

https://dspace.org/

Fear of crime and its relationship to helping attitudes and empathy in a South African student sample

Buitendag, Juandri

2017

https://hdl.handle.net/10539/24457

Buitendag, Juandri (2017) Fear of crime and its relationship to helping attitudes and empathy in a South African student sample, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, <https://hdl.handle.net/10539/24457>

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Fear of Crime and its Relationship to Helping Attitudes and Empathy in a South African Student Sample

By

Juandri Buitendag

Student No. 532616

A research report submitted to the School of Human and Community Development, Faculty of Humanities in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master's in Community-Based Counselling Psychology

Supervisor

Professor Tanya Graham

September 2017

Declaration

I, **Juandri Buitendag**, declare that this research report is my own unaided work except as stated in the acknowledgements. No other person's work has been used without due acknowledgement in the main text of this report. It is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for a Master's degree in Community-Based Counselling Psychology at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination at any other university.

Signature of Candidate Date: 28/09/2017

Juandri Buitendag

Student Number: 532616

Dedication

To my father Manfred, for without you, this would not have been possible. You inspire me and make all my dreams come true.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my family and friends for your continual support and unwavering belief in me, and all the encouragement along the way.

I acknowledge with gratitude the guidance of my supervisor, Professor Tanya Graham. I am grateful to Professor Graham for her support in my choice of research. To Professor Vera Roos, a colleague and a remarkable researcher; thank you for your patience with me, and your continual support. Lastly, to my participants, who have allowed this research to come alive.

Contents

List of Tables 10

List of Abbreviations 11

CHAPTER 1: Introduction and Background 1

Introduction 1

Background to the Study 2

Aims of the Study 5

Rationale of Study 6

Chapter Organisation 10

CHAPTER 2: Literature Review 12

Introduction 12

Crime in the South African Context 12

The Importance of Fear of Crime on Campuses. 15

Crime on Wits Campus. 18

Victimisation 20

Fear of Crime and Decision to Protect Oneself. 21

The Importance of Empathy 23

Empathy in the South African Context. 26

The Importance of Helping Attitudes 27

Prosocial Behaviour. 28

Trauma and Prosocial Behaviour 33

Studies on Victimisation and Helping Behaviour. 34

Latane and Robin (1969) Model in South Africa. 35
Gender, Victimisation, Fear of Crime, Empathy and Helping behaviour 39
Theoretical Framework 40
Operational Definitions 45
Conclusion 46
CHAPTER 3: Methodology 48
Introduction 48
The following research questions guided this study: 48
Hypotheses 48
Research Design 49
Sample and Sampling 49
Instruments 52
Independent Variables. 52
Dependent Variable 54
Procedure 54
Data Analysis 55
Ethical Considerations 56
Conclusion 57
CHAPTER 4: Results 58
Introduction 58
Preliminary Descriptive Data Analyses 58

Victimisation Frequencies 58
IRI Scale 59
Fear of Crime on Campus Scale 60
Helping Attitudes Scale 60
Reliability Analysis 60
Reliability for IRI Scale 61
Reliability for Fear of Crime on Campus 61
Reliability for Helping Attitudes Scale 62
Correlational Analyses 65
ANOVA Results 66
Independent T-tests 67
Independent t-tests Helping Attitudes and Victimisation 68
Independent t-tests Fear of Crime on Campus and Victimisation 69
Independent T-tests Empathy and Victimisations 70
MANOVA Results 71
Hierarchical Multiple Regression 72
Additional Analyses 75
ANOVA Population groups and Fear of Crime On Campus 75
Summary of Results 76
Chapter 5: Discussion 77
Introduction 77

A Synopsis 77

Findings 78

Interpretation of Results 79

Methodological Issues 90

Conclusion 90

Chapter 6: Conclusion, Strengths, Limitations and Future Recommendations 91

Strengths of the Study 91

Limitations of the Study 92

Significance of the Study 92

Proposed Future Research 94

Implications for University Security 95

Implications for Campus Counselling Services 96

Conclusion 97

References 98

APPENDIX A: Demographic Questionnaire 112

APPENDIX B: The Interpersonal Reactivity Index 113

APPENDIX C: Fear of crime on campus instrument 116

APPENDIX D: Victimisation Instrument 118

APPENDIX E: Helping Attitudes Scale 119

APPENDIX F: Ethical Clearance Certificate 121

APPENDIX G: Participant letter 122

List of Tables

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of the Sample (N=264) 61
Table 2 Frequencies of Victimisation 69
Table 3 Descriptives Empathy Subscales 70
Table 4 Descriptives Fear of Crime on Campus Scale 71
Table 5 Descriptives of Helping Attitudes Scale 71
Table 6 Reliability measure of Empathy 72
Table 7 Reliability Measure of Fear of Crime 72
Table 8 Item Total Statistics of Helping Attitudes Scale 73
Table 9 Pearson Correlation between Helping Attitudes, Empathy and Fear of Crime on Campus 76
Table 10 Hypothesis 1: Levels of empathy and levels of helping attitudes 76
Table 11 Hypothesis 2: Levels of fear of crime on campus and helping attitudes 66
Table 12 Hypothesis 3: Gender differences in fear of crime on campus, helping attitudes and empathy. 77
Table 13 Independent t-tests Helping Attitudes and Victimisation 78
Table 14 Hypothesis 4: Different victimisations will have an effect on helping attitudes in students 79
Table 15 Independent t-tests Fear of Crime and Victimisation 80
Table 16 Hypothesis 5: Different victimisations will have an effect on fear of crime on campus in students 80
Table 17 Independent t-tests Empathy and Victimisation 81
Table 18 Hypothesis 6: Different victimisations will have an effect on students empathy 81
Table 19 Hypothesis 7: Exposure to crime and effect on fear of crime on campus, empathy and helping attitudes. 82
Table 20 Results of the Hierarchical Multiple Regression on Helping Attitudes of students who have been victimised on campus. 83
Table 21 Results of the Hierarchical Multiple Regression on Helping Attitudes of students who have not been victimised on campus 84
Table 22 Hypothesis 7: Exposure to crime and effect on fear of crime on campus, empathy and helping attitudes. 85

List of Abbreviations

ANOVA ..... Analysis of Variance

CCDU ..... Career and Counselling Development Unit

CPTED..... Crime Prevention through Environmental Design

CTS ..... Continuous Traumatic Stress

HAS..... Helping Attitude Scale

HPCSA..... Health Professions Council of South Africa

IRI ..... Interpersonal Reactivity Index

MANOVA..... Multivariate Analysis of Variance

MRA ..... Multiple Regression Analysis

SAPS ..... South African Police Service

StatsSA..... Statistics South Africa

UCT..... University of Cape Town

UK..... United Kingdom

USA..... United States of America

Wits..... University of the Witwatersrand

CHAPTER 1: Introduction and Background

Introduction

The South African Victims of Crime Survey (2014) indicated that persons older than 16 years of age, most commonly experienced theft of personal property. These crimes as a statistic, might be considered a threat too remote to have any bearing on well-being. However, with crime becoming a personal issue to individuals in South Africa, it has a direct negative influence on people's helping behaviours and quality of life (Møller, 2005). Evidence of category crimes such as contact crimes and property crimes, have been suggested to have risen in violence in the past years in South Africa. Violence presents a significant challenge within the South African context. Research indicates increased levels of interpersonal and collective violence exhibited in either physical, sexual or psychological forms (Bowman et al., 2015). Neocosmos (2010) outlined the link between injustices and trauma that victims face in modern times. However, others have noted that trauma is a deep-rooted issue in South Africa (Bowman et al., 2015). Despite this, a constant effort is made for South Africans to overcome the effects of past and present injustices. These factors are acknowledged as a presidential problem, and despite much progress and positive reformation in social and economic areas, certain inequalities and residual trauma of an oppressive era remain (Bell, 2015). But, these factors are to be considered as background and history of the South African population, and is not necessarily the focus of this study.

Crime on campus threatens the sustainability of society, and Arther and Bohlin (2005) say that universities have an ethos – good or bad – and that such moral criteria can transform students' characters, defining them for future societies. Crime is a construct which is well researched in the field of psychology, and many authors agree that crime is not new (Bendebaugh, 2003; Kramer, 2013). However, globally, South Africa is considered a country

wrought by crime, violent communities, and student protests. The most recent student protests have been thoroughly covered by the media and shine a light on the importance of university structures. Some reports have shown universities to be a microcosm of the whole of society and as such, has been the driving force of this research. It was elected in response to a large body of previous research that showed the significant relationship between empathy and helping attitudes, however, the topic emerged from the dearth of literature on the role that victimisation and fear of crime might play on these previously correlated variables within university structures.

