered scenarios from the every-day to the most extreme human experiences. There has been a building of understanding as the Chapters have progressed and the dynamics of being feared have become clearer. In doing so, there is a simpler question that can now be asked: What do these contexts have in common? It is to exploring these connections that the remainder of this Chapter is dedicated. This research has found four distinctive themes inherent in the micro-dynamics of being feared. These elements are concerned with the presence of fear within a fleeting encounter, as defined in Chapter 3, and the ways in which those who experience being feared understand and act upon it. These are *purposeful*, *accidental*, *alleviating* and *competent*. These micro-dynamic features of being feared were experienced across and between each of the groups. Not every individual expressed experience of all of the pillars, however they were strongly present and each of the strategically selected groups had evidence supportive of this. It demonstrated that it was present within each of the various and related contexts this research has explored. The remaining section will draw on new and already presented analysis to demonstrate the features of each of these interlocking pillars of fear.

Purposeful Fear

First, comes the concept of purposeful fear within an interaction. This concerns the actions and behaviours of those that want to encourage or augment fear in others. Purposeful fear can be defined as the purposeful actions of an actor within an encounter to instil fear in another within an everyday encounter. This theme was evident in the experiences of nearly all of the participants within the study and present within every group. This suggests that it is an integral part to understanding the experience of being feared. As the evidence has shown, being feared can come in a plethora of different circumstances and contexts. In order to understand the

purposeful fear dynamic, there is something inescapable that must be present in order for it to be realised. It is simply a desire to be feared. This is not something that is ever-present – it can be as fleeting as the encounter itself - but at some level and within some interactions there is a desire to be feared. As Jam, a gym-goer, suggested:

“I want people to be fearful of me in some situations, yeah, no doubt.”

The idea of desire was not always articulated so explicitly amongst the participants. It nonetheless represented a strong theme that helped to define the need for such a categorisation. There were a number of reasons for the expressions of desire. Some were focused on the execution of duty or job role, these form a theme in their own right as will be shown later in the competent fear pillar. Others centred around confidence, self-protection, and personal advantage. Again reflecting on his own reasons for eliciting fear, Jam suggested:

“You want them to be fearful of your abilities, if someone is fearful of you then it improves your own confidence... [it] is kind of like a deterrent. People worry about being hurt by you.”

Jam was not alone in this sense, the idea of deterrence and ease of transition through particular spaces was important. Purposeful fear was most frequently articulated with a desire to be left alone or to avoid potential victimisation. It is evident that purposeful fear has its social uses. Shelley, a young person, also reflected on her happiness at the presence of fear for this very reason:

“I’ll happily let people be scared of me. I’ll be happy about it, especially if I’m out. In everyday life I want people to think that I am an aggressive person. They don’t mess with me then.”

The uses of fear in these social scenarios had uses that were profound, like not getting mugged as Judge Jaffa, LeBron and Max indicated in Chapter 9. It also had less profound benefits that could be imperceptible but, to those that used it, had a definite cause and effect as Jam suggested:

“At things like festivals and things like that when you want to get through a crowd. Some people wouldn’t want to let you through a crowd but then they’d turn around and see what I looked like and let me passed.”

This example does not necessarily indicate a fear in the observer per se. Rather a wariness or a reaction to Jam’s presence. It is therefore important to consider the concept of validity when addressing being feared within this pillar. If a person is attempting to instil fear they need to be believable. This is never truer than when attempting to excerpt control, maintain perceived advantage or actively seek to gain advantage within an encounter. In many ways, the articulations of *how* fear was achieved was more typical of this pillar of fear. There are a number of suggestions proffered within the research for how fear can be elicited. Some, as Judge Jaffa suggests, have very clear ideas about how to purposefully cause fear:

“Some things are bog standard that will make people afraid of you. They are transferrable to any situation. Be assertive, be confident and convey that with eye contact. The tone and volume of your voice are also important as is how you stand and how you walk. It is a different type of walk. Everything contributes to that validity.”

The relationship between Judge Jaffa’s understanding of purposefully causing fear and the elements of Goffman’s (1959: 32) personal front (appearance and manner) as presented in the early part of this Chapter are clear. There is a technique that is learnt and known to those that elicit fear and employed when needed. Lebron also articulated his method for eliciting fear. Amongst these seemingly simple behavioural changes, is the notion that understanding and attributing the meanings inherent in the reaction of others is very much an important part of being feared:

“I would stare at someone and not blink. I’d give them a piercing stare. You can do a lot with a stare. You can read someone. You can see whether they want to fuck with you. I’ll move fast and make people flinch. Keep them on their guard. I need to make them scared. I know fear. I can see it.”

Jam also spoke of how he would go about achieving this fear, if it was immediately obvious to him that it was not present and he wanted it to be. The processes are incredibly similar and rely on the giving and receiving of expressive information. At times props and focusing the interaction in a way that suits the desired outcome were used:

“Just with, you know, eye contact, just sort of, starring at them. You know, just being quite dominant, strut, walk, confident walk, chest out, walking tall, being relaxed and things. I have just noticed that that makes people fearful. It has worked in the past. People don’t really focus so much on what they are doing so they may try and get out of your way. So you know it works.”

Purposefully causing fear is not just about ease of passage or deterrence. There is a darker side to this pillar of fear. Much of what was articulated within this research deals with the spectre of crime and the inherent symbolic (and actual) possibilities of violence. For some participants within the study the fear was purposefully instilled for criminal gain. The process was much the same, but with very specific aims. Tyrone explained his method for causing fear and very much falls in line with those already articulated:

“Like I said, it’s how you carry yourself. Body language helps a lot for itself. You don’t have to say much. Certain ways, facial expression you pull. You know what I mean? It is more down to attitude. So it’s that really. So, I think that is the main thing”.

The criminal process of eliciting fear is more extreme. Yet it still relies on the giving and receiving of expressive information. It is necessary to know whether the purposeful fear that is required, has been achieved. Tyrone and others within the groups described the ways in which they identified their targets. The methods used to cause fear were practiced and known:

“If there is a group, you do not have to be as aggressive at first. You would just talk to them. You know. When you are on your own, you have hood up, balaclava on and run up, ‘What the fuck have you got for me? Tell me you don’t have something for me

and I will knock you the fuck out!’ Stuff like that. But, I only did it on my own, 3/2 times. But you just know who you can and can’t do certain things with.”

Despite the more serious consequences resulting from this interaction, the processes by which the fear response is gained follows that of previous examples. For Tyrone, there is still a need to know whether he can and has been successful in purposefully instilling fear. So Tyrone explained how he knew:

“Just body language... The way people carry themselves. You can, if you are walking down the street and you can see if someone is timid by the way of how they are. You know what I mean? So it is, seeing that, and noticing that, basically taking advantage of that. It means you don’t really have to do anything. They’ll be shocked and you can take advantage of that. They will do what you say.”

The overarching concerns within this pillar of fear are the actions and behaviours of those that want to encourage or augment fear in others. As this and the previous Chapters have shown, this can be achieved in numerous contexts and for vastly different reasons. Purposeful fear has been defined here as the purposeful actions to instil fear in another within an everyday encounter. The emphasis on the everyday is important within this pillar as it marks a specific separation to fear elicited in the line of duty within a work-based scenario (discussed shortly). This pillar of fear recognises the desire and ability to manage fear within everyday encounters. Many of the participants were well versed in the protocols required to elicit fear in the people they came into contact with. There were a number of scenarios in which it was a desired outcome and it was often reflected on with pleasure or a sense of achievement. This theme was evident in the experiences of nearly all of the participants within the study and present across all groups. The actions within this pillar are very much situated in the personal for gains and advantage. Little consideration was given to those who experienced fear, beyond the recognition that they were indeed afraid. Here, purposefully causing fear was selfish, cold and calculating. The aims were not always nefarious, but there was little reflection beyond the desire to manipulate the impression given to those that were observing. The following two pillars of fear introduce examples of less purposeful and more reflective dynamics of being feared.

Accidental Fear

This section turns to those circumstances in which fear has been caused accidentally. Fear can be caused in others by an individual with no intention to elicit a fear reaction whatsoever. This pillar of fear again deals very much with the everyday but also relates to work-based scenarios. This theme was, much like purposeful fear, evident in the experiences of nearly all of the participants within the study and present within every group. This further suggests that in order to understand the dynamics of being feared this pillar must be explored and understood. Evidence within the data demonstrates that different circumstances and contexts can lead to the recognition of fear in others without intent. In order to understand the accidental fear dynamic, there are three elements to explore. First, is recognition of fear within an encounter. Again, this can be understood in the interpretations of the expressive information shared by those observed within an encounter. This has been described variously within in each of the preceding data Chapters. Second, is the tendency of the feared person to attribute these observed signs of fear to themselves. Simply put, without this process of attribution, there is no feared person within the encounter. Third, is the lack of intention to cause this reaction within an encounter. This is important as, in stark contrast to the purposeful pillar of fear, this can be the cause of a number of different feelings, actions and reactions on the part of the feared person.

Many of the expressions of accidentally causing fear were shared in the most mundane and matter-of-fact ways. It is something that all respondents reflected on at some point within their interviews. It was something that was almost dismissed by many of the respondents as if unworthy of detailed mention or lacking in sensationalism when reflecting on being feared. This common reflection was simply observing people explicitly crossing a road to avoid contact. Usefully, Jam expressed his experiences in some detail with a particular day's example:

“There is like, fear, when, especially in this new place that I’ve moved to up in the North, because I don’t get it down in the South. I was just on a, just walking to meet the guys at work, at a curry house in the village, just walking, and there was a woman, she was with her dog, and she just crossed the road, it seemed, so that she didn’t have to walk on the pavement with me and didn’t want to make eye contact.”

Also, I was walking along a bridge, on the footpath, and there were two girls and as they saw me, they went in the opposite direction as soon as they saw me. And this was in broad daylight. That is two examples from the same day!”

Jam was able to recall his feelings when this happened:

“At first I thought, ‘oh my goodness, what is wrong with these people?’ you know? ‘What is the issue? I don’t know what the issue is! Why are you scared? Why are you crossing the road?’ but then I thought ‘pft, that is the way of the world. That is the way the world is. I can’t do anything about it.’”

There was a futility to the experience for Jam. He recognised, as the pillar of fear would suggest, that he had not put into place any specific actions to elicit a fear reaction. He, in effect, had no immediate ability to control the reactions of others. Robert and Joseph, 16-year-old students, also suggested that people were often afraid of them (see Chapter 9). Joseph offered his own explanation of why this was the case:

“I haven’t ever noticed people doing that [being afraid] from my own age group really. It really only happens with older people. Like Robert said, they take one look and the have made their mind up about me. I am young and I am not trusted.”

As discussed in Chapter 9, it was the blanket association with criminality that is most disturbing to Joseph. His age represented a visual barrier through which the substance of his person was unable to escape. The chief realisation from this experience was that he is not judged as an individual but as part of a ‘teen’ collective, which echoes findings from Day (2009). Being feared in this sense can fall within the realms of the accidental. Neither Joseph nor Robert are in control of how old they are and their presence in shared spaces (in this scenario they were in a shopping precinct). Joseph expanded upon this point:

“They don’t need to know us, they already think they do. I’m already a target like that. Already got a tag. I am a teenager. That is my tag. They don’t need any more than that right? I can’t do anything about how old I am, right? So I guess I just have

to deal with it. They don't trust teenagers. It doesn't matter what type of person I am."

There are important areas to explore here. These are two examples among many within the strategically selected groups. It is here that there is the clearest evidence of the participants speaking to their own context. They are all attributing fear to the self, whilst reflecting on the characteristics they possess that they suspect of being the cause of the fear. For example, PC McLaren reflected on the fact the he was a police officer when assigning the cause of accidental fear; Joseph reflected on the fact they he was young; Jam reflected on his race; Mr Darcy reflected on the fact that he was holding a machine gun, to name a few. The contexts, causes, and characteristics of those that expressed the accidental causing of fear were various and not always clearly defined. Yet they all shared the important distinction that they had not meant to instil fear and they felt they were judged poorly by their observers or not understood sufficiently. Judge Jaffa articulated his own interpretation of the fear of others and the judgemental nature of their reactions to him:

"People are afraid of me with me just walking the streets. They'll look at me and think I am a certain way. People won't look me in the eyes. You can see the fear and the judgements. Like, I can't just approach an adult. When I have you can see that they don't think my approach is innocent. They think I am after them. That is even when I am on my own. When I am with a group of friends it's even worse."

The problem Lebron faced was that identifying the aspects of his person that are the causes of fear is not a simple task. He reflected on its complexity as he saw it. Different people he interacted with may have a different reason to fear him than he has experienced before. For this reason the ability to recognise and attribute the fear he perceives takes on ever more personal significance:

"It's not one thing that does it. It could be my walk, my stance, and my posture. It could be what I am wearing. A lot of this can dictate how people react to me."

The accidental fear pillar is not solely centred around specifically personal areas. When other contexts of fear are considered, there can be a relationship with work-

based attribution as well. For example, PC McLaren indicated that accidental or unwanted fear could be a barrier to his police role as discussed in Chapter 5. He suggested that there are times when accidental fear impedes his ability to reason with people:

“The uniform is something that people can be genuinely afraid of. But fear can be a barrier to the job. A lot of the time you just want to talk to people.”

This view was shared with all the officers. For example, Thelma and Louise both described observing fear when they performed door-to-door enquiries after burglaries:

“We know the uniform can be threatening. I am aware of that. I know people can be frightened of us. When we are going house-to-house you can see it in people’s faces [fear]. Their faces drop. I see it straight away. You just see the panic. In those situations you go into that mode. You expect fear. It’s real fear too.”

In contrast to the orchestrated and controlled fear within the previous section, the accidental fear pillar presents a less co-ordinated and uncontrolled aspect to being feared. There is no design or desire within the interactions that describe this dynamic and, as a result, the reflections from the participants are less exalted and less enjoyable. They can reflect confusion, frustration and, in some senses a degree of inevitability. This being said, there are traits that are shared between these two pillars of fear. Namely, the way in which people identify and describe fear. This is necessarily a common trait among all of the pillars as it is the way in which the participants are able to recognise their status as a feared person regardless of the meaning attributed to it. The ways in which fearful people express their fear (physically, facially, verbally) are similar regardless of whether it is something that is purposeful or accidental. The following section explores the methods and concerns expressed by the participants when they notice that people are afraid of them but do not wish this to be the case.

Alleviating Fear

This pillar of fear considers the actions of those who have caused fear accidentally or purposefully and seek to remove it. It explores those that actively engage in measures to alleviate and reduce the fears of others when they notice it is present. It considers the steps taken to avoid encounters in which fear is expected. It also examines the situations in which those that perceive being feared engage in specific behaviours to alleviate fear in others. As will be discussed here, and as seen within examples presented in previous Chapters, this is a theme that intersects with every group, within every context from the mundane to the extreme and is common between individuals to the point of near universality. There is a central premise to this particular pillar of fear that revolves around the idea that no participant within the sample has the desire to be feared within every encounter. To that end, the protocols engaged within the cohort to alleviate fear are equally as developed as those to instil fear. As will be shown, it would appear that failure is far more prevalent in those encounters in which actors wish to alleviate fear than with those that wish to instil it. This helps to underline the importance of appearance as discussed within this Chapter. It also helps to demonstrate the potential social precariousness of being feared.

In order to understand the various contexts in which the participants expressed a need or desire to alleviate fear there is a logic in demonstrating the most everyday situations and then leading towards the more extreme. Amongst these scenarios is a narrative in which those that are feared develop an expectation of fear within an encounter. This supports Goffman's (1959) idea that there is a degree of consistency to the expressive information an actor receives and the interpretation of the ensuing behaviour. There are situations in which fear is definitely expected for Max Powers and efforts to reduce it are regularly employed:

“If I am behind someone I will make them aware that I am there. One thing I do is the good old-fashioned foot scrape. Just a couple of scrapes on the floor, so they can hear. To them I hope it looks like I’ve just tripped or something. For me, I just want them to know that I mean them no harm and I am just trying to get past.”

This example from Max Powers provides an opportunity to explore two distinctive elements of alleviating fear. First, as shown concisely by Max, there are situations in which there is an expectation of fear within an interaction. As has been shown within various scenarios in the preceding Chapters, this can be based on a build-up of experiences within similar settings (Goffman, 1959). It could be the frequency and consistency of reactions from people with a particular appearance and manner (Goffman, 1959). Importantly here, expectations of fear, and therefore methods to alleviate fear, are employed without the need to have these suspicions corroborated. Second, is more of a post-stimulus response in that the feared person notices or realises there is fear within an encounter and then employs measures to alleviate the fear that they perceive. For both of these elements, there is a need, a compulsion, or a duty to remove fear from an encounter. It is a process of managing fear within an encounter and there are varying degrees of success and failure within the data. The impact of the potential failures to manage fear has wide-ranging social connotations, as Lebron explains:

“People tell me I have a ‘screw face.’ It means I look at people aggressively. Girls tell me I look aggressive. It worries me because if I want to get to know a girl I don’t want them to think I am going to do something else. I had to change. I had to re-evaluate how I was. I had to think about why people were so afraid.”