Background to the Study

Clinard, Quinney and Wildeman (2014) outline a diverse range of behaviours that are included within the category of crime. In understanding fear of crime, it is important to acknowledge that crime is a multifaceted phenomenon that can be influenced by many variables and can take many different forms (Crush, 2008). Due to the word "crime" referring to a limitless variety of typologies, the current study focussed on specific types of crime. The Legalistic Typologies and the South African Police Service (SAPS) defined and included crimes which are used in legal classifications. Categories that are considered are "crimes against the person", which are crimes generally referred to in South Africa as "contact crimes"; they include instances where a person or people are injured/harmed or threatened with injury/harm during the incident. "Crimes against property" consists of crimes that occur when the victim is not present, or where the victim does not know that a crime is being committed, e.g. theft or vehicle theft (Brodie, 2013). Although the context of crime in this research details specific typologies; in pursuance of presenting an overview of how the concept is described in South African literature, this literature discussion will include various types of crime and studies which were carried out inside and outside of university contexts.

South Africa's statistics for contact crimes and crimes against property increased over the two years before the 2013 crime report was released (StatsSA, 2013). Media nationally and internationally covered the wave of student protests that started at the University of Cape Town (UCT) in March 2015. In addition to campus shutdowns across the country and the uptake of the activist groups associated with the #FeesMustFall movement, further demonstrations were held at the Union Buildings in Pretoria and within weeks, saw the beginning of protests at Wits (Luescher et al., 2017). Student protests across the country resulted in a culture of violent crimes against university and governmental systems. Along with the misperception that university campuses are environments where academic activities are conducted with a relatively low safety risk, students have articulated their escalating fears regarding crime on campuses (Healy-Clancy, 2016). Although there is acknowledgement of such crime against systems, and the culture of crime against establishments have been considered; the current study will focus on contact crimes and crimes against property on university campuses in South Africa.

Universities have been at the forefront of educating future decision makers, entrepreneurs, and leaders (Lozano et al., 2013). Furthermore, others have indicated that universities have the tendency to self-replicate their students, which delegates the types of leaders that are born throughout the generations (Walther et al., 2005). This provides a challenge to institutions of higher education and to society in general. To achieve a sensible future for those who are experiencing increased levels of crime and for those affected by the #FeesMustFall protests, one must consider changing the culture at universities. There is an abundance of research which declares that crime has a direct influence on isolation and may cause a rupture in the social fabric and social disorganisation of groups (Eagle, 2015). The indication that university students achieve high positions in society – such as leaders and chief executive officers – is of paramount importance, as these individuals will impact society

(Lozano et al., 2013). It is important to look at the effects of these crimes within university contexts and the ramifications towards society. The impact of crime on society indicates a need to address the empathy deficit (Krznaric, 2015).

Krznaric (2015) along with other authors (Nava, 2007; Roos and Wheeler, 2016) have characterised empathy as an essential element in the leap from self-interest to common-interest thinking. As outlined by George Lakoff (2005) cited in Krznaric, 2015, p. 4:

> Empathy is at the heart of real rationality, because it goes to the heart of our values, which are the basis of our sense of justice. Empathy is the reason that we have the principles of freedom and fairness, which are necessary components of justice. (Krznaric, 2015, p. 4).

Roos and Wheeler (2016) comment on the importance of empathy and how, in the South African context, it is informed by the notion of holism. There is an agreement with Krznaric's notion of an empathic society and the suggestion that the achievement of one's own well-being transpires through the promotion of the well-being of others. Empathy is an inseparable part of an individual's emotions (Nava, 2007; Roos & Wheeler, 2016). Nava (2007) states that empathy is a natural human ability, and can promote the helping of others through the literal concept of taking the perspective of "the other". Nava (2007) terms this concept as "taking into perspective" which is a type of empathy that may, or may not culminate in the assistance of another. Such information is important in the role of prosocial behaviour, defined for this study as, assuming attitudes to lessen the object's unease. There is generally a difference between the self and the object, and the ability to help is present. It brings about the needed scope to investigate the types of individuals who would intervene with crimes, and for what reasons.

Previous research done by Bedenbaugh (2003) on the effects of victimisation and fear of crime on campuses, informed this research. The study aims to narrow the gap in research into the nature and effects of fear of crime on students' empathy, and in turn changing attitudes in the South African context. This study seeks to explore if and whether fear of crime may be a predictor variable in relation to university students' empathy and helping attitudes.

For this reason, crime will be contextualised by reviewing previous literature, specifically statistics in a South African context: whether a relationship exists between empathy and helping attitudes/prosocial behaviour; what literature reveals about the psychological impacts of fear of crime and victimisation, on empathy and helping attitudes; the rationale of the study; and finally, the proceeding chapters. Hoffman's Moral Development Theory will be used as a theoretical framework to inform this study and to explain the interactions between the interconnected variables of fear of crime, empathy and helping attitudes. Crime is a multifaceted phenomenon which covers a wide range of behaviour and typologies. For the purpose of this study, crime is defined specifically in relation to "crimes against (a) person"; instances where a person or people are injured/harmed or threatened with injury/harm, and "crimes against property"; crimes that occur when the victim is not nearby, or where the victim is unaware that a crime has been committed (Brodie, 2013). Further definitions of empathy, helping attitudes and victimisation will be provided.

Aims of the Study

The general aim of the study is to explore whether there is a relationship between the levels of empathy in South African students at the University of the Witwatersrand, and the helping attitudes of the same student cohort. A secondary aim will be to determine whether these variables are influenced by fear of crime and victimisation on campus.

Rationale of Study

University campuses are, in most instances, viewed as environments built for academic activities and possessing relative safety, however, along with subsequent protests which have demanded that higher education fees must fall, students have articulated a higher fear of crime on campuses across the country (Healy-Clancy, 2016).

The SAPS and media coverage portrayed the increased violent behaviour of subsequent protests across campuses in South Africa. Contemporary South Africa is faced with social injustices, crime, and a fear of crime, these factors remain a significant issue within this context and represent an ongoing complication within university spheres (Mogekwu, 2005; Singh, Mudaly, & Singh-Pillay, 2015). People born and raised in South Africa, as well as immigrants, appear to face certain psychological and social challenges associated with the social injustices, prejudices and crime of the country (Bénit-Gbaffou & Oldfield, 2011).

The South African Victims of Crime Survey (2014) reports that since 2010, four in 10 people's feelings of fear of crime had increased, and that individuals aged 16 and older have commonly experienced theft of personal property. In addition to this, the survey also noted that countrywide, individuals in the Free State reported feeling the most unsafe, particularly when walking alone (Stats SA, 2014). While the South African Victims of Crime Survey (2014) highlights the growing rate of crime in South Africa and individual's feelings of fear of crime, it fails to account for the specificity of students' responses to perceptions of crime on South African campuses. The limited scope of the survey fails to include the approximately 100 000 students who were enrolled at South African universities in 2013 alone (Stats SA, 2013).

Fear of crime and victimisation represents a physical and psychological intrusion in university culture, and in the personal lives of university students. Combined with the lack of awareness of crime on campus, fear of crime has been associated with students becoming victims of campus crime (Bedenbaugh, 2003). Fear of crime on campuses has been extensively researched in Westernised countries (Laner, Gover, & Dahod, 2009), but within a South African context, there appears to exist a relative dearth of research and information, despite the high prevalence of crime. The literature which is available, indicates that rigorous future research is required regarding fear of crime and victimisation in South Africa in general, and on South African university campuses (Demombynes & Özler, 2005; Kramer, 2013).

As a result, there is impetus to examine fear of crime at universities in a South African context. Lozano et al., (2013) stated the importance of university students and their impact on society, explaining that there is evidence suggesting that university students are the driving force for change in society. Research indicates that universities are responsible for the production of community and societal leaders in all spheres (Lozano et al., 2013). Universities train South African leaders, from teachers to chief executive officers, and such production indicates the importance of a university student population. Society has viewed university campuses separately from the crimes faced by the country and has wrongly assumed campuses to be immune to the crimes surrounding them (Bedenbaugh, 2003). This study examines fear of crime and victimisation on campuses and empathetic levels that could foster helping attitudes towards others.

Fear of crime on campus and victimisation has become a growing concern for individuals and institutions (Hilinski, 2008; Singh, Mudaly, & Singh-Pillay, 2015). Fear of crime not only affects the potential enrolment of students at universities, but also affects students' sense of community and helping attitudes towards others (Bell, 2015; Bond, Desai,

& Ngwane, 2013). It therefore appears imperative that research within a South African context investigates the individual effects of crime and that it explores what influences helping attitudes towards others (Williams et al., 2007). Recent social protests associated with the #FeesMustFall movement, have intensified the need to understand students' fear of crime and its relationship to empathy and helping attitudes towards others on South African campuses (Kiguwa & Langa, 2015), with a view to understanding how these attitudes could be strengthened. Krznaric (2014) recognised the root of prejudice, crime and violence as the inability to see the perspective of "the other". Krznaric's (2014) study indicates that empathy should be the fundamental force for social change, along with others such as De Waal (2009), who agrees with the importance and effect that individuals with empathy may have on society.