Lebron faced the difficulty of identifying the aspects of his person that were the causes of fear. He was aware that the different people he interacts with may have different reasons to fear him. For this reason the ability to recognise and adapt to fear takes on ever more personal significance, as Lebron suggests:

“It’s not one thing that does it. It could be my walk, my stance, and my posture. It could be what I am wearing. A lot of this can dictate how people react to me.”

The success or failure of a fear management strategy is also dependant on his ability to correctly recognise the existence of fear whilst simultaneously establishing the most effective way to alleviate that fear. In Goffmanian terms this would be the development of a dramaturgical awareness and understanding the reactions and meanings within every interaction. However, understanding and interpreting the

meanings of interaction does not imply that these reactions can be controlled. Judge Jaffa indicated that on occasion, alleviating fear was a futile enterprise:

“Sometimes you could do everything in your power to calm someone or whatever. It just won’t work. Some people are going to be scared no matter what.”

Herein lies the chief difficulty for many of the individuals when engaging in efforts to alleviate fear. Their ability to recognise their feared status is subject to their ability to understand the meanings in the reactions of others. Lebron adds detail to this idea:

“There will always be times when I unknowingly make someone afraid. To get rid of fear I just smile or nod and ask a question to get them to relax. Just something to make them feel at ease. Like, even if I know where the toilet is I will ask them and they relax. But if they are scared they are scared. Nothing I can really do.”

There are difficulties inherent in these coping strategies. For Lebron and for others there is an expectation that attempts to alleviate fear are as likely to fail, as they are to succeed. This can be particularly wearing if there is a high degree of frequency in attempting to alleviate fear. Jam explained his own frustrations:

“I get it a lot of times, because until I talk, people are quite fearful. It’s strange. I don’t understand why because... Well, as soon as, people always comment, as soon as I speak they are like “wow, very English” and it is something instantly they identify with. And it instantly stops me being something they would be fearful of.”

Jam in particular was keen to stress that the constant judgements were a frequent reminder of his status as someone likely to be feared was a point of contention within his life:

“I don’t think it is fair. I don’t think I should, it’s not a problem for me because I have done it all of my life. However, I don’t think I should have to...It is all the time.”

Jam, Judge Jaffa, Lebron and others such as Frank, all demonstrated the same techniques when attempting to alleviate fear. They moved from what Goffman (1959)

would define as an unfocused interaction, to a focused interaction. In the unfocused interaction there is an awareness of the presence of both actors (the fearful and the feared) but there is no common focus. Once perceiving the fear Jam, Judge Jaffa, Lebron, Frank and others all engaged in methods to focus the interaction. This can be verbally by asking questions and talking or it can be by displaying a different manner via facial expression, like Lebron suggested.

There is potential for this to be a much harder endeavour when the fear is attributed differently. For example, this pillar of fear is also one that has an explicit footing within the work-based scenarios as described by the police, bouncers and soldiers. PC McLaren described (in Chapter 5, p. 127) his own techniques for alleviating fear when dealing with a policing matter. His methods involved purposefully removing the items of personal protection clothing, handcuffs and baton. PC McLaren believed that the symbolic value of this process was enough to re-align the impressions and fear attribution that had occurred to that point. Thus reducing the fear he observed and, importantly, allowing him to fulfil his duties more effectively.

In doing so, PC McLaren showed sensitivity to the way he looked in uniform and to the implications or barriers this might have in this scenario. So within this pillar of fear we can see the echoes of all the elements of Goffman's (1959) personal front – setting, appearance and manner. Indeed, PC Endeavour, PC Flemming, PC Lee, Thelma, Louise and PC McLaren described various scenarios in which they felt it necessary to remove certain items of uniform to alleviate the fears or worries of others. For example, Thelma described a situation in which she was called to a house in which a mother had physically abused 2 children; she had used belts to hit them:

“First up, I had an argument with the social worker because I turned up in uniform. I told her that if she wants a police response then this is what she gets. But if the situation is appropriate, like this one was, I’ll remove the body armour, remove the belt and try to be a bit more human. Appear a bit more like them. It took a very long time to get through to these kids.”

All of these scenarios indicate that a purposeful degree of adaptation is required to alleviate fear. Yet the success of these adaptations can be hugely varied. To restate

some evidence as provided by Mr Darcy, a soldier, there remained a futility to this process much like that experienced by others in different contexts.

As stated in Chapter 6, Mr Darcy, is a soldier of both combat and post-conflict experience. He indicated that within his military experience there were important functions within the broader role of the military that can lead to situations in which alleviating fear is indeed a very necessary skill. Mr Darcy provided an insight into the peacekeeping or post-conflict policing functions that the military often perform. He highlighted points at which alleviating fear and establishing friendly authority were the key goals.

Mr Darcy strongly suggested that there was an incongruity between being an invading force one day and a protective force very shortly afterwards. This was indicative of the broad futility in attempting to alleviate the fears of a distrustful population as described on pages 146-147. This would appear true on both a societal level and on the situational level as Mr Darcy articulated. The act of forcibly apprehending an insurgent using military tactics, soldiers and weapons is both trying to give a show of force to the wrongdoers and, in the same instance, demonstrate protection for the rest of the population. These competing concepts seem to be fundamentally conflicted. So in relation to being feared, alleviating fear was a professional necessity but Mr Darcy came to realise it was situationally impossible. Mr Darcy saw himself as an object of fear. Importantly in this scenario, he perceived himself to have caused fear in people from whom he was not trying to elicit fear:

“What were they (the Iraqi people) supposed to think? 6 months earlier we’d bombed the shit out of Baghdad and rolled up in a tank. Now we’re keeping them safe? You’d be scared too. After seeing those kids I questioned myself. I didn’t feel good about little girls crying.”

Amongst all of the attempts to alleviate fear there is a limit to which the feared are able to control the expressive information they give. This is an important point that carries across all groups to a greater or lesser extent. Mr Darcy is not able to successfully express his desire to alleviate fear. This is because the connotation of his

appearance and manner cannot be managed sufficiently to remove the fear he sees in others. As Goffman (1959) suggests, we develop an expectation of the way people will behave based on a combination of setting, appearance and manner. In the process of trying to alleviate fear, there is a concerted effort from those that are feared to distance themselves from these expectations and thus, one of the potential causes of fear they perceive. This may be overcoming expectations based on gender, age, race, the body, a uniform, and/or the execution of a duty, or all of these things combined. In some situations this is an easier task than others. For example, Jam might be able to focus an interaction by engaging and articulating within a conversation in an everyday scenario. This becomes far more difficult when it may be trying to calm someone who has been abused, as was the case for Thelma and Louise. Or indeed, when in a peacekeeping role in a war zone, as Mr Darcy was above.

In the data presented within this Chapter and preceding ones, the variety of contexts for alleviating fear are wide ranging. In this pillar of fear, the importance of intension is clear. It is not only the desire to stop being feared, it is a conscious employment and adaptations to behaviour in order to achieve these ends. In this sense, there is a close relationship with that of purposeful fear. The strength of intension is equally as powerful, yet the desired outcomes are in opposition. Importantly, the dramaturgical tools to recognise the fear within an encounter are the same. Similarly, the expressive tools used in order to convey these intensions, regardless of the divergent desires therein, are also the same.

Competent Fear

‘Competent’ is a catch all term that can be used to describe those that provoke fear in the execution or service of their job. This pillar of fear is very much situated in the work-based contexts as examined by this thesis. It is important to explore this theme within the sample and it can be considered, in many ways, as a valid construct in itself. The pillars that have preceded this one (purposeful, accidental, and alleviating) can be considered within a personal *and* work-based context. This pillar of fear is unique in that it explicitly considers fear away from a solely personal perspective. It considers and moves the context of being feared towards understanding the

provocation of fear for reasons that can be deemed as outside of the personal, or guided by the execution of a duty or obligation.

Those that experience being feared within this pillar still interpret and make sense of their experience in very personal ways. Each of them interprets their place in the world in largely the same way as all participants do within the sample. They reflect on their gender, their age, their physical appearance, and their race. They are distinct in two important ways. First, the tools, powers, and resources at their disposal are different to others. In the case of bouncers, they have an obligation to their employer (and to the law) to ensure that the establishments they work at operate smoothly, within the rules of the night time economy and have power to deny entry and eject patrons from their premises. Police officers are able to execute all of the powers granted to their station as sworn warranted officers. This affords various allowances for arrest, detention, searching and violence to name some. Soldiers, when deployed in combat situations have the capacity to take life legally. They operate in the most extreme environments that humans can be exposed to. They are asked to, in the line of duty, perform acts of extreme violence and danger. They have the potential to lose their own life in the performance of their work-based role. Second, the intensions they have when eliciting fear in others in a work-based context, is driven by the duties and obligations of their role. This moves the context away from the personal and towards a goal which they may not have complete control over. They may be duty-bound by the same tools, powers, and resources that set them apart in the first place. As the data within this thesis will attest, they make decisions and use their own set of unique skills in the execution of their jobs. Yet in the execution of those jobs they represent something that is symbolic of something other than themselves to the observer. To put that into more Goffmanian language, the settings in which they are found, the appearance they present to onlookers, and the manner in which they conduct themselves are all part of the expressive information they display. Marry that to the roles and duties they need to perform, and you have the context and underlying intensions for the scenarios presented within this thesis and the justification for inclusion.

Using fear as a tool was a common theme within this research. This was never more evident than when the police officers used a show of strength. This was explained

variously by a number of officers in Chapter 5. Fear, as PC Fleming explained, was an essential element in gaining compliance. It was the looming spectre of violence that helped achieve this. The importance and usefulness of fear in a policing context was evident within many of the scenarios he described and, as he succinctly states:

“You are reliant on fear to get a positive result.”

This is an important element of this pillar of fear. The positive result he spoke of was one that is directly related to the execution of the policing role. In this sense, a positive result is compliance and fear enables compliance for this police officer. Fear is an essential tool for police officers in gaining control within a situation where they believe there to be a lack of control. Underlying all of the actions was the performance of a function to which PC Fleming is duty-bound to execute. The data in previous Chapters (particularly Chapters 5, 6, and 7) show the strong relationship to fear and compliance. It is a position that requires skill and an ongoing situational negotiation. That is true of both instilling fear and alleviating it in a work-based context. In situations where violence breaks out, for those within the competent fear pillar, this can represent a failure to gain control and, therefore, a failure to illicit fear appropriately.

The range of duties within the research was wide ranging. For example, much of Pink Fairy’s specific military experience involved him being the object of fear had very clear interactional objectives. These objectives would have been set out by a complex hierarchy and with clear goals. He would have received long term training and situational briefing before being allowed to execute his role in the field. As a Royal Marine he was required to capture and detain prisoners. He variously described this in Chapter 6 as ‘prisoner handling’ or ‘processing.’ There were a series of protocols that he was required to perform within these encounters:

“The point is, is that you um, you go through all of that and you think, you know, that is quite bad. Horrible things you do, like we would bet a dollar on who could make the first prisoner cry. Not nice but, you know, you make them really fearful. You wouldn’t hit them or anything like that but you’d ruffle them up and you’d make them know, you’d shout at them, you’d take things off them like their pictures and put them

to one side, of their family and stuff and they would think that they are going to see them again.”

Pink Fairy was given training for all elements of the protocol surrounding prisoner-of-war handling. The ‘processing’ of prisoners represents an encounter that is taking place in an environment in which Pink Fairy was able to control, to a certain extent, the spatial and temporal conditions in which the prisoner was kept. This competent and targeted use of fear is perhaps the most extreme example within the research but it typified this pillar of fear very well.

There are examples of those that provoke fear in the execution or service of their job within every participant from the police, bouncers, and soldiers groups. The scenarios with bouncers tend to be less extreme but they revolve around the management and use of fear within the execution of their role in much the same way. They have a role to perform and being feared is a tool deployed in the hopes of having an easier night. Mr Mental, a bouncer, indicated that observing a lack of fear was a precursor to a lack of compliance later in the night. He perceives fear to be synonymous with compliance:

“When I don’t sense fear, especially from the lads, I think ‘these are going to be trouble.’”

Wolverine related the symbolic elements of being a bouncer to being the starting points for gaining that control and compliance. Within Chapter 7, many of the bouncers expressed the various tools they had at their disposal. Many of these revolved around their ability to fight. Others reflected on the more subtle expressions of authority within their role, as Wolverine explained:

“There were several levels of how I would judge someone as a doorman. One was how they looked. One was how they talked. How they talk to me, yeah, at the end of the day, I am he doorman. I get to say yay or nay as to whether you get to come through the door of that bar and have a good time or whether you have to go away. If you talk to me like I am a piece of shit, and I am the person that gets to tell you to go away, how are you going to talk to the people in the bar? How are you going to talk

to the bar staff when all they do is sell you drinks? So if you already talk to me like I am an idiot, why would I want you in my establishment? Once you are inside, you are a problem. When you are at the door, you are not really a problem to me. I don't really care. You are not in the bar and I have lots of open space to work in, where I am not going to annoy people whilst throwing you out and you are not going to annoy people whilst being thrown out. When you get in, that is when you can be an issue to me. You have to dominate people when you are on the door. They have to know that you are in charge."

The importance of fear within the work-based context was underlined well within the research when the personal and the dutiful contexts were separated. For example, Mr Mental suggested:

"When it comes to people in general I don't want to be perceived like that. Fear is something I need on the door not in general."

Big Daddy, a bouncer, shared this thought and he too separated work and everyday life by the way that he behaved:

"My job is my job and my family is my family. When you are at work you change your whole persona. You change the way you talk to people, my voice goes a lot lower, my eyes become a lot wider apparently, you just, you know, I think it is the chest, the shoulders come up you know, you just have that blinkered vision. When I am with the Mrs and the kids I am just Dad."

This reflects the Goffmanian (1959) front stage/back stage as discussed previously. In the work-based context, the front stage performance is the bouncer with 'blinkered vision' and the audience are those from whom he is directly trying to elicit fear. The back stage to this work-based performance is at the point at which he is with his family and no such response is required or indeed, desired.

This guides the analysis neatly towards the idea that those within the competent fear pillar are often moving the attention away from the self and aligning it with a sense of duty. This is a key feature of the competent fear pillar. PC Leeds explained this well:

“Then you have what I represent; the police. He [a person he is dealing with] has obviously had a lot of dealings with the police and most of them have probably been bad. He’s also from London, I am aware that people don’t get on with police so well there; there is a lot of them-and-us atmosphere. So, I think the uniform would pose more of a risk than I would. By wearing it I represent something that perhaps he would not like. People are probably scared of the consequences.”

For PC Leeds and a number of the other officers, Richard and Johnson’s (2001) observation that the uniform of a police officer conveys the power and authority of the person wearing it would hold true in this situation and would have a direct impact on the way that both men engage in the encounter. Thelma and Louise both agreed:

“We know the uniform can be threatening. I am aware of that. I know people can be frightened of us.”

The uniform is a powerful, and visual, clue to the wearer’s authority, capability, and status (Richard and Johnson, 2001). Indeed, PC Fleming suggested that the presence of the uniform can be a beacon to which trouble is attracted:

“You could almost argue that sometimes people are more aggressive to you in uniform, just because out of uniform I don’t find myself in those situations. I don’t deal with drunk people when I’m out of uniform. I don’t deal with people that are at domestics. I don’t deal with people that want to fight other fans at football matches. I probably get more, I am more likely to be assaulted, in work than out of work because of the situations.”

The necessity of the tools, powers, and resources of those in the work-based contexts is clear.

Those falling under the competent fear pillar can externalise their fear inducing activities and justify it by way of duty-bound association. It could also be phrased as a duty-bound necessity in many cases. In this sense there is a lessened burden on them in other aspects of their daily lives. When they strip away that symbolism and when

they step away from the work contexts they are able to function in a different and separate context. A context that would then fall under a different pillar of fear.

The Dynamics of Being Feared

For those that experience being feared, these pillars of fear form part of an experience that can be played out on a daily basis. These pillars of fear do not exist independently of each other. There are areas that overlap and situations in which one pillar may be prominent at the start of an encounter and, depending on the context and their underlying purpose, another pillar may then take over. For example, a police officer finishes a shift in which they have needed to overcome an aggravated crowd at a football match. They get changed into their civilian clothes and make their way to their car. As they pay their car parking charge they realise that the person in front of them is fearful of them, giving furtive glances and clutching their bag closely to them. The officer decides to engage them in a focused conversation and employ fear alleviating actions, such as smiling, speaking softly, and exchanging pleasantries. As the evidence has demonstrated, there are situations in which all of the respondents within the research have engaged in at least 3 of the 4 pillars of fear. This shows that fear is an emotion around which those that are feared must manage with care.

Much of what defines the pillars of fear revolves around the polarity of intentions. For those that purposefully want to be feared there are methods and protocols that can be engaged in order to illicit that response. The resources available to each person can depend on their status as ascribed by their personal front (Goffman, 1959) or their position of authority. The importance of purpose is prevalent amongst all of the pillars of fear. So far, we have looked at purposeful fear, accidental fear, alleviating fear, and competent fear. Each of these pillars has a distinct relationship to purposefulness. It forms an important recognition of what is happening within an encounter, what they want to do about it, and how they proceed. For those situations in which people are accidentally feared, these contexts are in stark contrast to the purposeful pillar of fear. This can be the cause of a number of different feelings, actions and reactions on the part of the feared person. In some situations this would be the catalyst for immediate actions to find a remedy and alleviate the fear. For others, it is simply a recognition that the cause of the fear is the self and that it was not on purpose.

Understanding being feared and how that fear is attributed is very much dependent on the context of the encounter. This is the context in which the feared place themselves and the context in which they are placed by their audience. When these interactional expectations are mutually aligned, the result is fear that is in some ways predicted and in many ways understood. When they are misaligned fear is either not present at all or present and misunderstood by one or all of the interactants within the encounter. This is a point that will be returned to. Once that context is taken into account and the varied purposes are understood, the dynamics of being feared as described and demonstrated by the pillars of fear illuminate the grounds by which being feared is negotiated, managed and understood.

Chapter 11) Conclusion

There are a number of purposes for this concluding Chapter. The Chapter will revisit the main aims and objectives of this study and demonstrate how they were achieved. This will help to put into context what has been achieved and how the final comments relate to the original intentions of the research. Following this, the Chapter will also restate the original contribution to knowledge that this research has proffered. This helps to underscore the concluding remarks and situates the findings more appropriately within the wider field of research. This is followed by the three main areas of findings stemming from the empirical research for this thesis. Firstly, the importance of context, the self, desire, and duty is drawn together. This theme addresses the connection between fear and underlying contexts within which the feared are placed. This brings together the findings concerning symbolism and duties of work-based roles, alongside the expectations people have of the behaviour and intentions of others.

Following this, the conclusion discusses the processes of learning to be feared and how this is embodied. This theme distils the ways in which fear is recognised in others and how this is reflected in the self. Alongside this, the findings concerning the impact the body has on fearful encounters is better understood. It considers how racial identity can play a role in being feared but that the research findings require a less simplistic approach to understanding the experience. In this sense, it moves the research forward beyond existing thought.

The findings also consider the micro-dynamics of fear across the groups within the study and the themes that connect the experience of being feared together across contexts. The concluding remarks consider four pillars of being feared as borne out within the data. Initially, findings concerning the purposeful causing or augmentation of fear in others within encounters is explained. Then, the accidental causing of fear is discussed. Following this, the dynamics of alleviating fear within an encounter is explained. Then the conclusion looks at the competent use of fear in situations with specific duty-related goals. This Chapter will also explain the successes of the research process, including the specific parts of the methodology. Finally, the areas

for further investigation following the findings of this research will be addressed in detail.

Revisiting the Aims and Objectives

It is appropriate at this juncture to revisit and briefly explain the way the main aims and objectives were achieved within this study. First, was to understand the micro-dynamics of fear from the perspective of those who are perceived by the public and in communities as potential offenders, as 'fearsome' and 'intimidating'. The study adopted a strategic sampling strategy and specifically sought those people that recognised and related to the experience of being feared. This was achieved by looking across multiple academic disciplines in order to understand who and what people are afraid of and in what contexts this is most prevalent. Having appropriately selected people with direct experience of being feared, the specifically designed research instruments assisted in eliciting answers to key thematic questions. These questions considered specific details of the encounters, of how fear was recognised, and in which encounters fear was present. Inherent in these thematic questions was to understand the signals, cues and behaviours that inform an individual that they are feared. The research was successful in acquiring detailed accounts of the experience of being feared, and was able to marry the analysis of expressive information via Goffman (1959) and Mead (1934) with the accounts of those who had experienced being feared, in both the most mundane and the most extreme contexts.

The second aim was to research into how being feared feeds into perceptions of identity, threat and fear and how these perceptions shape the actions of those that perceive themselves to be feared. This research, having sought to understand the micro-dynamics of fear has also, by having this aim, explored the way that being feared shapes action within an encounter. This is born out in one of the major findings of this research. For some, fear is a desired outcome within particular encounters. At times it is present without effort. At other points there are actions and behaviours, which are employed to elicit a fear response. For others, noticing fear within an encounter is unwanted or accidental and tactics and protocols are employed to avoid or assuage the fear perceived in others. Being feared in some cases was a frequent occurrence in their everyday lives. For others, being feared was part of a process of

managing fear in a work-related capacity. The research successfully addressed this aim by being able to explore issues of identity and ensuing action from a wide range of contexts. For some, the feared identity was a deeply personal matter, which caused them to question their place in the world. It also caused them to question the judgements of those around them. For others, being feared was a constituent part of their working lives. It was an emotion to be managed for the purposes of a more effective performance within the duties of their job.

The third aim of this research was to understand how these actions and perceptions are shaped at the point of interaction as well as the possible long-term impacts on those individuals that experience being feared. The research has successfully demonstrated the impact of being feared over long periods of time and in specific scenarios. It has also explored the perceptions that groups and individuals form of others at the point of interaction. The behaviours and actions of others help to shape an ongoing impression of the self and of the wider world. This, as far as being feared is concerned, can lead to the expectation of fear from others within encounters. It can also lead to the ongoing and long-lasting adaptation of behaviours. This can be in a personal context as well as a work-related one. It can also be inherent in the desire to cause fear in others or alleviate it. The research found that the frequent exposure to being feared allows that feared person to use a deployable set of protocols to manage the fear they see around them. Being feared is dependent on the context of the encounter. This is the context in which the feared place themselves and in which they are placed by their audience. When these interactional expectations are mutually aligned, the result is fear that is in some ways predicted and in many ways understood. When they are misaligned fear is either not present at all or present and misunderstood by one or all of the interactants within the encounter. This research has successfully shown a broad range of contexts from which unique characteristics have been drawn out alongside larger thematic areas.

Fourth, to understand the role that fear plays in the production/maintenance of order within personal and/or work-based encounters. This research has explored the aim in detail and this is reflected in the findings. The design and recruitment was explicitly targeted to researching experiences of being feared in a variety of contexts and these included work-based scenarios. This has helped to successfully explore the way in

which fear is used in a work-based capacity and used to achieve outcomes that the feared person is duty-bound to perform. The importance of these duties has also shaped the way in which those people understand the causes of this fear and their justification for using it. All of the aims and objectives within this research have endeavoured to investigate a circumscribed and under-researched area within the field of fear of crime. In an area of research that appears saturated (Lee and Farrall, 2009) this research has been able to offer and achieve succinct aims with an innovative interpretation of the experience of fear. Therefore, it is also necessary to revisit its original contribution to knowledge.

The Original Contribution to Knowledge

It is important to restate what the intended original contribution to knowledge has been for this research thesis. This serves two purposes. The first purpose is to connect the final remarks of the thesis alongside the original aims and intended contribution at the beginning. The second purpose is to place these original contributions alongside the key findings from this study and to link these findings with the possibility of further work in the field.

As stated in Chapter 1, an investigation into the perspective of the feared is not an entirely new endeavour. It has been considered from a life experience/life narrative perspective (Ellis, 1995; Kelley, 1988) and has been situated within the wider fear of crime literature (Day, 2009). This research has added to the field of fear of crime. It has contributed to the understanding of being feared in three distinct and original ways. Firstly, the research took a micro-sociological approach to the phenomenon of being feared. This allowed the research to be based on interpretative analysis rather than statistical or empirical observation, and shares close association with the philosophy of phenomenology (Goffman, 1974). It is focused on the nature of everyday human interaction and agency on a small scale (Goffman, 1974). This guided the research towards its chosen methodology, its sample and also guided the formation of the research instruments. This focus allowed the research to understand the dynamics of fearful encounters in a way that has yet to be fully understood. The second original contribution was the decision to use a Goffmanian conceptual

framework within the research. This follows on directly from the micro-sociological exploration and helps to situate and frame the area of research. By using Goffman the research was able to frame the moments when people meet, face-to-face and define the context in which being feared is realised and understood. This guided the focus of the data collection and focused the participants on recounting the specific details of their experiences. The third contribution concerns the breadth of contexts and experiences within the sample used within this research. It differs significantly from previous work concerning this perspective as stated in Chapter 1. Ellis (1995) and Kelly (1988) offer personal accounts of being feared. Day (2009) completed a qualitative study of university age males. This study has been designed to explore the experience of being feared from a wider group of people in age, gender, race, physical size and occupation. The breadth of context has allowed the research to explore the similarities and differences in the experience of being feared from the mundanity of everyday encounters to the fighting of insurgency in Afghanistan. This third contribution, with its consideration of a broader array of contexts in everyday interactions, is more wide-ranging than has been achieved within the field to-date. This has been achieved by designing the research to sample and understand aspects of the work-based and everyday experiences of being feared. Fear, within an interaction, can be exacerbated by deeper symbolic and social meanings. Individuals can assign the causal factors of perceived fear towards the requirements of their dutiful endeavours rather than to personal characteristics. By exploring a wider range of people and occupations the study can understand the significance of these factors on the experience of being feared in a way that has not been done before.

a) Research Findings and Future Directions

This section will cover a number of areas to conclude the thesis. The key research findings will be outlined explicitly. First, the importance of context will be explained. This section will outline how the context in which someone experiences being feared shapes their understanding of the process, how fear is attributed, and the rationale and justifications they have for their ensuing actions. Here the distinct elements of each of the groups within the research are concluded. This allows for the unique contexts of being feared to be drawn out. In doing so, it allows for the connected themes to be explored thereafter. Second, the embodiment of fear is concluded. This draws

together an overarching theme within the experience of being feared in a fleeting encounter by highlighting the importance of the body. In doing so, it allows for the connections between each of the groups to highlight the importance of Goffman's personal front and the ways in which the presentation of self has an impact on the way that we are perceived by those around us. Third, this research has found four distinctive elements inherent in the micro-dynamics of being feared – pillars of fear. The final elements of the explicit research findings are concluded here. These elements are concerned with the presence of fear within an interaction and the ways in which those who experience being feared understand and act upon it. There were strong thematic connections between the groups, and the pillars of fear reflect these connections. In conjunction with the importance of context and the body this highlights the key areas that contribute to fear of crime more broadly.

The Importance of Context – The self, the desire, and the duty

Being feared was understood and used differently between the groups within this research depending on the different contexts in which these encounters took place. However, being feared has a thematic thread, which connects these experiences. Explanations of what caused fear, justifications for its use and the processes of its management moved from the extreme to the mundane. Those that are feared speak to the contexts to which they most relate. It reflects how they see themselves and how they organise and frame (Goffman, 1959) their experiences. This is a simple yet profound finding. Reflections of being feared centre on self and the purpose and context of presence within an encounter. Resulting desires (causing fear, alleviating fear) can be both personally assigned and/or linked to the duty to which they are dedicated. It is within this finding that the selection of the research groups is of the greatest use.

For some groups within the sample, the police, soldiers and bouncers, the perceptions of being feared are inextricably linked with the context of their roles. Whilst being feared is still instilled and understood by the individuals involved and attributed to their presence within an encounter, there is a wider context to consider. When being feared was experienced in a work-based context the interaction was ascribed a special meaning. This special meaning demonstrated that there is a backdrop of legitimacy

and an entitlement to cause fear in certain situations and a need to remove it in others. This was dependant on the demands of the situation and the relevant duty. Fear within these interactions is a consequence of a specific duty with a specific aim. It shapes the purpose, intensions, actions and justifications of those individuals within such encounters. For those that experience being feared within a work-based context, the management of fear is a necessary and acquired skill that can be deployed to uphold the law, maintain order and/or procure information.

This research found that fear in a work-based context was used in a particular way. Within the wider understanding of being feared in this context is the connection between fear, the threat/use of violence and the justifications for violence. The police officers in Chapter 5 understand that they represent authority and are entrusted with official insignia of rank (Goffman, 1959), powers, tools and resources to reflect this. This knowledge prefaces each encounter they have. They have the capacity to threaten and engage in legally sanctioned violence. They have the capacity to deprive an individual of their freedom. This special context changes the nature of the interactions they have and changes an individual's capacity to manage fear within an interaction. For the police officers, it is the knowledge that they have the ability to threaten and use force that allows them to manage fear successfully. There was some variation as to whether fear was interpreted as a by-product of the dissemination of their duty or as a deliberate intension within a policing action. What was not contested was the usefulness of being able to cause fear and how that related to a successful policing outcome. The use of fear within encounters for the police was justified and externalised against the broader position as a police officer and the inherent aims of their position. For the police, fear was a tool to be deployed whenever necessary. Much in the same way as violence would be, should the situation require it. Equally, when fear needed to be alleviated, the justification for this was also driven by the need for a successful policing outcome.

Bouncers employed techniques and tactics in order to obtain and maintain order in certain situations. The research shows that fear plays a large part in this process. In this respect there are undoubtedly similarities that can be drawn with the police. However, the order of the night-time economy is based on a less formal set of rules than that of the police. In short, the tools, powers and resources are different to those

of the police. Equally, the mandate of their roles is necessarily narrower and the demands upon them can reflect this. This changes the dynamics of the interactions they have and the authority they can assume to have. As already stated, the potential for violence, the concept of 'toughness' and the presence of 'muscle' are intrinsic to the profession (Hobbs et al, 2002; Monaghan, 2002). For the bouncers, the body plays a key role in their ability to control others and maintain order. Much in the same way as the police, the spectre of violence is never far away. The reasons and methods of violence at the disposal of the bouncers are necessarily different. The aims of their role are far smaller than that of the police and the powers bestowed upon them less universal. However, within each encounter they have within their capacity as a bouncer, the use and justification of fear is to achieve a satisfactory outcome for their place of employ. They are able to manage fear within these encounters by using their bodies, the threat of violence, their verbal pacification techniques and, even their charm. All are part and parcel of the job and underpinned by a duty to the role they are performing.

For the soldiers, the use of fear was again required within their role. By the nature of the circumstances in which they were placed, the prospect of lethal violence was very real. The knowledge and use of fear within their roles as soldiers was trained and expected. The techniques used to instil fear, particularly in prisoner handling, were practiced and had a specific aim. This aim was both the cause of fear and its justification. Equally, in the process of peacekeeping, the cause of being feared was because of what being a soldier in those circumstances symbolically represented. Being feared in this sense was unwanted, but it was a direct product of a professional endeavour. Failure to engage effectively with that role could have resulted in a large loss of life and, therein, lay justifications for being feared and its relationship with the aims of the profession. In some ways the tools, powers and resources of the soldiers within the sample were more far-reaching than that of the police and the bouncers. The ends by which they could achieve their means within their work-related context are far more extreme. In this sense the frames (Goffman, 1959) by which they organise and understand their experience of being feared are unique.

When being feared is experienced in a non-work-based context, perceptions of identity, threat and fear were not coupled with a professional goal or a sense of duty.

Within the sample, for groups such the gym-goers, students and young people, the perceptions of being feared are inextricably linked within the context of the self. Responses to being feared were a mixture of action, inaction, annoyance and sadness. In light of this, for the non-work-based, understanding being feared was attributed differently when experienced in these contexts. The judgements, behaviours and actions of others were considered on a far more personal level. They lacked the fall-back of a work-based role or sense of duty in helping to understand, externalise and rationalise the fear they sensed in others. The responsibility and causes of being feared were primarily centred on the individual. Thus, the management of fear took on different meanings but was nonetheless necessary within these groups.

For the gym-goers in Chapter 8, this was understandably focused on the body. In some scenarios, this fear was invited and in others not. The gym goers moved from environments where their bodies were developed and understood, to a space in which they would be feared and reacted to differently. In the gym-goer's context, the body represents a symbolic barrier in the management of interpersonal fear. It can be both a tool for harm and a shield in the process of managing fear in observers. Those people that are aware that their body causes a fearful reaction navigate this within many encounters and many different spaces and social contexts. The body is both help and hindrance, they can intimidate, coerce and console depending on the circumstances. There are also audiences whose fear is beyond their control. The experience of being feared for the gym-goers is a balancing act – but it is an act that is always prefaced by the connotations derived by others of their appearance. Fearful encounters experienced by those with a muscular physique represent a balancing act between causing fear within a selected and appropriate audience and alleviating fear within an audience whose fear is accidental or unintentionally generated. This balancing act is played out between the context of being able to protect the self and desires to be able to protect others and to pass through life feeling less personally threatened. Each of these is prefaced within the context of the body and its capacity for violence. The importance of the corporeal elements of being feared are played out in more specific detail shortly. As we will see, the body and its various symbolic expressions is a key finding in its own right within this research.