Research has indicated that crime is directly correlated to the isolation of individuals (Eagle, 2015), and such isolation causes a rupture in the social fabric of university students' lives. Past research extensively examined factors associated with prosocial behaviour and has consistently found that prosocial behaviour and helping attitudes were directly correlated to empathy in individuals (Batanova, Espelage, & Rao, 2014; Roberts, Strayer, & Denham, 2014; Sharma, 2015). This is also in accordance to Hoffman's (2000) theory of Moral Development, which states that individuals who exhibit higher levels of empathy, also exhibit more prosocial behaviour. Empathy will thus be used as a variable and this is a direct result of its relationship to people exhibiting helping attitudes (Graziano, Habashi, Sheese, & Tobin, 2007). While previous studies addressed the relationship between the empathy and prosocial behaviour of individuals and their expressed willingness to help others, (e.g. Decety, Bartal, Uzefovsky, & Knafo-Noam, 2016; Roberts, Strayer, & Denham, 2014; Schroeder & Graziano, 2015), research within a South African sample has been overlooked (Kramer, 2013). This scarcity of research suggests that little is known about empathy and helping

attitudes in South Africa. Although there is acknowledgement that the helping attitudes which will be examined transcend the larger social issues of people in South Africa, this research will add to the existing literature base and could stimulate further research. It may also foster increased understanding of prosocial behaviour in the South African campus context.

In addition, existing studies have researched empathy and its relation to prosocial behaviour, but have not examined the interaction between these variables and the fear of crime. Graziano et al. (2007) indicated that there could be a strong link between the person-situation complex, and their motivation to help others, suggesting that individuals with a disposition for empathetic behaviour may not act in some instances because of other situational factors and processes. Fear of crime may therefore be an important factor that affects the expression of prosocial attitudes towards others. Few studies have researched the effects of empathy on helping behaviour in South Africa. When examining the high rates of crime and victimisation in South Africa, it is important to consider that empathy levels for some individuals may be high, but so is crime and victimisation, and this may inhibit helping attitudes towards others (Boag & Wilson, 2013; Demombynes & Özler, 2005; Fox, Nobles, & Piquero, 2009).

The present research seeks to contribute to the existing library of knowledge on the chosen topic. In addition, the findings may prove informative for universities, as it will provide information about the current sense of fear, and helping attitudes among its students. This information may also be useful in informing possible interventions and preventative actions in campus support services. Lastly, this research will be making use of instruments that have never been used or tested on a culturally diverse sample or in a South African university campus context, and thus will be testing psychometric properties (Bedenbaugh, 2003).

Chapter Organisation

The following chapters include:

Chapter 1: Introduction and Background: The chapter includes the introduction which outlines the importance and significance of the constructs of the study. Furthermore it includes the background of the study, which has also been included to give a foundation of the utilised constructs. This chapter will be concluded with the aims of the study and the rationale of the study.

Chapter 2: Literature review: The following chapter will focus on the constructs of the study, such as crime in South Africa and the university campuses, the importance of fear of crime on campuses, and a specific look at crime on Wits campus, followed by the construct of victimisation, and the decision to protect oneself. The description of its link to the importance of empathy and an outline of the Hoffman theory which drives this study and what this means for empathy in the South African context. This outlines the importance of helping attitudes and prosocial behaviour, and the correlation between victimisation and helping behaviour. For this, prosocial behaviour theories will be outlined, along with the Latane and Robin (1969) Model in South Africa. There is also a focus on the correlation between gender, victimisation, fear of crime, empathy and helping behaviour in South Africa. Lastly, the theoretical framework for this study is examined in detail.

Chapter 3: Methodology: This research project made use of a quantitative design to answer proposed research hypotheses and research questions. Information regarding the research design, including sampling method, data collection, data analysis, quality, and ethical considerations, are discussed.

Chapter 4: Results: The results of the study were presented in order of the outlined hypotheses. Data was investigated to ensure the assumptions of parametric testing were

complied with. Reliability statistics were run for all measures utilised in this study. The hypotheses were tested using correlations, Independent T-tests an ANOVA, along with a MANOVA and hierarchical multiple regressions.

Chapter 5: Discussion: This chapter summarises the main findings of the study in relation to its general aims. The aim of this research was to investigate the relationship between the levels of empathy in South African students at the University of the Witwatersrand, and the helping attitudes of the same student cohort. A secondary aim was to determine whether these variables were influenced by fear of crime and victimisation on a university campus. This chapter further discusses the findings of the results section and will consequently examine the interpretation thereof. The interpretation of the results will be sectioned into the subsequent research questions which guided this research. The research questions that are discussed in accordance to the interpretation of the results, which include: whether helping attitudes of students on Wits campus are affected by fear of crime, victimisation and empathy; 1) whether gender has an effect on helping attitudes, empathy and fear of crime on campus; 2) whether individuals with higher levels of empathy exhibit higher levels of helping attitudes towards others; 3) whether, in cases where individuals have not been victimised, their levels of fear of crime on campus, empathy and helping attitudes have affected each other; and lastly, 4) whether in cases where individuals have been victimised, their levels of fear of crime on campus, empathy and helping attitudes have affected each other. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the methodological issues.

Chapter 6: Conclusion, Limitations and Recommendations for Future Studies: This chapter will evaluate the study to provide an overview of the strengths, weaknesses, and limitations. This chapter will conclude with a discussion of the implications of the research and recommendations for future studies.

CHAPTER 2: Literature Review

Introduction

The following chapter focusses on the constructs of the study, such as crime in South Africa and on the campuses of higher learning institutions, the importance of fear of crime on these campuses, and a specific look at crime on Wits campus. This will be followed by the construct of victimisation and the decision to protect oneself, its link to the importance of empathy, and an outline of the Hoffman theory which drives this study and describes what the study means for empathy in the South African context. It will also outline the importance of helping attitudes and prosocial behaviour and highlights the correlation between victimisation and helping behaviour. For this, prosocial behaviour theories are outlined, along with the Latane and Rodin Model in South Africa (Latane & Rodin, 1969). There is also a strong focus on the correlation between gender, victimisation, fear of crime, empathy, and helping behaviour in South Africa. Lastly, the theoretical framework for this study is examined in detail.

Crime in the South African Context

Citizens in South Africa seek to alleviate the fear of crime and to mitigate the incidence of crime by providing a sense of protection, such as building high walls around properties, however, such precautions cannot be used within university spaces (Lemanski, 2004). Meth (2016) agrees with this sentiment and acknowledges that the pervasive nature of crime crossing private and public boundaries, informs subsequent fear of crime. According to Lemanski (2004), a threat of crime affects all South Africans, however, the threat of victimisation is determined by where individuals live and work. This is a fact that skews victimisation rates in certain areas, in such cases, the fear of crime is greater in urban areas. It

is a popular perception that white South Africans report crime and fear crime, it also features higher on their societal concerns (Møller, 2005). Meth (2016) applauds the use of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) and recognises the role it plays in shaping crime prevention. Wealthy areas in South Africa are afforded a space and a sense of security due to plentiful police stations and protective infrastructure. In contrast, such infrastructure and the employment of private security is not available to areas with weak defensible spaces, such as universities. The significant increase in fear of crime is not restricted solely to affluent white suburbs. Poorer settlements and other areas within South Africa are equally permeated by fear (Lemanski, 2004). A viewpoint shared by all sectors of society is that criminals who are caught will not be brought to justice (Møller, 2005). Others have indicated the extreme disproportion between poor and black South Africans, and white South Africans (Silber & Geffen, 2016).

Research on fear of crime has grown considerably and has indicated that people believe crime and violence is increasing in frequency (Boda & Szabó, 2011). Fear of crime has been found to be equally distributed across social groups and environments (Powdthavee, 2005). Victims of crime in South Africa have argued that society has become complacent about crime (Møller, 2005). This suggests that the fear of crime plays a role in the lives of all individuals and groups in South Africa. The notion that crime, and the fear of crime, is felt equally across South Africa by all individuals is questionable, as literature suggests there are communities and cultures that survive by benefaction and by taking care of one another (Metz & Gaie, 2010). Eagle (2015) gives a definition to the constant fear in South African contexts as Continuous Traumatic Stress (CTS); a need to minimise or accommodate the reality of threat to survive in inescapably crime-ridden environments. CTS puts a psychological weight on individuals, and may explain why due to fear, some may choose to withhold helping behaviour. Bowman et al. (2015) outlined the complex ways in which South

Africa as a society has, over time, consistently utilised pathways of social inequality, militarised masculinity, community and family life which has been disrupted, and social capital which has been cut down, to form a socio-cultural tolerance of violence. Engaging with the violent crimes in South Africa has resulted in certain developmental and personality risk factors towards crime, and suggests the influence that certain factors may have on individual's fear of crime (Bowman et al., 2015). Given the high rates of crime in South Africa, one might contend that South Africans have become used to crime, and as such has become inclined to be depersonalised to witnessing crime of others and may not intervene. Moller (2005) considered that high crime rates may be an obstacle for South African citizens to have a high quality of life.

Some authors believe that the *ubuntu* ideology is a practice that allows for certain communities to be safer throughout South Africa (McAllister, 2009). Wilson (2001) states that *ubuntu* should be "recognised as an ideological concept with various definitions which brings together human rights, restorative justice, reconciliation and nation-building" (Wilson, 2001, p.13). Some authors argue that the use of the word *ubuntu* makes it unusable due to its overuse and exploitation (Krog, 2008). The ideology of *ubuntu* is widespread in South Africa, it is not denied that it has experienced enormous growth since the demise of the apartheid state, however, contemporary manifestations of *ubuntu* is based on a philosophy which informs action in daily life, as well as a principle that guides social action (McAllister, 2009). However, if *ubuntu* is utilised as a manner to explain social action, then one must consider its positives and negatives. Research suggests that *ubuntu* is not in so much a collectivist movement, but rather a movement that has revealed challenges and has slowly dispersed over time and is not used in the manner it was established to be used (Gumbo, 2014). Lemanski (2004) indicates that fear of crime is not confined to affluent white suburbs, but that it has

been felt throughout South Africa's diverse communities despite ideological uses of *ubuntu*, and is felt in black, coloured and poorer settlements alike.

Researchers have acknowledged that there is a great need for research about fear of crime in South African samples, and the importance of examining the interactive relationship between victimised students and helping behaviour (Crush, 2008; Kramer, 2013; Neocosmos, 2010). Furthermore, Dr Blade Nzimande, Minister of Higher Education and Training, stated in an open letter to all South African vice chancellors in 2015, that academic institutions needed to be assimilated into a solution for violent attacks at South African universities. Due to the lack of research on the impact of fear of crime and victimisation, the present study desires to explicitly link these factors and focus on the present gap in literature (Møller, 2005).

The Importance of Fear of Crime on Campuses.

South Africa has one of the highest crime rates in the world (Møller, 2005). It is a mark that has left South African society with high levels of fear of crime. Fox, Nobles, & Piquero (2009) agrees with this sentiment and defines fear as a multidimensional concept. South Africa's transparency in its trends of crime and violent crime, causes fear of crime to be pervasive throughout the country (Meth, 2016). Statistics show that there is an alarming increase in serious crimes in South Africa (Kramer, 2013; Lemanski, 2004). The worrying feature of crime scenes in South Africa is the propensity for violence. Although serious crime appears to present itself mainly in socio-economically deprived communities, recent studies have indicated that university students have encountered attacks in a more direct manner (Singh, Mudaly, & Singh-Pillay, 2015). Media coverage has suggested that there is something especially dramatic and distinctive about the 2015/16 protests (Badat, 2016).

Badat (2016) defines these protests as a general crisis of the state and against authority, and argues that such protests can only be resolved through formative action and the restructuring of economic, political and ideological systems. Badat (2016) provides the argument that the "consequence" of this is the pervasive destructiveness of the crises. Although such crime against the establishment is important for the contextual background of universities, it will not be the focus of this study.

Along with widespread feelings of discontent in South Africa and the students' #FeesMustFall movement, individuals have shown increased fear of crime on campuses (Bell, 2015; Bond, Desai, & Ngwane, 2013). Kiguwa and Langa (2015) also comment on key events such as #FeesMustFall and #RhodesMustFall, and how such movements increase anxiety and violence across the country. Thus, crime issues diminish satisfaction with community life on campus and overall well-being of individuals, unless negotiated by peace of mind with personal safety (Møller, 2005). Eagle (2015) suggests that such crime and violence may be playing a role in the facilitation of high levels of fear of crime and its contribution to social disorganisation. Such aspects of contemporary South African life, Eagle argues (2015), contribute indirectly to social mistrust and alienation, which enforces a mistrust in helping others. Exposure to high levels of crime and to the fear of crime on campuses due to student demonstrations, racial polarisation, and labour unrest contribute to individual and group anxieties. Such views are entrenched within public discourse and indirectly affects individuals' apprehension towards helping attitudes. Some authors suggest that crime has a direct influence on social cohesion and empathy (Eagle, 2015; Kiguwa & Langa, 2015; Krznaric, 2014). Some indicate that sense of injustice underpins the local insurgence of student demonstrations and the violent complexity of South Africa. It raises the struggle of identity that individuals may be encountering in South Africa. Where some may

be naturally empathetic, they struggle with continuous traumatic stress (CTS) and this may cause individuals to ponder to helping others or not.

Society has expected and viewed university campuses as sanctuaries for individuals where there is an elevated level of broadmindedness, as they are higher learning institutions (Bedenbaugh, 2003; Mogekwu, 2005). As stated before, the public perceive universities as separated from the real-world problems (Ferrari & Bristow, 2005). Fisher and Sloan III (2003) agreed with this sentiment that universities are assumed to be mostly crime free, but that university students report being afraid of crime. There is a need to reinvent the "clean" and "perfect" image of universities. Ferrari and Bristow (2005) suggested that university campuses need to develop initiatives to address community needs, and how such a sense of community may motivate students to perform public services such as helping those in need. There is little to no research that exists on how universities' surroundings may influence students' participation in helping behaviours. Fox et al. (2009) emphasised that crime victimisation is a growing concern on university campuses. Suggesting that crime and violence, and its social patterns are impacted through anxiety, anger and disillusionment, creating a continued violation that goes unchecked (Eagle, 2015). Eagle (2015) suggests that such factors not only reflect the fractured sense of society, but also the inhibition of agency of citizens to act and be part of a social movement.

South African research focusing on campus fear and the reasons related to it, has been scarce. In the United State of America, however, much research has focused on the reasons for fear of crime and the frequency of victimisation on campuses (Bedenbaugh, 2003; Hilinski, 2008). This research has given some insights into risks and safety on campuses. Despite this research, most studies have neglected to account for how the fear of crime may affect students' perceptions and what factors might contribute to how individuals feel, not only about crime itself, but also about helping victims (Demombynes & Özler, 2005). Few

studies in South Africa have researched how unsafe staff and students feel on campus. One study that examined this phenomenon, found that individuals' responses indicated that they felt unsafe on campus (Ayenibiowo, 2010). This was then found to affect prospective students' perceptions of safety and their choice of tertiary education institution (Kramer, 2013).

Crime on Wits Campus.

South African universities are in the spotlight due to the media coverage of the #FeesMustFall movement and its change from protest, to violent protest at Wits University (Luescher & Klemenčič, 2017). It is an indication that higher learning institutions are not without crime and fear of crime. Crime statistics from the Wits area in 2014 indicate an increase from 279 incidents the year before, to 310 in 2014 (Wits Vuvuzela, 2014). Wits has not only made students aware of campus control and security escorts that are available to them, but have also highlighted the crime hotspots on campus and in the surrounding areas. Despite the increase in theft, this has been stated to be a result of negligence by students. However, contact crimes have also increased in hot spots across campus, these include parking areas and some residences (Wits Vuvuzela, 2014).

One may debate how much crime truly happens within university campuses in South Africa. When designing campuses to eliminate crime, one expects spaces to be predominantly populated by pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and that such factors may prevent crime from happening. Other factors such as footpaths being built in open spaces and being well lit during dark hours, alarms within general use and in residential buildings may prevent crime even further. However, the social climate at Wits is contradictory to these previously suggested preventative factors (Lemanski, 2004). Listing key factors that shape security for

students, without such “target hardening”, it is understandable why fear of crime has risen over the years on campuses across the country. Factors such as these are critical in the shaping of an individual’s experience of crime and fear of crime on campuses. Observationally, the university is covered with examples of graffiti and vandalism, lights being out of order and alarms not working in classrooms or residential buildings.

Although crime is not always expressed through contact crimes at universities, there are still non-national, unwelcoming and despising feelings towards others, this is brought about by crime, which could be psychologically harming (Mogekwu, 2005; Singh, Mudaly, & Singh-Pillay, 2015). Despite crime only being understood as a statistic in previous studies, it is a true threat that directly and negatively impacts the subjective well-being and personal quality of life of all individuals in South Africa (Bradford, Huq, Jackson & Roberts, 2014; Møller, 2005). A study conducted by Cross and Johnson (2008) at Wits, found that xenophobic behaviours are linked to fear of crime and victimisation on campuses, leading to “serious repercussions” that include the perception that South Africa appears “very intimidating”. Despite the measurable and psychological distance South Africa has travelled since the apartheid era, Crush et al. (2008) found that group identities which reflect the apartheid legacy, are still felt on campuses. Further to this, individuals report having difficulty feeling a sense of community on campuses (Crush et al., 2008). Other authors such as Leong and Ward (2006) indicated that personality research into attitudes towards stereotyping may offer additional insights towards the influence of violent behaviour. The outbreak of attacks in recent years (protesting and xenophobic attacks) at South African universities, has made it clear that there is a great need for help and that this help comes first and foremost from within university structures (Vromans, Schweitzer, Knoetze, & Kagee, 2011).

Fisher and Sloan III (2003) indicated that previous studies on fear of crime focussed largely on the general population, and only limited research investigated the relationship with fear of crime and victimisation among university students. This is an imperative field of study due to the previous links made between university students and societal leaders as outlined by Lozano et al. (2013). Other studies have shown the compelling relationship between crime and the depersonalisation or dehumanisation of individuals exposed to trauma for extensive time frames (Eagle, 2015). Universities need to place an emphasis on the types of leaders they produce, and on producing leaders who will not take with them a culture of crime, which will affect the general population.

Victimisation

Research on types of victimisation on campuses has been scant in South African universities (Kramer, 2013). The limited literature that is available, however, indicates that contact crimes such as verbal abuse, behavioural divergence, and physical attacks generally take place in open areas, whereas sexual victimisation often occurs in university residences (Ayenibiowo, 2010). Overwhelming international research has indicated that those who have been the victims of crime demonstrate more fear of crime, than non-victims do (Boag & Wilson, 2013; Ferrari & Bristow, 2005).