For the young people and students, being feared was attributed to a wide range of factors to do with their age, gender, race, attitude, behaviour, social background and/or choice of clothing – essentially a defining list of Goffman's (1959) personal front. Likewise, in some scenarios being feared was invited and others not. The causes for fear posited were a varied list. Identities were shaped by their attempts to deny, rationalise, accommodate and resist being feared by strangers in public places. The importance of these exchanges mattered at the micro-scale to the individuals involved but also helped to shape their impression of the world on a macro-scale. The young people and students could move from an environment in which they were surrounded by peers to one in which they were suspected of criminal intent. The experience of being feared was heavily dependent on the context in which their audience viewed them (Goffman, 1959). It is to this extent that the young people and students moved from safe to unsafe identities frequently (Day, 2009). This is a group of whom the judgements, stereotypes, their place in the world, and their understanding of the world around them are developing. This being so, the meaning they derive from encounters can set an expectation of others and from others. Young people and students will often be viewed as part of a larger group, of which expectations of danger and criminality are assigned. This by-passes the individual characteristics of which they have often espoused. This is as true of their interactions outside of their age groups as well as within. Thus, they represent a group of people who can simultaneously live on both sides of fear. They are fearful and they are feared. The students and young people within their interviews divulged far more frequently their own fears alongside that of being feared. They use fear and their growing dramaturgical awareness for offensive and defensive purposes. They evolve from unknowing individuals to knowing individuals in their use and understanding of fear and its management within everyday interactions. The students and young people group quickly evolve an understanding of fear which remains relevant for the rest of their lives and can shape their understanding of their place in the social world for some time to come.

The context of fear for students and young people is very much one of growing awareness and transition. The range of experiences they draw on is limited compared to other groups of feared people. However, within their own context the existence of

fear is relatively new and so the process of learning and adapting to this newly acquired feared status is a sharp one.

Fear was recognised and acted upon by all participants and represents the range of experiences possible for the feared. The relationship between these groups can be understood as a relationship of fear and control. For some, fear was related to control as a work-based necessity. A lack of control implies a lack of success within those encounters. For those in non-work-related contexts this control represented an interactional agency. Their ability to control the communicative presentation of self (Goffman, 1959), made the process of rationalising and understanding the experience of being feared a more achievable one. In all contexts of being feared, there is a process of learning and adapting. This is a constant companion as the ingredients of each and every encounter needs to be understood on its own merits. This involves assessing the context of an encounter and coming to realisations about the position they hold within it.

Being feared, as understood by those that experience it, is linked to the context of the encounter. This is the context in which the feared place themselves and the context in which they are placed by their audience. When these interactional expectations are mutually aligned, the result is fear that is in some ways predicted and in many ways understood. When they are misaligned fear is either not present at all or present and misunderstood by one or all of the interactants within the encounter. For the police, the soldiers and the bouncers, the interactions are always framed by and within their professional endeavours. Their understanding of fear is linked and attributed to their position and their role. Whilst characteristics of their person were of note, it was never the primary reason they attributed to being feared. In their work-based encounters they were noticing, causing and alleviating fear precisely because they had a function to perform. For example, the police officer's experience of being feared was rarely in a context in which they were not recognisable to an audience as a police officer. For the gym-goers, students and young people the first framing point for experience was always inward. Thus, their experience of being feared was always a context in which the ensuing actions were something to which they have agency. This is regardless of whether fear was purposeful or accidental. If they perceive fear and they attribute it to themselves, all remaining actions or inactions are within their

control. The way in which the expressive information is absorbed by those that are feared is of enormous importance. It can inform their ongoing action and can frame how they perceive themselves moving forward. This process of attribution can be directed towards the self, reflected in need or desire, and can be externalised to the requirements of duty.

The Embodiment of fear - Learning to be feared

Physical appearance and fear was a strong common thread from within the research. It was reflected in the reasons for attributing fear, in the literal and the symbolic sense, as well as in the description of those most likely to be fearful. The physical presence of individuals, their actions and their reactions all build towards understanding physical appearance as a core area of understanding the experience of being feared. There are two key findings to conclude within this section. Firstly, understanding the experience of being feared involves being able to recognise that others are fearful. This involves knowing and identifying fear and learning the circumstances under which it happens. It is a process via which the feared person learns of their status through the actions and reactions of others. They learn how to understand reactions to their presence and their body. Secondly, understanding how to use and make sense of this interactional information and what it means for the feared person. There are broad conclusions that can be drawn here, but this concluding remark will focus on the impact of Goffman's personal front and the importance of the corporeal elements of being feared.

This research has shown that being feared has a great deal to do with appearance. This is both in a more literal sense and within a more detailed and nuanced Goffmanian one. This has been a key ingredient within each of the research groups. This needs to consider the appearance of a feared person and what facets of their appearance could be fear-causing. It also needs to consider the appearance of the fearful and what cues and signals are communicated, which inform of their fear. By considering the data alongside the help of the Goffmanian conceptual frame, it has been possible to understand that the communicative power of appearance is a conduit through which expressive information is given and received. Dramaturgical meaning is concerned with the inexorable expressive link between discursive (language, speech) and non-

discursive (clothing, hairstyle, gestures) (Brissett and Edgley, 1990) communication. Meaning within an interaction is not restricted to verbal communication. It considers both the importance of discourse (Mead, 1934) and the importance of appearance (Stone, 1986). A person's appearance, via non-discursive communication, can be enough to infer fear (see for example Madriz, 1997). When fearful people have described the appearance and characteristics of the people whom they fear this can be manifest with or without the addition of discursive communication within the encounter.

All groups within this research were aware of the cues and signals of fear in others. Descriptions of these signals ranged from the subtle to extremely detailed. There was a degree of certainty within the groups about their experiences and about the fear they perceived in others. So this elucidates the importance of the expressive nature of the body on both sides of a fearful interaction. Visual descriptions of action and behaviours of fear, included a lack of eye contact, furtive and worried glances, visible shaking, cowering and backing away, compliance to command, cessation of resistance and even bowel evacuation. Audible descriptions of fear included shaky or breaking voices and profanity and excessive apologising/speed of speech. There was also an awareness of eliminating elements of encounters, which might lead to fear as a justifiable reaction. Importantly, accounts of being feared included an awareness of time of day, number of people around and the location of the encounter. This situated their understanding of exactly the role they played in the production of fear within encounters.

This research has also established that understanding the role of appearance is integral to understanding being feared. Chapter 8 specifically focuses on the importance of the body in causing fear but references to the body are not limited to this Chapter. Chapters 5, 7 and 9 have references to the body and its role in being feared. Physical size and the potential or proclivity for engaging in violence was commonly expressed as causes for being feared. The importance of the process of growing up and the impact this has on being feared was also drawn out from the findings. Being feared was an identity that could be grown into alongside an increasing level of suspicion from others, which was synonymous with the process of aging. This was especially true of those in Chapter 9. Likewise, the symbolism inherent in the clothing choices

of feared people is also important. As Goffman suggests (1959), it can communicate social status, like gang associations in Chapter 9, or office of state as in Chapter 5. It can also communicate financial status, age or even religious affiliation. The experience of being feared is a process by which these symbols of appearance are learnt, understood and used. This is both as symbols received by the fearful and given by the feared.

The impact of racial identity is an important feature for being feared for those that identified this as a context of importance within their experiences. It was a feature understood and rationalised differently by the participants. In this sense, the findings concerning racial identity and being feared are broadly aligned with that of Day (2009). In situations where race is identified as a cause of fear, the participants articulated having an 'outsider' status. This reflected both on their own impressions of racial identity and on their assessment of their audience. In light of this, what this 'outsider' status meant and how it was understood varied. The impact of race in causing fear was not a specifically gender related issue within this study. This was the case for the people who experienced being feared or from the people from whom they perceived fear. Those that identified race as a cause of fear identified fear in men, women and younger people. This research is focused on the experience of being feared and, thus, race should be understood in these terms. For some, race was a determining factor in their experiences and involved moving from safe to unsafe identities (Day, 2009) as already suggested. This research has found that the situations in which there is potential for fear to be caused by race is not static. As audiences change, perceptions of any 'outsider' status would change accordingly. This research has uncovered the process of learning what the impact of racial identity on being feared has. This is particularly evident in Chapter 9 in the way the students and young people navigate their racial identities (among other identities simultaneously navigated) in explaining the fear of others. Interpretations of the impact of race are constantly evolving from this group. The research shows that it is during their teens and twenties that identities with fear are at their most pronounced and are negotiated, as they find their place in the world and learn and adapt to the barriers of being feared within interactions.

Where these research findings differ to previous research is by placing the conceptual emphasis on wider contexts and narratives and thus developing a broader outlook on appearance beyond that of binary grouping or broad attribution of causes. That is to say, to those that did not highlight race as a contributing factor to their fearsomeness, there needed to be another area of their person to which fear was attributed. This was an important addition to the field and the Goffmanian framework was the tool through which this was understood. By adapting an understanding of Goffman's personal front there was a wider pallet of physically expressive information that could be considered and analysed. As a number of the participants were at pains to point out within Chapters 9 and 10, for them there was not one factor to consider in the experience of being feared. It was a multitude of factors (clothing, age, style of walk, use of language, body shape, behaviour). These were identified alongside, or in the absence of, racial characteristics. So, in order to understand being feared, the attribution of cause should not be over simplified. Narrowing the endeavour to one component of the self (no matter how significant) was not borne out within the data for this research.

To underline the importance of the body and appearance within the experience of being feared, it is worth returning to the fundamental framing of the encounter as set out in the early stages of this research. That also means a return to the parameters set out with the conceptual framework. As many of the accounts within the data suggest, there is one immovable implicit fact that in order to understand being feared, it is important to observe. That it is not only a spatial or temporal concern but one that includes a living object of fear – a person. The corporeal themes between the groups help to amplify the importance of the object in this experience. Goffman's *Encounters* (1961) conceptualised an area of specific interaction that metaphorically frames a situation within which it is possible to analyse fleeting encounters. Here the personal perceptions of specific interactions have created the experiences on which this research has engaged and analysed. The participants have given their own meaning, attributed cause, applied reason and described and structured these experiences. The participants of each group have, for obvious reasons, focused on their own circumstances when making sense of the world around them. They see, report, legitimise and make sense of the world through their own eyes. In doing this, the

study has highlighted the nuances of each group and each individual in turn and how being feared relates to them and their lives.

The Micro-Dynamics of Being Feared – Pillars of fear

This research has found four distinctive elements inherent in the micro-dynamics of being feared. They are considered within these findings and termed as pillars of fear. These pillars are concerned with the presence of fear within an interaction and the ways in which those who experience being feared understand and act upon it. They are *purposeful fear*; *accidental fear*; *alleviating fear*; and *competent fear*. These micro-dynamic features of being feared were experienced across each of the groups. As has been demonstrated when highlighting the importance of context, being feared can be understood and used differently between the groups. However, linking all of the nuances and details of each of the groups and their inherent contexts, was their common relationship to these pillars.

First, comes the concept of purposeful fear within an interaction. This concerns the actions and behaviours of those that want to encourage or augment fear in others. The research defines purposeful fear as the purposeful actions of an actor within an encounter to instil fear in another within an everyday encounter. Second, this section turns to those circumstances in which fear has been caused accidentally. Accidental fear can be caused in others by an individual with no intention to instil fear whatever. Yet it is noticed and attributed to the self. The choice of action or inaction thereafter is dependent on a number of factors. Third, this section considers those that actively engage in measures to alleviate and reduce the fears of others. This alleviating fear dynamic considers the actions of those whom have caused fear accidentally and seek to remove it. It also considers the steps taken to avoid encounters in which fear is expected. Here we can consider both observed fear and the prediction of fear in others. The final pillar is competent fear. It is called as such because it represents a link to competent authority when experiencing being feared. Fear experienced in this pillar carries different intensions and symbolic meanings. It is unique in that it considers and moves the context of being feared towards understanding the provocation of fear for reasons that can be deemed as outside of the personal and instead guided by the execution of a duty or obligation.

The first pillar of fear is purposeful fear. This research has shown multiple instances of purposeful fear within the interactions explained and described by the participants. It refers to the actions and behaviours of those that desire fear within an interaction and want to encourage or augment fear in others. The research findings show that for this pillar of fear, being feared was both a defensive and offensive phenomena. It was a way of passing easily through crowds, getting their way in confrontations and avoiding confrontation and interaction altogether. In these instances, the research findings show that these encounters were considered as positive when those that are feared felt they were in control of the impression that was transmitted. This was particularly clear within the gym-goers. With the young people and students of Chapter 9 there was a similar understanding of the purposeful use of fear as an offensive and defensive tool. For some, it was a means of assimilating and avoiding victimisation. This was achieved by adopting particular forms of dress, ways of communicating and even ways of walking. Encouraging fear in others was also a means of defiance, of self-expression and independence and social and financial gain. The benefits of being feared were particularly pronounced for those students and young people who had transitioned from a position of vulnerability to one of relative power when in control of fear. For some, being feared was a desired response within an encounter. It was a response that was encouraged and, in some cases, was enjoyed.

For those that experience being feared, there was a sense that, as might be expected, the purposeful causing or augmentation of fear was coupled with a sense that this process was controllable and that they were in a position to manipulate it. Chapter 8 showed that the gym-goers were able to cause fear in certain settings and it was a desired outcome. This was important in a gym setting specifically but had benefits in wider public spaces. In order to understand the purposeful fear pillar, there is something inescapable that must be present in order for it to be realised. It is simply a desire to be feared. This is not something that is ever-present – it can be as fleeting as the encounter itself - but at some level and within some interactions there is a desire to be feared and they know how to go about acquiring it.

This is in stark contrast to the second pillar of fear within the research. The research found circumstances in which fear was caused accidentally. There are many examples

within the chapters of fear being noticed in others by an individual with no intention to instil fear whatsoever. The way in which this was understood and attributed was more varied. In Chapter 5, the police equated accidental fear to unfamiliarity with contact with the police. This was attributed to both the symbolic (and actual) power the police possess and the expectations the fearful people have of the intentions of the police. For the police, the existence of accidental fear was not an unhelpful situation professionally. In fact, it indicated a degree of specific work-based control without the need to engage in behaviours or actions to augment fear (competent fear). In Chapter 6, the soldiers had a very specific example of when they were feared accidentally. This was a very complex encounter involving a prisoner extraction and school children. Here, the intentions of the peacekeeping force were observed and interpreted by an unintended audience (Goffman, 1959). The expressive signals and behaviours of the soldier in question was, in no-doubt, fear inducing. However, school children, rather than insurgents observed this performance and the reaction was akin to what would be desired or expected from such actions but from entirely the wrong audience. Due to the fact that all of the work-based groups within the study are identifiably so, the reactions, meanings and expectations of their status derived by their audience (Goffman, 1959) can always be counter to the impression they want to be able to transmit. In such cases, they will be accidentally feared and it may be outside of their control.

In Chapters 8 and 9 the findings show that with the gym-goers, the students and young people, the realisation of being accidentally feared holds different connotations. The dynamics are not framed by work-based endeavour and the implications upon the individuals that experience it from these groups can be more personally significant. In short, being feared accidentally for many can be interpreted as an assumption of criminal or nefarious intent. When deliberate action is not employed and the rationale for fear is difficult to fathom, this is the point at which introspection is more likely. Accidentally being feared is then understood by means of recognising physical, age, gender and racial difference. This is intertwined with the judgements they perceive other people to be making of them and the assumptions they make of the reactions they observe. Or as Goffman (1959) would suggest, it is the process of establishing meaning within the act of giving and receiving expressive information.

The third pillar of fear covers the process of alleviating the fear of others within an encounter. The research found that in order to accomplish this, it is important that being feared is recognised in the first instance. There were examples of reactions to alleviating fear from all of the groups within this study. In Chapters 5, 6 and 7 the examples of alleviating fear were all linked to dutiful endeavours. The police in particular engaged in measures to alleviate the fears of people they came into contact with. This process involved identifying the cause of fear and employing measures to remove it from the encounter. At times, these measures involved removing the symbols of power and narrowing the barrier between police officer and civilian. These reactions represent an attempt to redress the balance of power within the interaction that, for the police, is the core cause of being feared. However, the process and motivation for alleviating fear is still inextricably linked with the work-based goals and a successful policing outcome as mentioned earlier. These goals and the management of fear are inclusive of the victims of crime as well as perpetrators. The dynamics of alleviating fear can be subtle and simple such as removing insignia or uniform. As will be discussed shortly with the gym-goers, students and young people, a smile and a minor adjustment of manner (Goffman, 1959) can alleviate the perception of fear within an encounter. For the bouncers, their duty extends far beyond the control and filtering of the unruly and undesirable. It also extends to their venue's ability to welcome paying patrons. To this extent, upon noticing unwanted fear in customers, the bouncers are duty bound to notice fear and react accordingly.