These studies have typically omitted the link between types of victimisation and the level of victimisation, and the fear of crime on university campuses. Fox et al. (2009) suggests that prior research failed to analyse specific types of victimisation separately and failed to explore the relationship of fear of crime in students. Dull and Wint (1997) examined the relationship between different victimisation types and fear of crime. The results indicated a greater fear of property crime and that victims showed significantly more fear towards

property victimisation, whereas non-victims were significantly more fearful of personal victimisation (Dull & Wint, 1997). Such findings suggest that fear of crime is specifically associated with types of victimisation. Prior research indicated that partitioning victimisation types into categories such as personal versus property crime is limiting, as there are many different types of victimisation categories, and two such broad groupings do not allow for attention to more relationships.

Hopkins and Tilley (2001) state that three minimum components must combine for a crime to occur, such as: a convenient target; an offender; and the lack of a competent defender. The study suggests that residents have some control over victimisation, however, taking precautions and being vigilant may put pressure on citizens, such pressures include not calling for help in crime situations due to fear of personal sacrifice (Hopkins & Tilley, 2001; Møller, 2005). In accordance with the idea of certain factors influencing individuals' reactions to situations, studies have found that an individual's behaviour is influenced by biological as well as societal forces, and thus many variables can affect the way an individual reacts to people (Yakushko, 2008) in various situations (Aydinli, Bender, Chasiotis, Cemalcilar, & Vijver, 2014; Zhang & Ding, 2014).

Fear of Crime and Decision to Protect Oneself.

Drawing on a social psychological perspective, fear of crime is conceptualised as both an emotional concept and a cognitively based concept (Asencio, Merrill, & Steiner, 2014). It is a concept that is closely linked to perceived risk of victimisation, and it attempts to define the breadth to which individuals fear falling victim to crime. However, there have been suggestions to separate the two. Research has indicated that individuals who have high levels of perceived risk of victimisation, had very low levels of fear of victimisation (Ferraro &

LeGrange, 1987). This concept may be highly helpful concerning research in South Africa. It suggests that individuals who are highly vigilant may be less likely to act out helping behaviour due to their high perceived risk of victimisation. Research suggests that people who are afraid of being victimised, engage more in protective behaviour (Ferraro & LeGrange, 1987). Asencio, et al. (2014) suggests that potential negative consequences of engaging in prosocial behaviour heightens anxiety and as such, produces protective behaviour in people. Such protective behaviours decrease feelings of vulnerability and may be an indication why individuals with dispositional empathic traits may feel a need to protect themselves in a high-risk environment such as South Africa.

Asencio, et al. (2014) differentiates between fear of crime and perceived risk, and defines these as an emotional response to potential victimisation and a cognitive fear, respectively. There has been an indication in past research that fear of crime studies have neglected distinct populations such as university students (Asencio, et al. 2014; Woolnough, 2009). In 2012, the Bureau of Justice Statistics indicated that individuals between the ages of 18 and 24 had a higher rate of victimisation than any other age group, making this a distinct population to study. Although university students are not necessarily at higher risk of victimisation than their peers who are not students, others have indicated a higher fear of crime in university populations (Bedenbaugh, 2003; Rodriguez et al. 2013). Others have agreed with this sentiment and indicated that fear of crime and perceived risk are of higher concern to university students on campuses, as studies have suggested a higher-than-average crime rate in this population, specifically regarding sexual and simple assault against individuals (Lane, Gover, & Dahod, 2009).

While previous studies have focussed on variables such as fear of crime and perceived risk and victimisation, media reports and statistics of serious crimes on campuses in South Africa have indicated that far less attention has been given to those who are at high risk for

victimisation (i.e. university students). Powdthavee (2005) also indicated that women fear crime more than men in South Africa fear crime, both during the day and at night. Ferraro (1996) explained the marked gender differences concerning the fear of crime as a "shadow of sexual assault", and how such fears of rape or sexual assault influences the higher rates of fear in women, compared to men. Also suggesting that there are differences in gender regarding the fear of crime behaviours in university students. Fear of crime outcome behaviours can be dichotomised into avoidance/constrained behaviours, or protective/defensive behaviours (Asencio, Merrill, & Steiner, 2014). The protective behaviours include taking self-defence classes, whereas avoidance behaviours constitute any behaviour not participated in due to fear of victimisation, such as not helping someone on the side of the road, not visiting certain neighbourhoods, or choosing not to stay out late. Ferraro and LaGrange's (1987) study suggests that women, white people and individuals with low socio-economic status, are more likely to engage in avoidance and protective behaviours. Fear of crime, anxiety and worry about crime has become a familiar part of South African life. Reducing such feelings has resulted in little action or less action regarding prevention of crime or to be prosocial. South African research has indicated that those who worry about the consequences of crime are more likely to display increased levels of fear of crime (Powdthavee, 2005). As such, the findings of existing empirical research suggests a general trend of higher levels of fear of crime in women compared to males.

The Importance of Empathy

Nava (2007) expresses empathy as an investigative agent, a construct which has been studied previously, but one that still needs to be investigated, and one which opens a special pathway for the current study. Empathy, according to Bekkers and Wilhelm (2006), is

expressed as the emotional response of concern, sympathy, or compassion, in reply to other people's needs. For the present study, it is important to note that although individuals may exhibit high dispositional empathic burden and may also show a moral principle to help others, it is not synonymous with helping behaviour.

As set out by Preston and de Waal (2002) as cited in Nava (2007) there are delineations and different definitions for empathy. They define empathy in terms of different typologies. Firstly, *emotional contagion* is the emotional state of a subject that is a direct result of the object's state, with no separation between the self and the object. *Sympathy* is defined as the subject feeling sorry for the object, and such emotions are aimed towards the situation more than towards the physical state of the object. Nava (2007) defines empathy as the subject's emotional state, however, there is a difference between the self and the object, where an ability to help the other is present. Nava (2007) describes cognitive empathy as the subject representing the object's state, with the ability to culminate assistance. Nava (2007) similarly outline prosocial behaviour as a type of empathy and it is defined as the distinction between the self and the other, and the ability to help with the assumption to reduce the object's unease.

Decety and Jackson (2004) propose that empathy in individuals is composed of: affective sharing; conscience of the self and the other; and mental flexibility. Affective sharing is a shared representation between the self and the other which liaises with perception-action. Conscience of the self and other indicates that there is no confusion between the self and the other (Decety and Jackson, 2004). Mental flexibility is the adoption of the other's perspective and regulating the processes. Along with these complexities and the definitions, it indicates that empathy is an inseparable part of prosocial behaviour and the interaction between the self and the other.

Roos and Wheeler (2016) designate certain motivations towards being empathetic, they outline the following: listening to another to understand their world; allowing a better understanding of the other's situation; and responding with verbal and non-verbal messages that interconnect with an affective understanding of a person's situation. There is an acknowledgement that empathy is expressed on a cognitive and on an affective level (Roos & Wheeler, 2016). Van Langen et al. (2014) also define empathy in terms of a multidimensional construct comprising of cognitive and affective components. The cognitive component comprises the ability to recognise another's situation without the necessity of responding emotionally; and an affective level comprises of the emotional experience that accurately expresses the other.

Lack of empathy on the other hand may be explained as being less aware of the other, being judgemental, and analysing another's situation solely from one's own perspective, foregoing an emotional response to others (Roos & Wheeler, 2013). Building on this, Williams et al. (2007) indicate that there may not be a lack of empathy as such in the South African context, but that individuals may typically exhibit high levels of empathy which may then, due to their fear of crime, hinder their attitudes to helping others in a diverse range of situations.

Furthermore, a study done by Boag and Wilson (2013) indicates that one key mechanism, empathy, was robustly found to decrease negativity towards others as well as lowering stigmatisation. Research has, however, shown sufficient evidence that individuals with dispositional empathy have shown more helping behaviour towards others (Crush, 2008; Sharma, 2015). Staub (2001) concluded with the same findings that empathy was correlated with helping, along with several other studies, also indicating the relationship between empathy and helping behaviours (Decety, Bartal, Uzefovsky, & Knafo-Noam, 2016; Roberts, Strayer, & Denham, 2014; Schroeder & Graziano, 2015). Theorists have also shown

correlations between prosocial behaviour and prosocial personality, and have indicated empathy as a key component to helping attitudes (Batson, 2010).

Empathy in the South African Context.

Certain contextual and personal factors have been studied in other countries and have indicated that individuals with supportive familial relationships may be a precursor for empathetic concern for others (Mestre, Samper, Frías, & Tur, 2009). Furthermore, Batson et al. (2002) explored whether empathy for a member of a group which has been, can improve mindsets towards the group. The results suggested that empathy induced for a stigmatised member of such a group, can improve attitudes towards the entire group, and that more positive attitudes can translate into action on behalf of said group.