The research found that alleviating fear was more difficult in different contexts. In Chapter 8, the experience and tendency within the gym-goers to alleviate the fear of others was polarised. Being feared was still recognised and attributed to the body but there were differences in the willingness to engage in behaviours that would alleviate these fears. As suggested in Chapter 8, the gym-goers are unable to appear different within an interaction. In order to engage in the process of alleviating fear they must adopt specific strategies. For the gym-goers this ranged from a verbal apology (or another form of focused interaction) or, as was suggested, 'a white person smile', a smile, so-called because of its deliberate attempt to appear non-threatening. The most important things here, in terms of research findings, is the universality of this pillar across the contexts of fear.

The alleviating fear pillar is, in part, a reaction garnered from an expectation of fear within an encounter. This research found that for the gym-goers there was a need to alter the perception or barrier created by the body. In Chapter 9, the students and young people's ability to alleviate fear was dependent on their ability to notice fear in others. Chapter 9 discusses a transition from unfeared to feared identities (Day, 2009) and the necessity to alleviate fear is linked to this. Those that are aware of being feared over the course of time were able to develop a sense of whom fear could be expected from. This enabled the students and young people to engage in measures to alleviate fear and learn to react to its presence. This was through a process of recognising the signs of fear and distrust over time. Some attempts to address the issue were met with negative outcomes and, for those individuals it was a reinforcement of their feared status. Certain techniques were elucidated, such as scraping a foot to alert people of their presence. Reactions to, and expectations of fear were common amongst the research groups. This study found that much of the engagement in alleviating fear was to dissociate from wrongfully perceived intent – an activity many within this group felt they were suspected of. This study found that for people this pillar, alleviating fear required breaking visual barriers. This could be achieved on occasion by asking simple questions and engaging in a more focused encounter (Goffman, 1959). The important finding for the research here is the potential polarity of intension. The same people that desired fear within an encounter are able to recall and describe situations in which they did not want fear within an encounter. In either happenstance, those that experience fear are inclined to actively engage in the management of the fear they perceive in order to achieve a desired outcome, whatever that outcome might be.

The final pillar of fear is the competent pillar. The competent pillar of fear is unique in that it explicitly considers fear away from a solely personal perspective. It considers and moves the context of being feared towards understanding the provocation of fear for reasons that can be deemed as outside of the personal or guided by the execution of a duty or obligation. This sets this pillar apart in both context and the extent to which the tools, powers and resources of causing fear in this context are trained, augmented and driven by duty. It is this pillar that helps to truly

set this research apart from those that have worked in the field to date. Those that engage in competent fear are underpinned by the legitimacy of their actions.

In Chapter 5, the police demonstrated that fear within an encounter and the ability to manage it was a process by which they were able to maintain control. Research findings show that the use of fear was a key tool to the policing process. Being feared in these circumstances can be augmented with an escalation of powers and the threat of violence and/or arrest. The existence and maintenance of fear equated to situational control and the compliance of those they interacted with. In Chapter 6, the soldiers demonstrated that purposefully induced fear was an essential ingredient in procuring information in the handling of prisoners. These were purposeful, specific and designed processes in which fear is controlled from the start. Every element of the interaction between the soldier and the prisoner was controllable in a way that was not replicated amongst any other group. In the case of prisoner handling, control was assumed (the prisoner is captive) and fear was the purpose of the interaction. This was an extreme example of formal training in the process of causing fear. It was trained, targeted and applied. There is a degree of professional competence within the actions of this pillar of fear.

In Chapter 7, the bouncers demonstrated their keenness to project authority and maintain order. Similarly to the police, this was through the threat and use of violence. The use of threats was supported by the rules of the establishment and the consequences to the revellers of breaking them. The research showed with this group that the capacity to augment feelings of fear in others increased with experience and skill levels. This reduced the need and the desire to engage in acts of violence. This process would not be possible without the purposeful engagement in protocols to cause fear.

The research has shown within this pillar of fear, specific examples concerning the execution of deliberate tactics to gain control via fear where none had been present. This cannot be described as an augmentation or supplementation of fear. Instead, in instances of crowd control or public order, compliance was gained through a process of increasing threat in stages to the point where an affective barrier of confrontation tension/fear was created (Collins, 2009) over which people were not prepared to

transgress. This shows an awareness that the application of tactics, which will likely result in fear, are necessary. Similarly, in Chapter 7, the bouncers suggested a lack of fear within some patrons indicating the potential for trouble later in the night. In these instances, convincing people of the futility of attempting to resist their authority involved managing fear and managing expectations of violent outcomes. This was understood to be the point at which diplomacy fails and threats increase. It is at this point that the threat of force to elicit fear (and therefore control) and the need to actually use force are at their closest. Key to this process was the need for the bouncers to add fear into encounters because it was considered a problem if it was not present. The key finding for this research is to relate the management of fear to their duty and obligation. It relates to a process by which a level of control or dominance is assessed and deemed to be necessary. At which point, processes and protocols are employed in order to competently instil fear and gain control. The research finds that the management of fear and being feared are integral to this process. Equally integral for this pillar is that any justification for the employment of the tools, powers and resources that cause fear are demonstrable, repeatable and necessary in the execution of the role of the feared person.

Successes of the Research Process

There are many parts of this research process, which have been particularly successful and rewarding. In some cases these successes have been subtle, in some cases they have been personal to the researcher and others more methodologically insightful. However, of particular note is the process of allowing the participants to be involved in the process of choosing their alias. In early interviews, this process was considered at the end of the discussion. In the first interview, the researcher was in the process of formally ending the interview, reiterating to the participant that place-names, individual's names and venue names would be removed from the text in transcription for reasons of anonymity. The researcher then asked, 'Do you have a preference for the name I use for you?' In the following seconds, the participant gave a considerable amount of thought and a name was decided upon. The name was Fleming. PC Fleming. The participant explained their love for James Bond and seemed happy at the chance of having this name. For the following interview, it was decided that this question should come first. The researcher felt that by establishing an alias in the

early rapport-building stages of an interview, it might allow the participant to relax and enjoy the shared agency within the process of anonymisation. It is submitted that this subtle and seemingly insignificant courtesy was a way by which the formality of the research could be dissolved and the potential barriers between interviewer and interviewee weakened. As mentioned in Chapter 4, there were instances within a number of the interviews where participants referred to their aliases. In these cases more detailed responses and more intimate interviews were made possible.

The application of the Goffmanian framework can be considered a success for this research. As the data analysis has shown, there is much to be admired in the way that Goffman considered the world of micro interaction. Therefore it is important to acknowledge here what Goffman was able to give, and what he was not. Chief among Goffman's offerings is the way in which his body of work has been able to establish a platform of interaction within which it is possible to analyse meaning. By legitimising the small and the individually experienced things it allows for a narrative of lived experience to be shared and codified. Essentially, how an individual interprets the world around them *is* the world around them. This research supported a number of key tropes within the many and varied categorisations of interactions as outlined by Goffman. Appearance, setting and manner (Goffman, 1959) were prevalent parts of the framework for understanding both the giving and receiving of expressive information. For the experience of being feared it was an integral part of being able to understand how intensions and emotions can be utilised to suit the desires of the individual. Goffman (1961) conceptualised an area of specific interaction that metaphorically frames a situation within which it is possible to analyse fleeting encounters. Here the personal perceptions of specific interaction can create the experiences with which this research will engage and to which the participants will give meaning, attribute cause, apply reason and describe and structure experience.

What Goffman does not give is a full spectrum within the same interaction. That is to say, he is comfortable with legitimising one side of an interaction with no consideration to opposing views or interpretations. This is both a fault of Goffman and the design of this study. Whilst one of the key critiques of Goffman is that he does not attempt to apply the importance of the minutia of interaction into anything larger than the immediate situation, so this research does the same. Whilst the

research investigates an under-researched area in an attempt to shed light onto an area with little understanding, it does not fully square the circle. The design of the study places the emphasis on legitimising the experiences of those that perceive themselves to be feared. In the context of the research aims this is entirely justified. However, more is needed to connect the experiences of the feared and the fearful together. This would obviously require different aims and a very different research and sampling protocol.

Suggestions for Further Research

Further to the successes outlined above, there are additional successes and future endeavours to be introduced here. Research of this nature can offer considerable discussion for further investigation and that is in large part to the many avenues of interest derived from the process of producing this thesis. This is true, not only of the topic at large, but also of the different groups that have been included. There are a number of areas that are of interest to the researcher for ongoing enquiry. This final section of the thesis outlines suggestions for further research. Some of these suggestions are in the process of being fulfilled and others will be for future endeavours. This does not represent an exhaustive list of suggestions but offers an extensive array of key areas for research as derived by the thesis findings. There are some areas of expansion and exploration that constitute specific investigations into the strategically selected groups. Other suggested areas of future work focus more exclusively on the core thematic elements as found by this research.

Considering the findings of the research more broadly, a deeper exploration of the use of fear as a tool in managing encounters would be welcomed. This should utilise the same conceptual framework and include a more specific exploration of Collins' (2009) confrontation tension/fear barrier. The ability of some participants to use the spectre of violence to control encounters was a key finding within this research. The researcher would welcome the opportunity to understand the breadth of these phenomena and understand its use more widely. There is strong evidence to suggest a more specific exploration into the extent and dynamics of its use within work-based encounters. Intriguingly, there are suggestions within the data that similar tools are used by those that commit interpersonal crime. A larger sample of such people would

be needed and could help to connect this theme more substantially. In doing this, a more specific understanding of the breadth of the competent and purposeful fear pillar and those that are able to take advantage of it would add a key area to the field of fear of crime but also in the dynamics of interpersonal relationships. It would have the opportunity to add to the broadening Goffmanian application as presented within the thesis. This would marry the presentation of self, alongside the importance of front and back stage behaviour (Goffman, 1959). There is potential here for understanding how certain people are able to use and manipulate the confrontation/tension fear barrier (Collins, 2009) to their advantage. The possibility of bringing more detail to the understanding of fear and violence would be of great appeal to the researcher. There is also scope to look into the use of fear as a tool for those in positions of authority. This could look more broadly at work-based scenarios that can expand on the police, bouncers and soldiers used within this thesis. This could potentially include any number of authority figures, such as school teachers and/or parents, and move the research into a more sociological direction.

An understanding of the impact of extreme exposure to fear and danger and its impact in ongoing life is of great interest. For the soldiers within this study, the impact of their war experience and being feared in ongoing life was manifest in very different ways. To this extent, a larger exploration of the impact of war and the legacy of being feared would be needed to fully understand this group. This would enable a specific criminological and sociological investigation on soldiers to add to the existing, often psychologically based literature concerning post-deployment (see Killgore *et al*, 2008). This study would have the potential to consider both being feared and violence specifically. A deeper exploration in this regard would allow the research to explore more specifically the use of Goffman's frames (1974) in this context with a larger cohort of participants. There are a number of potential areas for research and the researcher is, as of September 2018, in the process of beginning the recruitment of participants from all three armed services.

There is a deeper relationship with the symbolism of the police and the existence of fear and distrust amongst the people they come into contact with, within the execution of their duty. This is true with those of whom the police suspect nefarious activity and of a wider distrust towards the police from some individuals and communities. It is

submitted that issues of trust and suspicion require better understanding from both sides of the police/public interaction. Examining the underlying issues surrounding distrust and fear towards the police is an incredibly interesting area. There are questions concerning the origin of this distrust, which could be considered at a personal/experiential, local, national or international level. These questions can be considered at a wider societal level and in the micro-sociological context. Research of this nature can better understand community reactions to policing policy and for the police to better understand the issues surrounding their presence.

In light of the above, there are two areas of specific research here that the researcher is pursuing following the findings within the research with regard to the police. First, is to explore detailed qualitative explanations into why people distrust the police. This has both community and policy implications. In a Goffmanian sense, the presence of the police holds a degree of symbolism (good, bad and indifferent) that precedes and flavours each encounter. This symbolism and all inherent feelings towards it can be both fleeting and lingering. Distrust can be acquired in a moment or held over from generation to generation. The suggested aim is to research the reasons and nuances behind mistrust in the police. This is a topic that can impact on every element of policing. Ultimately, the aim is to develop research to allow communities to be better understood in their attitudes towards the police. In addition, for police forces to understand the level of trust their local residents have in their practices, and to better understand the differing needs of the communities they police. This is to understand the influences (local, regional, national and international) on the degree to which people place their trust in the police. It would also allow the researcher to work with both the police and the community to understand fear and distrust from both sides. This was a limitation of the study presented within this thesis in that it explored and legitimised one perspective (albeit and under-researched one).

The second area for further research in relation to the police is as an expansion of the alleviating fear pillar. Amongst the data presented within this thesis, a number of officers described moments at which they have needed to alleviate the fear of the people they come into contact with. There were a number of scenarios presented, not all of which were relevant to this research. However, there were a number of accounts within the interviews about the process of giving death notices. This very specific

police function has the potential to expand on the alleviating fear pillar and allows the researcher to develop a more specific knowledge of the processes the police deploy to strip away the insignia of rank (Goffman, 1959) and measure interactions that are non-confrontational. There is also much to be learnt from their experiences in sharing such devastating information. In this sense, there are protocols and best practices to be understood and frames (Goffman, 1974) that can be established within this, somewhat unique, duty. This potential research area has the opportunity to move away from studying fear specifically and leads more towards an understanding of the experiences and ongoing impact that some police duties can have.

There is an important emphasis on the corporeal within the thesis. This is something that the researcher would like to explore in greater detail. There is potential, especially within Chapter 8, to fully develop the idea of the body as defensible space. Newman's (1973) work was introduced and key areas of his defensible space concepts were introduced within the Chapter. These were used to help augment the importance of presentation as used within the conceptual framework. The researcher is keen to expand this with a more specified research goal in mind and address the nuances of this application of both Newman (1973) and Goffman (1959). As an object of fear and alongside the presentation of self, the body is an ever-present in all of the scenarios expressed by the participants. To a greater or lesser extent, the body must play a role in the experience of being feared (as defined within a fleeting encounter in this thesis) and this is a definite area for deeper exploration. In this sense, there is much to be learned about the transitions the body experiences over time. This was touched on within this research in the form of the gym-goers and a process of transition. However, there is potential for an interesting exploration that can help to understand fear of crime when considering body alongside the aging process. The decline of corporeal faculties has been demonstrated as a reason for an increase in fear of crime in the elderly (Hale, 1996).

There is a triumvirate of important features that require specific exploration in relation to being feared. These are age, race and gender. They merit their own investigations. This research in many ways has managed to titillate interest in these areas. It would have been a mistake within this thesis to overstate the evidence relating to each of these areas in their own right. It would not have been from a valid

position methodologically. The strategic sampling was focused on broadening contexts rather than representative cohorts in an age, race or gender sense. For many individuals within the study, these themes simply did not exist in isolation. In other cases, they did. So, there is a degree of intersectionality to the endeavour that has been highlighted within this research (see Chapter 10). This can be linked more broadly to the corporeal elements of the research.

Nonetheless, the impact of racial identity is an important feature for being feared. It was a feature understood and rationalised differently by the participants within the study. What this research demonstrated was, that in situations where race is identified as a cause of fear, the participants articulated having an ‘outsider’ status. This reflected both on their own impressions of racial identity and on their assessment of their audience. There is much more to be learnt about the importance of race specifically within this field. It was something that Day (2009) was adept at explaining within her work. Yet her research was specifically designed to understand this element of fearful interactions. This was not the intention of this research specifically but, for a number of the respondents this was certainly a key element to their experience of being feared - a way in which they made sense of their place in the world. There is considerable evidence within many areas of criminological research to indicate the extent to which racial minorities are disproportionately represented within every area of the criminal justice system (see Lammy Review, 2017). This is something that represents direct issues within the criminal justice processes but also about the ways in which people perceive and react to black and ethnic minorities on a day-to-day basis. The evidence within the thesis findings is enough to indicate this is a worthy avenue for further investigation. It is perhaps a missed opportunity for this research that it was not designed to recruit representative samples from specific ethnic minorities. Thus, there are inferences that can be made but a more specifically designed piece of research would be able to expand on these ideas with far greater authority.

The development of the pillars of fear was a clear connecting theme between the groups within the research. There is more to be gained from taking these themes, together or in isolation, and developing a wider evidence base for them. In particular, there was less evidence within the study on how those that experience being feared

navigate between these pillars. As the research frame centred on fleeting encounters there was a weaker emphasis on the transitional nature of being feared and this is something that can be investigated much more closely. This in turn may allow a movement away from the micro-social exploration and towards a more complete understanding of the experience of being feared.

There is much more to be learned about the use of fear in the encounters of those committing crime. Many of the experiences of the participants within this research do not specifically involve a crime of any sort – usually just the suspicion or worry that one may occur. Yet, there have been individuals within the groups interviewed for this research that have engaged in crime and used fear and the threat of violence to achieve their aims. An investigation into the dynamics of these specific types of encounters would be a natural step for this research to take in the coming years. It has been touched on briefly within this research, but the relationship between the use of fear in the commission of crime represents a worthy and challenging area to explore. It is an area into which this research can naturally evolve.

Appendix 1 – Interview Schedules

Question List – Police

Conduct general introduction and ensure that the information sheet has been read and checked and received. Then sign the consent form as provided to the respondent.

Questions - General life questions

Could you just tell me a bit about who you are and what you do?

How long have you lived in Leeds (if Leeds)?

Which part of town do you live in?

What do you do in your spare time?

Police related questions

1. If you think of your job, what recent situations have you found threatening or felt uneasy?

- a. Ask for several situations – Detailed descriptions
- b. How long ago?
- c. How frequent?

2. In your job you need to give the impression of being in command, being an authority figure etc. Can you explain to me how you achieve that? What do you do?

- a. Ask for several situations – Detailed descriptions
- b. Prompt for physical manifestation of authority/stature
Working alone? In a group? In particular settings? Time of day?

3. If that fails to maintain order what happens next?

- a. What was your reaction?

- b. How did you manage this situation?
- c. Seek as many examples as possible

4. Do you have an impression as to what makes people comply?

- a. How is this compliance achieved in your job?

5. Do you think that people are fearful of you?

Main Interview Questions

General questions on fear

6. Have you been worried or fearful of others recently? (Specify this part of the interview does not relate to their job)

- a. Ask for several situations – Detailed descriptions
- b. How long ago?
- c. How frequent?
- d. Where did these situations occur?
- e. If not, why do you think this is?

7. How did being worried or fearful make you feel?

- a. How did you react?
- b. Did you change your behaviour in these situations?
- c. If yes, how and why did you think it was necessary?
- d. If no, why not?
- e. Did you notice the behaviour of others?
- f. What were they doing?

8. What do you think caused your fear?

Questions on being the object of fear

Now, can we look at the other side of fear –

9. Have you noticed situations in which others have been worried or fearful of you?

- a. Ask for several situations – Detailed descriptions
- b. How long ago?
- c. How frequent?
- d. Look for as many examples as

10. How did you feel in this situation?

- a. How did you react?
- b. Why do you think it happens?
- c. If it happens often – why do you think it happens more often?
- d. If it is not a frequent event – Why do you think it is not frequent?
- e. Did you speak to your friends about it?

11. Do you think they were fearful of you?

- a. Probe for explanations of attribution, attribute to themselves, situation, others
- b. Is this a problem for you?
- c. If not you, what were they fearful of?

12. What do you do/would you do to alleviate fear/alley fear/stop people fearing you?

- a. Actions, behaviour, avoid certain areas, avoid going out at certain times of day

13. What do you do/would you do to cause this fear?

a. Actions, behaviour, avoid certain areas, avoid going out at certain times of day

14. How did the realisation that you were feared make you feel?

a. Did your behaviour change?

b. Has it changed your perception about certain people, places, situations?

Closing Questions and basic information

How old are you?

What do you do for a living? (not for Police)

How would you define your ethnicity?

How would you define your physical appearance?

Question List Bouncers

Conduct general introduction and ensure that the information sheet has been read and checked and received. Then sign the consent form as provided to the respondent.

Questions - General introduction and rapport

Could you just tell me a bit about who you are and what you do?

How long have you lived in Leeds (if Leeds)?

Which part of town do you live in?

What do you do in your spare time?

Main Interview Questions

General questions on fear

1. Have you been worried or fearful of others recently? (Specify this part of the interview does not relate to their job)

- a. Ask for several situations – Detailed descriptions
- b. How long ago?
- c. How frequent?
- d. Where did these situations occur?
- e. If not, why do you think this is?

2. How did being worried or fearful make you feel?

- a. Did you change your behaviour in these situations?
- b. If yes, how and why did you think it was necessary?
- c. If no, why not?
- d. Did you notice the behaviour of others?

e. What were they doing?

3. What do you think caused your fear?

Questions on being the object of fear

Now, can we look at the other side of fear –

4. Have you noticed situations in which others have been worried or fearful?

- a. Ask for several situations – Detailed descriptions
- b. How long ago?
- c. How frequent?
- d. Look for as many examples as possible – for example - On one's own, in a large/small group, light or dark time of day, specific geography, who was fearful of you? Old/ young/ man/ women/ same age/ race etc.

5. How did you feel in this situation?

- a. Did you speak to your friends about it?
- b. Why do you think it happens?
- c. If it happens often – why do you think it happens more often?
- d. If it is not a frequent event – Why do you think it is not frequent?

6. Do you think they were fearful of you?

- a. Probe for explanations of attribution, attribute to themselves, situation, others
- b. Is this a problem for you?
- c. If not you, what were they fearful of?

7. What do you do/would you do to alleviate fear?

- a. Actions, behaviour, avoid certain areas, avoid going out at certain times of day

8. What do you do/would you do to cause this fear?

- a. Actions, behaviour, avoid certain areas, avoid going out at certain times of day

9. How did the realisation that you were feared make you feel?

- a. Did your behaviour change?
- b. Has it changed your perception about certain people, places, situations?

Job/Occupation related questioning

10. If you think of your job, what recent situations have you found threatening or felt uneasy?

- a. Ask for several situations – Detailed descriptions
- b. How long ago?
- c. How frequent?

11. In your job you need to exert authority. Can you explain to me the mechanisms by which you achieve that?

- a. Ask for several situations – Detailed descriptions
- b. Prompt for physical manifestation of authority/stature
Working alone? In a group? In particular settings? Time of day?

12. If your mechanisms fail to maintain order what happens next?

- a. What was your reaction?
- b. How did you manage this situation?
- c. Seek as many examples as possible

13. Do you have an impression as to what makes people comply?

- a. How is this compliance achieved in your job?

14. Do you think that people are fearful of you?

Closing Questions and basic information

How old are you?

What do you do for a living? (not for Police)

How would you define your ethnicity?

How would you define your physical appearance?

Question List – Gym-Goers

Conduct general introduction and ensure that the information sheet has been read and checked and received. Then sign the consent form as provided to the respondent.

Questions - General introduction and rapport

Could you just tell me a bit about who you are and what you do?

How long have you lived in Leeds (if Leeds)?

Which part of town do you live in?

What do you do in your spare time?

Main Interview Questions

Main Prompts for ALL

How did that make you feel?

Did you change your behaviour?

Did they change their behaviour?

What impact does this have on your life?

General questions on fear

1. Have you been worried or fearful of others recently? (Specify this part of the interview does not relate to their job)

- a. Ask for several situations – Detailed descriptions
- b. How long ago?
- c. How frequent?

- d. Where did these situations occur?
- e. If not, why do you think this is?

2. How did being worried or fearful make you feel?

- a. Did you change your behaviour in these situations?
- b. If yes, how and why did you think it was necessary?
- c. If no, why not?
- d. Did you notice the behaviour of others?
- e. What were they doing?

3. What do you think caused your fear?

Questions on being the object of fear

Now, can we look at the other side of fear –

4. Have you noticed situations in which others have been worried or fearful?

- a. Ask for several situations – Detailed descriptions
- b. How long ago?
- c. How frequent?
- d. Look for as many examples as possible

5. How did you feel in this situation?

- a. Did you speak to your friends about it?
- b. Why do you think it happens?
- c. If it happens often – why do you think it happens more often?
- d. If it is not a frequent event – Why do you think it is not frequent?

6. Do you think they were fearful of you?

- a. Probe for explanations of attribution, attribute to themselves, situation, others

- b. Is this a problem for you?
- c. If not you, what were they fearful of?

7. What do you do/would you do to alleviate fear?

- a. Actions, behaviour, avoid certain areas, avoid going out at certain times of day

8. What do you do/would you do to cause this fear?

- a. Actions, behaviour, avoid certain areas, avoid going out at certain times of day

9. How did the realisation that you were feared make you feel?

- a. Did your behaviour change?
- b. Has it changed your perception about certain people, places, situations?

Gym specific questions

10. You attend the gym on a regular basis. What was your motivation for going?

11. In your opinion, what do people think when they see you?

- a. Why do you think they feel this way?
- b. Do you think you are treated differently now compared to before?

12. In your opinion, are there interactions in which the shape/strength of your body has been an advantage?

- a. If not, has it ever been a disadvantage?

Closing Questions and basic information

How old are you?

What do you do for a living/part time job?

What are you studying at college/university?

How would you define your ethnicity?

How would you define your physical appearance?

Question List – Students/ Young People

Conduct general introduction and ensure that the information sheet has been read and checked and received. Then sign the consent form as provided to the respondent.

Questions - General introduction and rapport

Could you just tell me a bit about who you are and what you do?

How long have you lived in Leeds (if Leeds)?

Which part of town do you live in?

What do you do in your spare time?

Are you studying?

What do you do if not studying?

Main Interview Questions

General questions on fear

1. Have you been worried or fearful of others recently? (Specify this part of the interview does not relate to their job)

- a. Ask for several situations – Detailed descriptions
- b. How long ago?
- c. How frequent?
- d. Where did these situations occur?
- e. If not, why do you think this is?

2. How did being worried or fearful make you feel?

- a. Did you change your behaviour in these situations?
- b. If yes, how and why did you think it was necessary?

- c. If no, why not?
- d. Did you notice the behaviour of others?
- e. What were they doing?

3. What do you think caused your fear?

Questions on being the object of fear

Now, can we look at the other side of fear –

4. Have you noticed situations in which others have been worried or fearful?

- a. Ask for several situations – Detailed descriptions
- b. How long ago?
- c. How frequent?
- d. Look for as many examples as possible
- e. Do people treat you now compared to the past?

5. How did you feel in this situation?

- a. Did you speak to your friends about it?
- b. Why do you think it happens?
- c. If it happens often – why do you think it happens more often?
- d. If it is not a frequent event – Why do you think it is not frequent?

6. Do you think they were fearful of you?

- a. Probe for explanations of attribution, attribute to themselves, situation, others
- b. Is this a problem for you?
- c. If not you, what were they fearful of?

7. What do you do/would you do to alleviate fear?

- a. Actions, behaviour, avoid certain areas, avoid going out at certain times of day

8. What do you do/would you do to cause this fear?

- a. Actions, behaviour, avoid certain areas, avoid going out at certain times of day

9. How did the realisation that you were feared make you feel?

- a. Did your behaviour change?
- b. Has it changed your perception about certain people, places, situations?

Closing Questions and basic information

How old are you?

What do you do for a living/part time job?

What are you studying at college/university?

How would you define your ethnicity?

How would you define your physical appearance?

Bibliography

Ainsworth, P.B. (2000) *Psychology and Crime: Myths and Reality*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.

Alison, L. (2005) *The Forensic Psychologists Casebook: Psychological Profiling and Criminal Investigation*. Cullompton: Willan.

Allen, J. (2006) *Worry about Crime in England & Wales: findings from the 2003/04 and 2004/05 British Crime Survey*. Home Office Online Report 15/06. London: HMSO.

Amerio, P. and Roccato, M. (2005) A Predictive Model for Psychological Reactions to Crime in Italy: An Analysis of Fear of Crime and Concern about Crime as a Social Problem. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*. 15 (1), pp. 17-28.

Atkinson, R., Parker, L. (2011) Gentrification and Displacement: The household Impacts of neighbourhood Change. *AHURI Final Report*. 160, pp. 1-89.

Bachman, R. and Schutt, R. K. (2007) *The Practice of Research in Criminology and Criminology Research*. London: Sage.

Baker, M. H., Nienstedt, B.C., Everett, R.S. and McCleary, R. (1983) Impact of a Crime Wave: Perceptions, Fear and Confidence in the Police. *Law and Society Review*. 17, pp. 319-335.

Balkin, S. (1979) Victimization Rates, Safety and Fear of Crime. *Social Problems*. 26 (3), pp. 343-358.

Bartneck, C., and Forlizzi, J. (2004). A Design-Centred Framework for Social Human-Robot Interaction. *Proceedings of the Ro-Man 2004, Kurashiki*. pp. 591-594.

Bauman, Z. (1989) *Sociology after the Holocaust*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Becker, H. S. (1986) *Doing Things Together*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Beetham, D. (1991) *The Legitimation of Power: Issues in Political Theory*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Benford, R. and Snow, D. (2000) Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 26 (1), pp. 611-639.

Bennett, T. (1991) The effectiveness of a police-initiated fear reducing strategy. *British Journal of Criminology*. 31 (1), pp. 1-14.

Biderman, A., Johnson, L., McIntyre, J. and Weir, A. (1967) Report on a pilot study in the district of Columbia on victimization and attitudes toward law enforcement *President's Commission on Law Enforcement & Administration of Justice. Field Surveys I*. Washington D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Blumer, H. (1969) *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Boers, K., Gutsche, G. and Sessar, K. (eds.) (1997) *Sozialer Umbruch und Kriminalität in Deutschland*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Bowling, B. (1993) Racial Harassment and the Process of Victimization: Conceptual and Methodological Implication for the Local Crime Survey. *British Journal of Criminology*. 33 (2), pp. 231-250.

Box, S., Hale, C. and Andrews, G. (1988) Explaining Fear of Crime. *British Journal of Criminology*. 28 (3), pp. 340-356.

Brissett, D. and Edgley, C. (1990) *Life as Theatre: A Dramaturgical Source Book*. New York: Adler de Gruyter.

Brodal, P. (2004) *The Central Nervous System: Structure and Function*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brown, D.K. (2003) Goffman's Dramaturgical Sociology: Developing a Meaningful Theoretical Context Involving 'Embarrassment and Social Organisation.' *Teaching Sociology*. 31 (3), pp. 288-299.

Bryman, A. (1998) Quantitative and qualitative research strategies in knowing the social world in May, T., and Williams, M. (eds.), *Knowing the Social World*. London: Open University Press. pp. 138-156.

Bull, R. H. C. and Green, J. (1980) The Relationship Between Physical Appearance and Criminality. *Medicine, Science and the Law*. 20 (2), pp. 99-108.

Bursik, R. J. and Grasmick, H. G. (1993) *Neighbourhoods and Crime: Dimensions of Effective Community Control*. Lexington Books: NYC.

Cannon, W.B. (1915) in Steimer, T. (2002) The Biology of Fear and anxiety related behaviours. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*. 4 (3), pp. 231-249.

Carlson, M. (1996) *Performance: A critical Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Chadee, D., Austen, L. and Ditton, J. (2007) The Relationship between Likelihood and Fear of Criminal Victimization. *British Journal of Criminology*. 47 (1), pp. 133-153.

Chadee, D. and Ditton, J. (2003) Are Older People Most Afraid of Crime? Revisiting Ferraro and LaGrange in Trinidad. *British Journal and Criminology*. 43 (2), pp. 417-433.

Champion, D. J. (2006) *Research Methods for Criminal Justice and Criminology*. 3rd Edition. New Jersey: Pearson Education/Prentice Hall.

Chapman, D. (1968) Sociology and the Stereotype of the Criminal. *Modern Law*

Review. 32 (6), pp. 704-713.

Chiricos, T., Hogan, M. and Gertz, M. (1997) Racial Composition of Neighbourhood and Fear of Crime. *Criminology*. 35 (1), pp. 107-119.

Christie, N. (1986) *The Ideal Victim: From crime Policy to Victim Policy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chriss, J. (1996) Toward an Interparadigmatic Dialogue on Goffman. *Sociology and Criminology Faculty Publications*. 39 (3), pp. 94-102.

Clemente, F. and Kleiman, M. (1976) Fear of Crime among the Aged. *Gerontologist*. 16 (3), pp. 207-210.

Coffey, A. J. and Atkinson, P. (1996) *Making Sense of Qualitative Data: Complementary Research Strategies*. London: Sage.

Cohen, S. (2001) *States of Denial: knowing about atrocities and suffering*. London: Polity Press.

Collins, R. (2009) Micro and Macro Theories of Violence. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*. 3 (1) pp. 9-22.

Collins, R. (2008) *Violence: A Microsociological Theory*. Oxfordshire: Princeton University Press.

Collins, R. and Makowsky, M. (1972) *The Discovery of Society*. New York: Random House.

Colomy, P. and Brown, J. 1996. Goffman and Interactional Citizenship *Sociological Perspectives*. 39 (3), pp. 371-381.

Conklin, J. (1975) Robbery, the elderly, and fear: An urban problem in search of solution in J. Goldsmith and S. Goldsmith (eds) *Crime and the elderly: Challenge and*

response. Lexington: Toronto.

Cook, F.L. and Skogan, W.G. (1984) Evaluating the Changing Definition of Policy Issue in Congress: Crime Against the Elderly in H. Rodgers (ed.) *Public Policy and Social Institutions*. New York: JAI Press: pp. 47-66.

Combs, J. E. and Mansfield, W. (1978) Drama in Life: The Uses of Communication in Society *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 8 (1), pp. 79-86.

Crawford, A. (1998) *Crime Prevention & Community Safety: Politics, Policies & Practices*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.

Croake, J. and Hinke, D. (1976) Methodological Problems in the Study of Fears. *Journal of Psychology*. 93 (2), pp. 197-202.