Contrary to this, Gilbert, Fiske, and Lindzey (1998) found that individuals' attitudes do not always translate into action. Such evidence suggests that individuals, with dispositional empathy, as in a South African context, may induce sympathetic feelings towards criminals. Batson et al. (2002) found that individuals' extreme negative attitudes have been challenged and changed despite an apparent attempt to resist the change. Attitudes changed significantly after several weeks despite that there was initially no significant improvement due to resistance (Batson et al. 2002). There is ample evidence to show that when feelings of empathy increased for a person in need, the readiness to help that person increased (Batson et al., 2002; Eisenberg et al., 2005).

Such a proposition may suggest that empathy felt for a member of a stigmatised group may lead to heightened readiness to help the group, this may range from any stigmatised group such as: victims; criminals; and racially stigmatised groups. Evidence of high empathy and reduced prejudice has emerged (Bäckström & Björklund, 2007). Boag and Wilson (2013)

proposed that an individual's engagement with prisoners serves as a function of reducing prejudice and increasing empathy towards offenders. Such suppositions may lend to individuals in South Africa's feelings of empathy towards criminals, and it may foster helping attitudes towards others despite crime and fear of crime on campus.

Vaes, Paladino, and Leyens (2002) propose a sense of "we-ness", that allows a group to have a sense of belonging, which in turn leads to and facilitates empathy and prosocial behaviour. Eagle (2015) disagreed with this sentiment by stating that CTS minimised the feeling of community and thus reduced empathic behaviour towards others.

The Importance of Helping Attitudes

Theoretical approaches explaining helping attitudes are numerous, and many circumstances and variables have been investigated (Aydinli et al., 2014). Helping attitudes in this study will therefore be defined on a multidimensional scale, which considers not only individuals' helping behaviours towards others, but also their own beliefs and feelings of helping others (Aydinli et al., 2014). Helping can therefore be conceptualised as planned helping, and spontaneous helping, along with antecedents which can predict these helping behaviours.

Empirical research has looked at the different factors that affect individuals' helping behaviour and formulated three main factors that influence helping behaviour, these being: social; dispositional, and situational (Lane et al., 2009). There have been many studies that examine helping behaviour regarding social, societal and psychological issues (Ferrari & Bristow, 2005; Graziano, et al. 2007). Aydinli et al. (2014) explained that although the concept of helping behaviours has been investigated across different circumstances, dispositions and motivations, they have yet to be researched in conjunction with each other. It

has been suggested that different types of helping can be driven by various psychological instruments (Graziano, Habashi, Sheese, & Tobin, 2007).

It has been indicated that there is a lack of research that studies the relationship between helping behaviour and fear of crime (Crush, 2008). Limited research has been conducted seeking to understand the individual's unwillingness to help as a function of their own fear of being victimised in South Africa (Batanova, Espelage, & Rao, 2014). Aydinli et al., (2014) agree with this statement and suggest that research on helping has so far only been examined with effects of personological variables and situational variables, but that individuals' prosocial value orientation and the interaction of implicit and explicit aspects, may affect individuals' different helping attitudes and beliefs. Aydinli et al. (2014) define explicit motives as operating on a conscious cognitive level and it directs individuals' behaviours towards goals, and that they then evaluate the situation and decide whether to pursue it, if they believe it is desirable. Secondly, in contrast, they define implicit motives as operating outside one's awareness. Suggesting that different behavioural outcomes can generally be determined by an interplay of implicit and explicit antecedents.

Prosocial Behaviour.

Past studies have indicated that from early adolescence, individuals are more likely to help others as they have a heightened sense of moral competence (Eisenberg, Cumberland, Guthrie, Murphy, & Shepard, 2005; Gini, Pozzoli, & Hauser, 2011).

Research has questioned, and has been puzzled over why certain individuals will help others to their own detriment (Latane & Rodin, 1969; Penner et al., 2005). Theories on the micro-level analysis of prosocial behaviour and helping attitudes, has entailed an evolutionary approach, biological and genetic bases of operation, developmental procedures,

and personality elements. Evolutionary theory focuses on kin selection, which is premised on the tenet that individuals would more likely help if there was a close "relatedness" to another person (Kotowski, 2001). Several studies have indicated and found that people are more inclined to help relatives than any other individuals or groups (Barrett et al. 2002). There has also been evidence that suggests that reciprocal altruism may be genetically expressed and as such, exists within every culture. Aligning with the ideals of *ubuntu*, Boster, Fediuk, and Ryan Kotowski (2001) have indicated that where individuals are brought up to help others, people are more likely to help those who offer help, and this creates a sense of community. Group selection is a mechanism of evolutionary theory that argues that groups with larger number of altruists will be dominating and this would increase empathic behaviour and decrease selfishness in individuals (Penner et al., 2005).

Biological and genetic bases of prosocial actions attempt to explain prosocial attitudes and behaviour through neuroanatomy and neurochemistry. This theory's assumption is based on the tenet that people participate in prosocial behaviour due to some physiologically-based affective state. Buck (2002) posited that there were innate neurochemical biases that allow individuals to act in a prosocial or selfish way. Although biological mechanisms have been found to underlie prosocial actions, others have believed that affective processes such as empathy, are an indication of a higher likelihood in being prosocial (Eisenberg et al., 1991). More recent research by Eisenberg et al. (2005) suggests, focussed on how affectability interacts with other variables to impact empathy and prosocial responses. Eisenberg et al. (2005) research found that children were more inclined to help positively if they were exposed to positive emotions during childhood. Contrary to this, Eisenberg et al. (2005) work also suggests that children who were often sad or anxious, increased their chances of responding with prosocial behaviour and helping others, however this is a general consideration and not necessarily specific to South Africa. Growing up in an environment

that is warm and empathetic, with a good life perspective, allows children to grow up feeling highly empathetic themselves, and such values may be instilled within certain South African cultures. However, many may feel such notions of empathy but may react differently, considering the current state of the country (Bowman et al. 2005).

Personality theories are well recognised for their assertions that certain personality factors are more highly correlated to prosocial behaviour (Eisenberg et al., 1991; Hilbig, Glöckner, & Zettler, 2014). Such tendencies are found to be relatively stable over life, and it is an indication that individuals' personalities may be highly empathetic, predisposing them to help others (Eisenberg et al., 1991; Hilbig, Glöckner, & Zettler, 2014). This is a difficult concept to generalise for the rest of the world, as not all individuals can participate in prosocial behaviour in cases of fear of crime and victimisation. There are significant associations between certain clusters of prosocial disposition, however, volunteering to help others ranges across situations (Penner et al., 2005). Penner et al. (2005) suggests future research widen the "lens" with which prosocial behaviour is viewed, specifically considering helping others, thinking about the processes thereof, and certain variables that contribute to such actions or inhibit such actions.

Helping has been investigated regarding the number of bystanders, the level or state of emergency, empathic concern, agreeableness and motivation. Bekkers and Wilhelm (2006) have indicated that there are certain determinants of helping behaviour; two of the main determinants being empathy and the principle of care. Previous studies have indicated that situational factors such as the number of bystanders and whether a bystander can interfere and help, were implicated (Laner & Benin, 2011). Secondly, social factors could influence whether an individual reacts, such as if they are a friend or family member of the victim. Finally, dispositional factors have indicated that there are enduring personal attributes and

personality traits in individuals who are more willing to help, such as females or individuals who are highly empathetic (Ferrari & Bristow, 2005; Laner & Benin, 2001).

Aydinli et al. (2014) disagree with these findings and state that various types of helping have hardly ever been examined in terms of implicit and explicit processes. Their study suggests that personal characteristics such as empathic feelings, or similar empathy-related ideas have been shown numerously to be associated with helping (Batson, Chang, Orr, & Rowland, 2002; Penner, et al., 2005). Aydinli et al. (2014) suggest that empathy has not been indicated to have a predictive effect as a variable on helping, and that sometimes these effects may be mediated by other beliefs. Limited research has examined the effects of higher moral competence in individuals and variables which may intervene with them helping others, these include victimisation, empathy and fear of crime.

On the other hand, Aydinli et al. (2014) found that explicit motivations predicted individuals' helping, regardless of implicit motivations, suggesting that individuals with high empathy levels would help regardless of the situation. However, these studies were not examined within a South African context where fear of crime and victimisation are of high concern. Batanova et al. (2014) indicated that certain characteristics, such as affective empathy, predict intervening behaviours and helping. Lane et al. (2009) investigated four models predicting the perceived likelihood of individuals choosing to intervene at the moment of victimisation and found that their participants – who were a large sample of college students – would intervene if they thought they were stronger, indicating that males, generally, were more likely to help (Laner & Benin, 2001). Once again, these studies have focused on only one factor that could influence helping attitudes, neglecting other possible aspects.

Despite these findings, there is still limited research addressing certain characteristics, traits and attitudes of people and their willingness to help others (Bekkers & Wilhelm, 2006; Morgan, Goddard & Givens, 1997). These variables have not been extensively studied within a South African context in which large social injustices may have led to an altered distribution of helping behaviour in this population, and it could be expected worldwide (Ferrari & Bristow, 2005; Wilhelm & Bekkers, 2010).

An individual's attitudes are formed during their socialisation with others as well as his/her personal consciousness (Litvinova & Tarasov, 2012). Penner et al. (1995) stated that prosocial behaviour, such as helping behaviour, was too convoluted to be anticipated by a single personality trait. Thus, it is difficult to predict behaviour in many specific situations when only looking at an individual's empathy and helping attitudes, specifically when fear of crime plays a huge role, such as in the South African context (Crush, 2008; Lemanski, 2004). It is important to note that these studies have not considered the role that an individual's fear of crime or experience of victimisation may have had, and with the additional relationship involving empathy and prosocial behaviour. A study by Graziano et al. (2007) can be seen as most valuable in forming a foundation for understanding the person-situation interaction in helping behaviour. There is acknowledgement that individuals do have certain dispositions, such as empathy that disposes them to help others more (Batson et al., 2002). However, it is argued that it is more informative to look at how these dispositions, combined with certain contexts, may affect whether and how individuals may decide to engage in prosocial behaviour (Graziano et al., 2007). Other researchers have also indicated a relationship between empathetic concern, intervention, and helping behaviour (Barchia & Bussey, 2011; Pöyhönen, Juvonen, & Salmivalli, 2010; Pozzoli, Gini, & Vieno, 2012).

Trauma and Prosocial Behaviour

Past research has indicated that individuals who have directly experienced traumatic events have benefitted in some way from the exposure and responded frequently to prosocial events (Frazier et al., 2013). The research was limited as it did not investigate trauma or victimisation experienced on the individual level, but rather looked at the collective level. This suggests that trauma experienced during events outside of the individuals themselves, made it easier to engage in prosocial behaviour. Piferi et al. (2006) examined the prosocial behaviour of university students after the attacks on the World Trade Centre in New York City. These students were much more willing to engage in prosocial behaviour as they were not directly affected by the terror attacks (Piferi, Jobe, & Jones, 2006). Studies following collective trauma have been more common, however, studies of prosocial behaviour following the experience of individual trauma, has been scarce (Frazier et al., 2013).

In the past 10 years, studies examining individual trauma and individuals' willingness to participate in helping behaviour, have indicated that individuals increasingly reported helping others, motivations being that it helped lessen their own distress after certain events (Piferi et al., 2006; Steffen & Fothergill, 2009). Although previous research suggests that people engage in helping behaviour after traumatic events, these studies were mostly conducted in the USA (Frazier et al., 2013) and not in a South African context, which has a uniquely violent history and finds itself in a complex situation currently. Frazier et al. (2013) make an important point in their study of trauma and prosocial behaviour, outlining that although empathy has been previously found to be related to helping behaviour, it may also be correlated to trauma exposure. Thus, without examining victimisation and fear of crime in conjunction with known correlates such as empathy, it would be difficult to predict its relationship to helping attitudes. Studies have indicated that individuals who were previously

victimised reported higher levels of empathy, however, no correlations were found to victimisation and helping attitudes towards others (Brewer & Kerslake, 2015).

Studies on Victimisation and Helping Behaviour.

Previous studies have indicated that a variety of problems can affect the chance that a person will attempt to help, such as the effects of implicit cognitions (Van Baaren, Janssen, Chartrand, & Dijksterhuis, 2009). Previous findings suggest that victims who engage in prosocial behaviours may be linked to a protective function regarding the victims, it also serves to motivate them to maintain helping attitudes towards others due to their own victimisation (Griese, Buhs, & Lester, 2016).

Other studies have indicated that undergraduate students had a significantly greater resolve to intervene with possible or actual victims, compared to potential or actual perpetrators of crime (Hoxmeier, Flay, & Acock, 2015). It is suggestive that students conceptualise prosocial helping behaviours diversely depending on their background. Both males and females reported the strong intent to implement prosocial behaviour after victimisation, but reported not wanting to intervene mid-victimisation (Hoxmeier et al., 2015). Differing contexts of assault should be examined when looking at programmes which aim to increase prosocial intentions in university students. Batanova et al., (2014) examined whether early adolescents would be more willing to intervene in peer victimisation as a function of their own response to being victimised. Batanova et al's., (2014) study suggested that early adolescence is a time where individuals have an increased sense of moral capability and may enhance their willingness to help. There is evidence that indicates that students were willing to intervene based on their personal past or current experiences of victimisation (Batanova et al., 2014).

Furthermore, Pozzoli et al. (2012) states that it is surprising how many studies have overlooked that victims may be more willing and capable of intervening on behalf of other victims. Others have indicated that self-reported victimisation will be linked negatively with willingness to intervene (Batanova et al., 2014; Clark & Word, 1972).

Latane and Robin (1969) Model in South Africa.

Empirical studies allowed for Latane and Rodin (1969) to formulate a model based on the process a bystander would follow in making decisions before intervening in a situation. Firstly, the individual must realise that something is amiss (Clark & Word, 1972). Secondly, they must be able to delineate that the situation requires help from a victim. The bystander then decides whether to take action or not, and so doing become involved, they also need to determine what kind of help to give. Finally, they must implement a decision to intervene (Clark & Word, 1972; Latane & Rodin, 1969).

This indicates that certain situational factors have been indicated to inhibit helping behaviours. Building on this model, Berkowitz (1972) indicated that social norms and feelings may influence helping behaviour and are major determinants of behaviour. The Berkowitz (1972) theory stating that individuals' helping behaviour is influenced by social norms, is highly relevant in a South African context, despite individuals being capable of selfless action and empathy, the anticipated beliefs that they will become a victim when trying to help, is highly influential in South Africa. These social norms and standards are not based on policies or laws, but instead are factors which are potent determinants of behaviour due to South Africa's violent past and the high crime statistics, which have become socially accepted. A cost-reward study of helping simulated an economic view of human behaviour, and considers that people exhibit prosocial behaviour when they can maximise their rewards

and minimise their costs (Piliavin, 1981). From this perspective, individuals display self-interest and will make decisions based on the opportunity for potential rewards for helping.

Prosocial behaviour can be considered on a multilevel perspective, and expanding on Latane and Rodin's (1969) model, is the work of Penner et al. (2005), who studied the aetiology of individuals' tendencies to help on a meso- and macro level. Research on processes involved in helping has developed into micro and macro level analysis (Penner et al., 2005). On the meso-level, there are theoretical models such as the five-step model by Latane and Rodin (1969) and the cost-reward model by Piliavin (1981). However, there is also the theoretical guiding principle that people are motivated to help due to empathetic arousal; the meso-level incorporates the helper-recipient couplet in certain situations. Where the micro level is the study of prosocial tendencies and origins and the various variations on these propensities. The macro level studies the prosocial actions that may occur within groups or large organisations (Penner et al., 2005). A large body of research such as: Latane and Rodin (1969); Penner et al., (2005) and Piliavin et al. (1981) on the macro level has consistently revealed robust favouritism bias towards helping members of one's own group as opposed to members of other groups, this is a dialogical problem that arises in South Africa, a diverse country. Other studies have indicated that individuals were less sympathetic to victims if they believed the individual was partially responsible for their own situation (Piliavin et al., 1981). Situational factors that were found to be of importance, were victims who were ill, these victims were more likely to be helped than individuals who were drunk (Piliavin et al, 1981). This suggests that even though there are many ill and elderly individuals in South Africa, there is more at play than social and dispositional factors that prevents individuals from helping others. On the multilevel perspective, the decision model of bystander intervention on the meso-level, has indicated that persons may only enact in prosocial behaviour depending on a range of outcomes, such as recognising that the situation

requires help, making the decision to take responsibility, and deciding to help (Penner et al., 2005).

Certain perspectives on the meso-level, such as the cost-reward model, puts emphasis on individuals being only concerned with self-interest in any emergency. Research has indicated that this central tenet of the cost-reward approach is consistent throughout. Bystanders are less likely to help if they feel there would be less reward, suggestive of individuals finding it difficult to help within an environment such as South Africa, where violence is high and crime is strife. These models effectively outline whether people would help or not help in certain situations, however, the question why people help, has been a problematic process. Research has however focussed on; (a) learning, (b) social and personal standards, and (c) arousal and affect (Eisenberg et al., 1991; Grusec, Davidov, & Lundell, 2002; Staub, 2001). These variables effectively fall into the proposed model by Latane and Rodin (1969).

Another relevant aspect of helping behaviour to consider, is that of altruism, defined as helping only to benefit others, with no prospect of advantage to the self (Gross, 2015). The theory of altruism would disprove the cost-reward model by purely indicating that an individual would sacrifice themselves for another. The ideology of reciprocal altruism suggests that individuals who do not know each other, will help because they believe that the other individual will return the help, developing a tit-for-tat strategy (Workman & Reader, 2014). This case, once again seems to be based on a Westernised evolutionary theory and cannot be applicable in a country with high levels of violence. The weakness in these studies is that they examined individuals through experimental methods, which lack ecological validity, and cannot be applicable in a country where individuals face more serious crimes than they do petty theft or drunken behaviour.

The learning mechanism applies general principles of operant conditioning and how helping is beneficial to others, and influences the beliefs surrounding this (Grusec et al., 2002). Secondly, the socialisation and personal standards framework is framed on the ideals of social responsibility and reciprocity and how such principles can promote positive self-images and the fulfilment of personal needs (Grusec et al., 2002). Thirdly arousal and affect approaches note the importance that emotion plays in motivating prosocial action (Grusec et al., 2002).