Dammert, L. and Malone, M.F.T. (2003) Fear of Crime or Fear of Life? Public Insecurities in Chile. *Bulletin of Latin American Research*. 22 (1), pp. 79-101.

Day, K., Stump, C. and Carreon, D. (2002) Confrontation and Loss of Control: masculinity and men's fear in public space. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 23 (2), pp. 311-322.

Day, K. (2009) *Being Feared: Masculinity and Race in Public Space* in Lee, M. and Farrall, S. (eds) *Fear of Crime: Critical Voices in an Age of Anxiety*. London: Routledge.

De Haan, W. and Loader, I. (2002) On the Emotions of Crime, Punishment and Social Control. *Theoretical Criminology*. 6 (3), pp. 243-253.

Denzin, N. (2002) Much Ado about Goffman. *The American Sociologist*. 33 (2), pp. 105-117.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (2003) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Diggines, G. (2008) Fighting Fear of Crime: A clickable internet crime map, created by the West Yorkshire Police Authority, is informing local residents of the real levels of crime in their area, in Home Office (eds) *The Sharp End*. London: HMSO

Ditton, J. (1999) *The View From Goffman*. London: MacMillan.

Ditton, J., Bannister, J., Gilchrist, E. and Farrall, S. (1999) Afraid or Angry? Recalibrating the Fear of Crime. *International Review of Victimology*. 6 (1), pp. 83-99.

Ditton, J. and Chadee, D. (2006) Peoples Perceptions of their Likely Future Risk of Criminal Victimization. *British Journal of Criminology*. 46 (3), pp. 505-518.

Ditton, J. and Farrall, S. (eds.) (2000) *The Fear of Crime*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Doran, B.J. and Lees, B.G. (2005) Investigating the Spatiotemporal Links between Disorder, Crime, and the Fear of Crime. *The Professional Geographer*. 57 (1), pp. 1-12.

DuBow, F., McCabe, E. and Kaplan, G. (1979) *Reactions to Crime: A Critical Review of the Literature*. Washington: US Dept of Justice.

Durkin, K. and Jeffrey, L. (2010) The Salience of Uniform in Young Children's Perception of Police. *Legal and Criminal Psychology*. 5 (1), pp. 47-55.

Ekman, P. (1992) in Steimer, T. (2002) The Biology of Fear and anxiety related behaviours. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*. 4 (3), pp. 231-249.

Ellis, T. (1995) How does it feel to be a problem?, In Belton, D. (ed) *Speak My Name. Black Men on Masculinity and the American Dream*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon. pp. 35-44.

Ennis, P. (1967) Criminal Victimization in the United States: A report of a national

study *President's Commission on Law Enforcement & Administration of Justice. Field Surveys II*. Washington D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Farrall, S., Bannister, J., Ditton, J. and Gilchrist, E. (1997) Questioning the measurement of 'Fear of Crime'. *British Journal of Criminology*. 57 (4), pp. 658-679.

Farrall, S. and Ditton, J. (2000) Fear of burglary: Refining national survey questions for use at local level. *International Journal of Police Science and Management*. 3 (1) pp. 9-18.

Farrall, S. and Gadd, D. (2004) The frequency of the fear of crime. *British Journal of Criminology*. 44 (1), pp. 127-132.

Farrall, S., Jackson, J. and Gray, E. (2009) *Social Order and the Fear of Crime in Contemporary Times*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Farrall, S. and Lee, M. (2009) *Fear of Crime: Critical Voices in an Age of Anxiety*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Ferraro, K. F. and LaGrange, R. (1987) The Measurement of Fear of Crime. *Sociological Inquiry*. 57(1), pp. 70–101.

Ferraro, K. F. (1995) *Fear of Crime: Interpreting Victimization Risk*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Fattah, E. and Sacco, V. (1989) *Crime and Victimization of the Elderly*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Flatley, J., Kershaw, C., Smith, K., Chaplin, R. and Moon, D. (eds) (2010) *Crime in England and Wales 2009/2010: Findings from the British Crime Survey and Police Recorded Crime* Great Britain Home Office Research Development and Statistics Directorate. London: HMSO.

Furedi, F. (2002) *Culture of Fear: Risk-taking and the Morality of Low Expectation*

(revised edition). London: Continuum.

Fussell, S. (1991) *Muscle: Confessions of an Unlikely Bodybuilder*. New York: Poseidon Press.

Gabriel, U. (2003) The Psychology of Fear of Crime: Conceptual and Methodological Perspectives. *British Journal of Criminology*. 43(3), pp. 600-614.

Gabriel, U. and Greve, W. (2003) The Psychology of Fear of Crime. *British Journal of Criminology*. 43(3), pp. 614-623.

Gamson, W. A. (1985) Goffman's legacy to political sociology. *Theory and Society*. 14 (5), pp. 605-622.

Garland, D. (1996) The Limits of the Sovereign State: Strategies of crime control in contemporary society. *British Journal of Criminology*. 36(4), pp. 44- 57.

Garofalo, J. (1982) Fear of crime as a problem for elderly. *Social Problems*. 30, 240-245.

Garofalo, J. and Laub, J. (1978) The Fear of Crime: Broadening our Perspective. *Victimology*. 3 (4), pp. 242-253.

Gaskell, G. (2005) **Social values and the governance of science**. *Science*. 310 (5756), pp. 1908-1909.

Geertz, C. (1983) in Brissett, D., Edgley, C. (1990) *Life as Theatre: A Dramaturgical Source Book*. New York: Adler de Gruyter.

Gelder, B. (2006) Perceiving fear in dynamic body expressions. *NeuroImage*. 35(2), pp. 959-67.

Gibbs, G. R. (2002) *Qualitative Data Analysis: Explorations with NVivo*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

- Giddens, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Goffman, E. (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. London: Pelican.
- Goffman, E. (1961) *Encounters*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Goffman, E. (1963) *Behaviour in Public Places*. New York: Free Press.
- Goffman, E. (1963) *Stigma: Notes on the management of a spoiled identity*. London: Penguin.
- Goffman, E. (1967) *Interaction Ritual: Essay in Face-to-Face Behaviour*. New York: Transaction.
- Goffman, E. (1974) *Frame Analysis*. Norwich: Fletcher and Son.
- Goffman, E. (1981) Review: A reply to Denzin and Keller. *Contemporary Sociology*. 10 (1), pp. 60-68.
- Goldstein, A. G., Chance, J. E. and Gilbert, B. (1984) Facial stereotypes of good guys and bad guys: A replication. *Psychonomic Society*. 22 (6), pp. 549-552.
- Goodey, J. (1997) Boys Don't Cry: Masculinities, Fear of Crime and Fearlessness. *British Journal of Criminology*. 37 (3), pp. 401-418.
- Goodey, J. (2005) *Victims and Victimology: Research, Policy and Practice*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Gordon, M. T., Riger S. (1989) *The Female Fear: The Social Cost of Rape*. New York: Free Press.
- Gouldner, A. (1970) *Other Symptoms of the Crisis: Goffman's Dramaturgy and Other*

New Theories The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology. New York: Basic Books.

Gray, D. E. (2014) *Dong Research in The Real World*. London: Sage:

Gray, E., Jackson, J. and Farrall, S. (2008). Reassessing the Fear of Crime. *European Journal of Criminology*. 5(3), pp. 363-380.

Gray, M., Lesser, D., Rebach, H., Hooks, B. and Bounds, C. (1988) Sexual aggression and victimisation: A local perspective *Response to the Victimisation of Women and Children*. 11 (3), pp. 9-13.

Greenberg, M.S. and Ruback, R.B. (1992) *After the Crime: Victim Decision Making*. London: Plenum Press.

Grèzes, J., Pichon, S., and Gelder, B. (2006) Perceiving fear in dynamic body expressions. *NeuroImage*. 35(2), pp. 959-67.

Grossman, P. (2004) Respiratory sinus arrhythmia, cardiac vagal control, and daily activity. *American Journal of Physiology- Heart and Circulatory Physiology*. 287 (2), pp. 29-33.

Hale, C. (1996) Fear of Crime: A Review of the Literature. *International Review of Victimology*. 4 (2), pp.79-150.

Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T. and Roberts, B. (1978) *Policing The Crisis*. London: Macmillan.

Hanson, R.F., Smith, D.W., Kilpatrick, D.G. and Freedy, J.R. (2000) Crime Related Fears and Demographic Diversity in Los Angeles County after the 1992 Civil Disturbances, *Journal of Community Psychology*. 28 (6), pp. 607-623.

Hannerz, U. (1980) *Exploring the city: Inquiries toward an urban anthropology*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Hare, P. and Blumberg, H. H. (1988) *Dramaturgical Analysis of Social Interaction*. New York: Praeger.
- Harre, R. (1979) *Social being: A Theory for Social Psychology*. London: Wiley Blackwell.
- Hartinagel, T. F. (1979) The Perception and Fear of Crime: Implications for neighbourhood cohesion, social activity and community effect. *Social Forces*. 58 (2), pp. 176-193.
- Henig, J. and Maxfield, M. (1978) Reducing fear of crime: Strategies for intervention. *Victimology*. 3 (4), pp. 297-313.
- Hermer, J. (2001) Gift Encounters: Conceptualising the Elements of Begging Conduct *University of Miami Law Review*. 56 (5), pp. 77-88.
- Her Majesty's Government (2003) *Criminal Justice System: 2002 Strategic and Business Plan*. London: HMSO.
- Hillyard, S. (2010) Ethnography's Capacity to Contribute to the Cumulation of Theory: A Case Study of Strong's Work on Goffman. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*. 39 (4), pp. 421-440.
- Hobbs, R., Hadfield, P., Lister, S. and Winlow, S. (2002) 'Door Lore': The art and economics of intimidation. *British Journal of Criminology*. 42 (2), pp. 352-370.
- Hollander, J. A. (2001) Vulnerability and Dangerousness: The Construction of Gender through Conversation about Violence. *Gender and Society*. 15 (1), pp. 83-109.
- Hollway, W. and Jefferson, T. (1997) The risk society in an age of anxiety: situating fear of crime. *British Journal of Sociology*. 48 (2), pp. 255-266.
- Hollway, W. and Jefferson, T. (2000) The role of anxiety in fear of crime in T. Hope

and R. Sparks (eds) *Crime, Risk and Insecurity*. London: Routledge.

Home Office (1989) *Report of the Working Group of the Fear of Crime*, Standing Conference on Crime Prevention, London: HMSO.

Hope, T. and Sparks, R. (eds.) (2000) *Crime, Risk and Insecurity: law and order in everyday life and political discourse*. London: Routledge.

Hopkins-Burke, R.D. (2005) *An Introduction to Criminological Theory*. 2nd Edition. Cullompton: Willan.

Hough, M. (1995) *Anxiety about Crime: Findings from the 1994 British Crime Survey*. Home Office Research Study 147. London: HMSO.

Hough, M. and Mayhew, P. (1983) *The British Crime Survey: First Report*, Home Office Research Study 76. London: HMSO.

Hunt, L. (2003) *Kung Fu masters: From Bruce Lee to Hidden Dragon*. Wiltshire: Anthony Rowe.

Innes, M. (2004) Crime as a Signal, Crime as a Memory. *Journal for Crime, Conflict & the Media*. 1(2), pp.15-22.

Innes, M. and Fielding, N. (2002) From Community to Communicative Policing: 'Signal Crimes' And The Problem Of Public Reassurance. *Sociological Research Online*. 7 (2), pp. 143-157.

Ito, K. (1993) Research on the fear of crime; perceptions and realities of crime in Japan. *Crime and Delinquency*. 29 (1), pp. 385-92.

Jackson, J. (2006) Introducing Fear of Crime to Risk Research. *Risk Analysis*. 26 (1), pp. 253-264.

Jackson, J., Farrall, S. and Gray, E. (2006) The Provenance of Fear *Experience &*

Expression in the Fear of Crime Working Paper No. 2 (November 2006).

Jones, C. S. and Kaplan, M. F. (2003) The Effects of Racially Stereotypical Crimes on Juror Decision-Making and Information-Processing Strategies. *Basic and Applied Psychology* 25 (1), pp. 1-13.

Karmen, A. (2004) *Crime Victims: An Introduction to Victimology*. 5th Edition. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Karstedt, S. (2002) Emotions and Criminal Justice. *Theoretical Criminology*. 6 (3), pp. 299-316.

Katz, J. (1999) *How Emotions Work*. London: University of Chicago Press.

Kelley, R. D. G. (1988) Confessions of a nice negro, or why I shaved my head, in Kimmell, M. S., and Messner, M. A. (eds), *Men's Lives*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Keltner, D. (2003) Fear and Anxiety: Overlaps and distractions in Lewis, M., Haviland-Jones, J.M., Barratt, L. (eds) *The Handbook of Emotions*. London: Guilford Press.

Kennedy, G.A. (1991) *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. (Aristotles volume trns. Kennedy). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kershaw, C., Budd, T., Kinshott, G., Mattinson, J., Mayhew, P. and Myhill, A. (2000) *The 2000 British Crime Survey*, London: HMSO.

Killias, M. (1990) New methodological perspectives for victimisation surveys: The potentials of computer-assisted telephone surveys and some related innovations. *International Review of Victimology*. 1 (2), pp. 153-167.

Killias, M (1991) Vulnerability and fear of crime in G. Kaiser, H. Kury and H-J. Albrecht (eds) *Victims and criminal justice: Victimological research - stocktaking and prospects* Max Planck Institut Research Report No. 50.

Killias, M. (2000). Different Measures of Vulnerability in their Relation to Different Dimensions of Fear of Crime. *British Journal of Criminology*. 40 (3), pp. 437-450.

Killias, M. and Clerici, C. (2000) Different measures of vulnerability in their relation to different dimensions of fear of crime. *British Journal of Criminology*. 40 (3), pp. 437-450.

Kinsey, R. and Anderson, S. (1992) Crime and the quality of life Public perceptions and experiences of crime in Scotland; *findings from the 1988 British Crime Survey*. Edinburgh: Central Research Unit: Scottish Office.

Krahn, M. and Kennedy, L.W. (1984) Rural-urban origin of fear of crime: The case for rural baggage. *Rural Sociology*. 49 (3), pp. 247-260.

LaGrange, R. L. and Ferraro, K.F. (1987) The Elderly's Fear of Crime: A Critical Examination of the Research. *Research on Aging*. 9 (3), pp. 372-391.

LaGrange, R.L., Ferraro, K.F. and Supanic, M. (1992) Perceived Risk and Fear of Crime: Social and Physical Incivilities. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 29 (3), pp. 311-334.

Lamert, C. and Branaman, A. (1997) (eds) *The Goffman Reader*. Blackwell: Oxford.

Larkin, M, Eatough, A., and Flowers, T. (2006) *Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis In Practice*. London: Sage.

Larkin, M., Watts, S. and Clifton, E. (2006). Giving voice and making sense in Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 3 (2), pp. 102-120.

Lavrakas, R. J., and Lewis, D. A. (1982) Fear of crime and behaviour restrictions in urban and suburban neighbourhoods. *Population and Environment*. 5 (2), pp. 242-264.

- Lea, J., and Young, J. (1984) *What is to be done about law and order*. Harmandsworth: Penguin.
- Lebowitz, B. (1975) Age and Fearfulness: Personal and Situational Factors. *Journal of Gerontology*. 30 (3), pp. 696-700.
- Lee, M. (2007) *Inventing Fear of Crime Criminology and the Politics of Anxiety*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Lee, M. and Farrall, S. (eds) (2009) *Fear of Crime: Critical Voices in an Age of Anxiety*. London: Routledge.
- Lemanski, C. (2006) Residential Responses to Fear (of Crime Plus) in Two Cape Town Suburbs: Implications for the Post-Apartheid City. *Journal of International Development*. 18 (6), pp. 787-802.
- Leininger, M. M. (1985). Ethnography and ethnonursing: Models and modes of qualitative data analysis. In M. M. Leininger (ed). *Qualitative research methods in nursing*. Orlando, FL: Grune & Stratton.
- Levinson, D., Ponzetti, J. and Jorgenson, P. (eds) (1999) *Encyclopedia of Human Emotions*. New York: MacMillan.
- Lewis, M., Haviland-Jones, J.M. and Barratt, L. (eds) (2008) *The Handbook of Emotions*. London: Guilford Press.
- Lichtenstein, S., Slovic, P., Fischhoff, B., Layman, M. and Combs, B. (1978) Judged Frequency of Lethal Events. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*. 4(6), pp. 551-78.
- Lindesay, J. (1991) Editorial: Fear of Crime in the Elderly. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*. 6 (2), pp. 55-56.

Liska, A. E., Sanchirico, A. and Reed, M. D. (1988) Fear of Crime and Constrained Behaviour: Specifying and Estimating a Reciprocal Effects Model. *Social Forces*. 66 (3), pp. 827-837.

Loader, I. (2000) Plural Policing and Democratic Governance. *Social and Legal Studies*. 9 (1), pp. 323-331.

Lupton, D. and Tulloch, J. (2002) Risk is part of your life: Risk epistemologies among a group of Australians. *Sociology*. 36 (2), pp. 317-334.

Lyman, S. M. and Scott, M. B. (1975) *The Drama of Social Reality*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Maclin, M., Herrera, K. (2006) the Criminal Stereotype. *North American Journal of Psychology*. 8 (2), pp: 197-208.

Madriz, E. I., (1997) Images of Criminals and Victims: A Study on Women's Fear and Social Control. *Gender and Society*. 11 (3), pp. 342-356.

Mins, J. G., and Meltzer, B. N. (1978) *Symbolic Interaction: A Reader in Social Psychology Boston: Allyn and Bacon*.

Mahoney, M. R. (1995) Segregation, whiteness, and transformation. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*. 143 (5), pp. 1659-1684.

Manning, J. (2013) *Researching Interpersonal Relationships: Qualitative Methods, Studies and Analysis*. London: Sage.

Manning, P. K. (2005) in *Encyclopedia of Social Theory*. Ritzer, G. (ed.) London: Sage.

Manning, P.K. (1980) in Ditton, J. (1999) *The View From Goffman*. London: MacMillan.

Manning, P. K. (1977) The Decline of Civility: A Comment on Erving Goffman's Sociology. *Canadian Review of Anthropology and Sociology*. 13 (3), pp. 13-25.

Marshall, S. L. A. (1947) *Men Against Fire: The Problem of Battle Command* William Morrow: New York

Marshall, A. D., Panuzio, J., and Taft, C. T. (2005) Intimate partner violence among military veterans and active duty servicemen. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 25 (7), pp. 862-876.

Matsumoto, D., Keltner, D., Shiota, M., O'Sullivan, M. and Frank, M. Facial Expression of Emotion in Lewis, M., Haviland-Jones, J.M., Barratt, L. (eds) (2008) *The Handbook of Emotions*. London: Guilford Press

Matthews, R. (1992) Replacing Broken Windows: Crime, Incivilities and Urban Change in R. Matthews and J. Young (eds.) *Issues in Realist Criminology*. London: Sage

Mawby, R.I. (1986) Fear of Crime and Concern over the Crime Problem among the Elderly. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 14 (3), pp. 300-306.

Maxfield, M.G. (1984) *Fear of Crime in England and Wales*, London: HMSO.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. and Sitenerios, G. (2001) in Lewis, M., Haviland-Jones, J.M., Barratt, L. (eds) (2008) *The Handbook of Emotions* London: Guilford Press.

Mayhew, P. and Hough, M. (1988) The British Crime Survey: Origins and Impact in M. Maguire & J. Ponting (eds.) *Victims of Crime: A New Deal*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

McFarland, D. (1987) in Steimer, T. (2002) The Biology of Fear and anxiety related behaviours. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*. 4 (3), pp. 231-249.

- Mead, G.H. (1934) *Mind, Self and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mead, G.H. (2001) *Essays in Social Psychology*. London: Transaction.
- Miles, M. B., and Huberman, M. (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Miller, H., Sciences, S. and Nottingham, T. (1995) The Presentation of Self in Electronic Life: Goffman on the Internet *Online Journal of Sociology* (June).
- Monaghan, L. F. (2002) Regulating 'unruly' bodies: work tasks, conflict and violence in Britain's night-time economy. *British Journal of Sociology*. 53 (3), pp. 403-429.
- Moore, S. and Shepherd, J. (2007) The Elements and Prevalence of Fear. *British Journal of Criminology*. 47(1), pp. 154-162.
- Morgan, P. (1978) *Delinquent Fantasies*. London: Temple Smith.
- Morrow, V. (2001) Using qualitative methods to elicit young people's perspectives on their environments: Some ideas for community health initiatives. *Health Education Research*. 16 (3), pp. 255-268.
- Muncie, J. and Wilson, D. (2004) *Student Handbook of Criminal Justice and Criminology*, London: Cavendish Publishing Limited.
- Nettler, G. (1974) *Explaining Crime*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Newburn, T. (2003) (ed) *Handbook of Policing*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Newman, O. (1973) *Defensible Space* Architectural Press: London.
- O'Brien, K., Hobbs, D. and Westmarland, L., (2007) Negotiating Violence and Gender: Security and the Night Time Economy in the UK in Body-Gendrot, S and Spierenburg, P., (eds) *Cultures of Violence in Europe: Historical and Contemporary*

Perspectives. London: Springer Publishing.

O'Bryant, S.L., Donnermeyer, J.F. and Stafford, K. (1991) Fear of Crime and Perceived Risk among Older Widowed Women. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 19 (2), pp. 166-177.

Ohman, A., Carlsson, K., Lundqvist, D. and Ingvar, M. (2007) On the unconscious subcortical origin of human fear. *Physiology and Behaviour*. 92 (2), pp. 180-185.

Ohman, A. (2008) Fear and Anxiety: Overlaps and distractions in Lewis, M., Haviland-Jones, J.M., Barratt, L. (eds) (2008) *The Handbook of Emotions*. London: Guilford Press.

Ostrow, J. (1996) Spontaneous Involvement and Social Life. *Sociological Perspectives*. 39 (3), pp. 341-351.

Pain, R. (2000) Place Social Relations and the Fear of Crime: A Review. *Progress in Human Geography*. 24 (3), pp. 365-387.

Page, P. (1999) Emotions and Danger in Ohman, A. (2008) Fear and Anxiety: Overlaps and distractions in Lewis, M., Haviland-Jones, J.M., Barratt, L. (eds) (2008) *The Handbook of Emotions*. London: Guilford Press.

Panskepp, J. (1992) in Steimer, T. (2002) The Biology of Fear and anxiety related behaviours. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*. 4 (3), pp. 231-249.

Pearce, H., Dixon, M., Reed, H., Margo, J. (2006) Freedom's Orphans: Raising youth in a changing world [online] Available at:
<https://www.ippr.org/publications/freedoms-orphans-raising-youth-in-a-changing-world> [Accessed: 26/7/2013].

Povey, D., Ellis, C. and Nichols, S. (2003) *Crime in England and Wales*, Home Office Statistical Bulletin 02/03, London: HMSO.

- Psathas, G. (1996) On Goffman and Methods. *Sociological Perspectives*. 39 (3), pp. 383-391.
- Psathas, G. (1977) Goffman's Image of Man. *Humanity and Society*. 1(1), pp. 84-94.
- Psathas, G. (1980) Goffman and the Analysis of Interaction in *The View From Goffman*, edited by Ditton, J. New York: St. Martin's
- Punch, K. F. (2014) *Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. London: Sage.
- Quinney, R. (1970) *The Social Reality of Crime*. Boston: Little and Brown.
- Ramsay, M. (1989) Downtown Drinkers: the perceptions and fears of the public in a city centre. *Crime Prevention Unit Paper 19*. London: HMSO.
- Ramos, L.L. and Andrade-Palos, P. (1993) Fear of Victimization in Mexico. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*. 3 (1), pp.41-51.
- Reiman, J. (1995) *The Rich Get Richer and the Poor Get Prison*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Reiss, A. (1967) Studies in crime and law enforcement in major metropolitan areas *President's Commission on Law Enforcement & Administration of Justice. Field Surveys III*. Washington D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Richard, R. and Johnson, M. S. (2001) The Psychological Influence of the Police Uniform. *FBI Enforcement Bulletin* 27.
- Rifai, M.Y. (1982) Methods of Measuring the Impact of Criminal Victimization through Victimization Surveys in H.J. Schneider (ed.) *The Victim in International Perspective*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Riger, S., Gordon, M., and LeBailly, R. (1982) Women's fear of crime: From blaming

to restricting the victim. *Victimology*. 3 (1), pp. 274-284.

Riger, S. (1981) On Women in D.A. Lewis (ed.) *Reactions to Crime*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage: pp. 47-66.

Royce, D. (2004) *Research Methods in Social Work*. 4th Edition. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Thomson Learning.

Sampson, R. J. (1988) Community Structure and Crime: Testing Social Disorganisation Theory. *American Journal of Sociology*. 94 (1) pp. 774-802.

Sampson, R.J. (1991) Linking the micro- and macro-level dimensions of community social organization. *Social Forces*. 70 (1), pp. 43-64.

Sampson, R. J. and Wooldredge, J. D. (1986) Evidence that high crime rates encourages migration away from central cities. *Sociology and Social Research*. 70 (3), pp. 310-314.

Sandberg, L. and Tollefsen, A. (2010) Talking about Fear of Violence in Public Space: Female and Male Narratives in Umea, Sweden. *Social and Cultural Geography*. 11 (1), pp. 1-15.

Sasson, T. (1995) Crime Talk: how citizens construct a social problem in Pain, R. (2000) Place Social Relations and the Fear of Crime: A Review. *Progress in Human Geography*. 24 (3), pp. 365-387.

Scott, J. (1990) *A Matter of Record*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Seidel, J. and Kelle, U. (1995) Different Functions of Coding in the Analysis of Textual Data in Kelle, U. (ed) *Computer-Aided Qualitative Data Analysis: Theory, Methods and Practice*. London: Sage.

Seidel, J (1998) Qualitative Data Analysis. The Ethnograph v5 Manual, Appendix E.

Available online at: <http://www.qualisresearch.com/>.

Seidman, I. (2013) *Interviewing as Qualitative Research*. Teachers College Press: New York.

Shakespeare, C1599-1600, *As You Like It*, 2/7.

Shaw, L. (1973) The Role of Clothing in the Criminal Justice. System *Journal of Police Science and Administration*. 1 (4), pp. 414-420.

Shotland, R.L., Hayward, S.C., Young, C., Signorella, M.L., Mindingall, K., Kennedy, J. K, Rovine, M.J. and Danowitz, E.F. (1979) Fear of Crime in Residential Communities. *Criminology*. 17(1), pp. 34-45.

Skogan, W.G. (1987) The Impact of Victimization on Fear. *Crime and Delinquency* 33(1), pp. 135-154.

Skogan, W. G. (1986) *From Crime policy to Victim Policy*. London: Macmillan.

Smith, J. A., Flower, P. and Larkin, M. (2009) *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Methods and Research*. London: Sage.

Smith, S. J. (1987) in Pain, R. (2000) Place Social Relations and the Fear of Crime: A Review. *Progress in Human Geography*. 24 (3), pp. 365-387.

Smith, S. J. (1987) Fear of crime: Beyond a geography of deviance. *Progress in Human Geography*. 11, pp. 1-23.

Smith, W.R. and Torstensson, M. (1997) Fear of Crime: Gender Differences in Risk Perception and Neutralizing Fear of Crime: Towards Resolving the Paradoxes, *The British Journal of Criminology* 37(4), pp. 608-634.

Snedker, K. A. (2006) Altruistic and Vicarious Fear of Crime: Fear for Others and

Gendered Social Roles *Sociological Forum*. 21 (2), pp. 163-195.

Snow, D., Rochford, E., Worden, S. and Benford, R. (1986) Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilisation and Movement Participation. *American Sociological Review*. 51 (4), pp. 464-481.

Sparks, R. (1992) Reason and Unreason in Left Realism: some problems in the constitution of fear of crime, in R. Matthews & J. Young (eds.) *Issues in Realist Criminology*. London: Sage: pp.119-35.

Spielberger, C. D. (1966). *Theory and research on anxiety: Anxiety and Behavior*. New York: Academic press.

Stebbins, R. (1969) Role, Role Distance Behaviour and Jazz Musicians. *British Journal of Sociology*. 20 (4), pp. 406-415

Steimer, T. (2002) The Biology of Fear and anxiety related behaviours. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*. 4 (3), pp. 231-249.

St John, C. and Heald-Moore, T. (1995) Fear of Black Strangers. *Social Science Research*. 24 (3), pp. 262-280.

Stone, G.P. and Faberman, H. (1986) in Brissett, D. and Edgley, C. (1990) *Life as Theatre: A Dramaturgical Source Book*. New York: Adler de Gruyter.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J.M. (1998) *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Strong, P. (1988) Minor courtesies and Macro structures in Hillyard, S. (2010) Ethnography's Capacity to Contribute to the Cumulation of Theory: A Case Study of Strong's Work on Goffman. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*. 39 (4), pp. 421-440.

Strong, P. (1988) *Courtesies and Structures: Erving Goffman: Exploring the*

interaction order. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Sutton, R. and Farrall, S. (2005) Gender, Socially Desirable Responding and the Fear of Crime. *British Journal of Criminology*. 45 (2), pp. 212-224.

Taylor, S. J. and Bogdan, R. (1984) *Introduction to qualitative research methods: The search for meanings*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Taylor, R. and Covington, J. (1993) Community structural change and fear of crime. *Social Problems*. 40 (3), pp. 374-397.

Taylor, C. and Gibbs, G. R. (2010) What is Qualitative Data Analysis (QDA)? [online] Available at: http://onlineqda.hud.ac.uk/Intro_QDA/what_is_qda.php
Accessed: 14/10/2013.

Thomas, W.I. & Thomas, D.S. (1928) *The Child in America*. New York: Knopf.

Tosh, J. (1991) *The Pursuit of History: Aims, Methods & New Directions in the Study of Modern History*. 2nd Edition. Harlow: Longman

Tseelon, E. (1992) Is the Presented Self Sincere? Goffman, Impression Management and the Postmodern Self. *Theory, Culture and Society*. 9 (2), pp. 115-128.

Valentine, G. (1992) Images of Danger: Women's source of information about the spatial distribution of male violence. *Area*. 24 (3), pp. 22-29.

Vanderveen, G. (2006) *Interpreting Fear, Crime, Risk & Unsafety*. The Hague: BJU Legal Publishers.

Vrij, A. and Winkel, F. (1991) Characteristics of the built environment and fear of crime: A research note on interventions in unsafe locations. *Deviant Behaviour*. 12 (2), pp. 203-215.

Waller, I. and Okihiro, N. (1978) *Burglary: The Victim and the Public*. Toronto:

University of Toronto Press.

Walklate, S. (2007) *Imagining the Victim of Crime*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Walklate, S. and Mythen, G. (2008) How Scared are We? *British Journal of Criminology*. 48 (2), pp. 209-225.

Wacquant, L. (2004) *Body and Soul: Ethnographic Notebooks of An Apprentice-Boxer*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Warr, M. (1982) The Accuracy of Public Beliefs about Crime: further evidence. *Criminology*. 20 (4), pp. 185-204.

Warr, M. (1984) Fear of Victimization: Why Are Women and the Elderly More Afraid? *Social Science Quarterly*. 65 (3), pp. 681-702.

Warr, M. (1985) Fear of Rape among Urban Women. *Social Problems*. 32 (3), pp. 238-250.

Warr, M. (1990) Dangerous Situations: Social Context and Fear of Victimization *Social Forces* 68 (3), pp. 891-907.

Warr, M. and Ellison, C. (2000) Rethinking social reactions to crime: Personal and altruistic fear in family households. *American Journal of Sociology*. 106 (3), pp. 551-578.

Watts, S. (2008) *Victim Support Informal Communication C*. District Manager, North Kent and Medway Office.

Weigert, A. J. (1991) *Life as Theatre: A Dramaturgical Source Book*. *Symbolic Interaction*. London: Routledge.

West, C. (1996) Goffman in Feminist Perspective. *Sociological Perspectives*. 39 (3),

pp. 353-369.

West Yorkshire Police Authority (2006) *Working with you to improve local policing*. West Yorkshire: Northgate Information Systems.

White, M., Kasl, S. V., Zahner, G. E. p., and Will, J.C. (1987) Perceived crime in the neighbourhood and mental health of women and children. *Environment and Behaviour*. 19 (5), pp. 588-613.

Williams, F., McShane, M. and Akers, R. (2000) Worry About Victimization: An alternative and reliable measure for fear of crime. *Western Criminology Review*. 2 (2), pp.1-31.

Williams, K.S. (2004) *Textbook on Criminology*. 5th Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, S.J. (1986) Appraising Goffman. *British Journal of Sociology*. 37 (3) 348-369.

Wilson, J. Q. (1975) *Thinking About Crime*. New York: Basic Books.

Wilson, J.Q. and Kelling, G.L. (1982) Broken Windows. *Atlantic Monthly*. 249 (3), pp. 29-38.

Wincup, E. and Noakes, L. (2004) *Criminological Research Understanding Qualitative Methods*. London: Sage.

Wright, T., Decker, SH. (1997) *Armed Robbers in Action: Stick ups and Street Culture*. Lebanon: University Press

Yarwood, R. and Gardner, G. (2000) Fear of Crime, Cultural Threat and the Countryside Area. 32 (4), pp. 403-411.

Yin, P. (1980) Fear of Crime among the Elderly: Some Issues and Suggestions. *Social*

Problems. 27 (1), pp. 492-504.

Zicklin, G. (1968) A conversation concerning face-to-face interaction. *Psychiatry.* 31 (3), pp. 236-249.