Penner et al. (2005) recognised a fundamental aspect that affects helping behaviour and determined that people are motivated to behave in certain ways and that the help attains certain goals. In South Africa, such an aspect is crucial, some may want to participate in helping behaviours due to their empathetic views, however, due to the many potential dangers involved with helping may contribute to the inhibition of such actions. These effects may be egoistically motivated or altruistically motivated (Eisenberg et al., 1991). Although previous research has emphasised the importance of empathic arousal and if stated that individuals decided to help, the empathic arousal may be exhibited in various kinds of emotions (Davis, Luce, & Kraus, 1994). Feelings of empathic arousal may produce altruistic motivations to benefit and help others through sympathy and compassion, but such feelings may be inhibited in cases where individuals have grown up in a violent country such as South Africa (Davis, 1994; Eagle, 2015). It is important to note that the model is dated and there is a need to test the model in more recent research; also bringing to the forefront whether this model has ever been tested in South African context.

Gender, Victimisation, Fear of Crime, Empathy and Helping behaviour

Considerable research has focussed on gender differences associated with victimisation, fear of crime, empathy and helping behaviour; however, there is a need for an amalgamation of these variables. There is a dearth of literature investigating the effects of all these variables on one another. More recent research has focussed on the types of crimes affecting students on campus by gender. Jennings, Khey, Maskaly and Donner, (2011) found that females were associated with higher instances of personal victimisation and property violence, whereas males indicated only higher personal victimisation. Previous studies on victimisation and perception of campus safety has indicated that females perceive more crime and fear of crime on campuses (Fox et al., 2009; Jennings et al., 2011). Other studies have supported these findings and indicated that men are more inclined to be victimised by crime than women are, and women indicated higher levels of fear of crime (Fisher & Sloan III, 2003; Fox et al., 2009). Research in the United States of America (USA) has increasingly focused on fear of crime and victimisation on campuses, with findings indicating that females are victimised more often on campuses and are also more fearful of victimisation and crime than their male counterparts (Fox et al., 2009). A study in the United Kingdom (UK) revealed that female university students were more fearful than male university students, research done more recently indicated that there was a significant relationship between the fear females experience and stalking in a female university sample (Barberet, Fisher, & Taylor, 2004; Wilcox, Jordan, & Pritchard, 2007). Fox et al. (2009) and Lane, Gover and Dahod, (2009) point out that firstly, previous research aggregated crimes by broad types and have typically overlooked other forms of victimisation. Secondly, that research generally focussed on female fear of victimisation and that research on male fear of crime has been scant, suggesting that research should not be limited to a female study. Research by Fox et al. (2009) concluded that women are more likely to fear crime and more importantly, that

women are more likely to be victims of all types of crimes, whereas previous research indicated the opposite. Gender is overwhelmingly associated with fear of crime on campus and females consistently report being more fearful of crime on campus compared to males (Wilcox, Jordan, & Pritchard, 2007).

Other variables which have received some attention are prosocial behaviour and empathic traits in males and females. Previous research found that men were more likely to help women, whereas women were more likely to help children, suggesting that gender plays a role in the rates of helping others (Lane et al., 2009). In other research, there is consensus that empathetic concern is found to be higher in females than in males (Roberts et al., 2014). Literature and previous studies indicate that certain variables such as gender, race and religiosity have emerged as consistently correlating to prosocial behaviour (Morgan, Goddard, & Givens, 1997; Schroeder & Graziano, 2015). Empirical studies have contributed to the evidence of an increased empathic inclination in women, compared to men (Mestre et al., 2009). Statistically it has been indicated that females experience the emotions of others on an emotional empathic level in addition to cognitive empathy, which is defined as the cognitive capacity to understanding other people's emotions. Whereas males indicated a lower effect size to experiencing either emotional or cognitive empathy (Mestre et al., 2009).

Theoretical Framework

Hoffman's (1981) Moral Development Theory will be used to inform this study. The theory not only considers the synthesis of cognition and affect, but also includes memory, information processing, and casual attribution. Most contemporary theories of prosocial behaviour and moral development tend to focus on a single dimension, with its own explanatory processes, this was found to be too limiting for the scope of this research. The self in moral psychology has focussed on moral reasoning and on the cognitive grounds for

decisions about right and wrong (Monin & Jordan, 2009). In the past, the neglect of the self in the theory of moral reasoning was due to the importance and empirical support for psychodynamic concepts such as superego strength, used to explain moral learning (Kohlberg & Kramer, 1969). However, by doing this, there was an isolation which was unique to moral thought and behaviour, which excluded the self and variables that share in the actions of moral reasoning and learning (Monin & Jordan, 2009). Seminal work by Augusto Blasi (1983) suggested that research needed to include self-identity as the central factor as influencing the strength of the link between moral judgement and moral action (Blasi, 1983). Hoffman's Moral Development Theory tries to overcome and account for this gap in human action and attempts to explain how cognition plays a significant role in human empathy and moral development. Hoffman's (1988) previous work only took into account the theory of prosocial moral behaviour and empathy's contribution to moral emotion, however, he has contributed to this theory by assigning importance to cognition (Hoffman, 2001). The principle of care has been defined as its own entity and as an extension to empathic concern. In relation to this study, it is important to point out that individuals may feel caring towards others as a natural extension of empathy; whether they help in specific empathic distressful situations is dependent on an individual's personal cognitive response to certain situations (Bekkers & Wilhelm, 2006). Hoffman's (2000) theory is based on the principle that: (1) empathy develops from reactive crying in children to truly empathic distress and empathising with others beyond their immediate situation; (2) empathic distress leads to individuals caring about others; and (3) caring can be internalised into a moral principle (Wilhelm & Bekkers, 2010).

Emphasis in this theory is placed on emotion, whereas there is still a recognition of cognition. Hoffman (2000) acknowledged that these two could end up "bonding", which would give cognition the ability to motivate behaviour. His theory not only emphasises

empathy, but it provides a stepping stone to empathy and its link to other emotional states such as fear, guilt, anger and responsibility (Hockley & Langdon, 2015). This is not only important in understanding the aspects of the development of empathy, but suggests the relationship between empathy, fear and helping attitudes. Hoffman's (2000) theory explicitly indicates that empathy is not only a cognitive mode that is associated with expressing cues towards a victim in relation to their situation, but also from their own painful past experiences. This theory also stated that individuals imagine how a victim feels or how they would feel in the victim's situations (Hoffman, 2000). Hoffman's (2000) Moral Development Theory not only accounts for person-situation differences in empathy and helping attitudes, but also accounts for an individual's past experiences and how this affects a person's empathetic concern in certain situations, and how it would affect prosocial behaviour. Byrnes (1988) has summarised that empathy is one of the most favoured strategies to combatting prejudice, willingness to identify and understand the feelings of others will instil a sense of helping attitudes towards others, and allow for a sense of community (Rhoads, Buenavista, & Maldonado, 2004).

The theory of moral development has a close relationship to this study, as it considers factors such as emotions evoked by an action or situation and how this may influence decisions that individuals choose to take. Hoffman's (2000) theory along with past research, indicates a relationship between moral behaviour, emotions and expectancy, and decision-making in prosocial behaviour towards others (Bekkers & Wilhelm, 2006; Johnston, 2009; Wilhelm & Bekkers, 2010). There is a misconstrued general idea that individuals who care for others and have empathic characteristics should always help individuals in need, here it is important to take into account the third and last principle of Hoffman's (2000) Moral Development Theory, that individuals may internalise caring into their moral principle.

This is an important principle for this study – especially within a South African context – as it considers that individuals may internalise their caring and empathic concern for others but may not always help individuals in need (Wilhelm & Bekkers, 2010). Secondly, Hoffman's principle of care refers not only to the individual caring and helping in immediate distress, but includes cognitively processing and evaluating the situation from the perspective of a moral being (Bekkers & Wilhelm, 2006; Wilhelm & Bekkers, 2010). These principles are critical to the information of this study, as all theoretical literature points to empathy and caring being direct determinants of helping behaviour, but still considers that individuals may be moral, caring and empathic individuals but that by evaluating certain situations may change a person's decision in helping others (Bekkers & Wilhelm, 2006; Wilhelm & Bekkers, 2010).

Hoffman's (2001) theory outlines and attempts to explain human action in five types of moral encounters or predicaments. First, Hoffman describes the innocent bystander, who witnesses someone in pain or distress. Second, Hoffman (2001) details the transgressor, who is the one who harms or is about to harm someone. Third, is the virtual transgressor, this individual may be innocent, but believes that they have harmed another in some way. The fourth Hoffman defines as multiple moral claimants, where one is compelled to make a choice (when does one help, when one feels guilty). Lastly, is the caring versus justice moral individual. This involves numerous moral claimants, but moreover a conflict between considering others and more abstract matters. All five of Hoffman's types are grounded in an empathic motive, each type features empathic anger, empathic feelings of injustice and guilt, empathic distress, and sympathetic distress (Hoffman, 2001). The fifth type is a principle which is highly relevant in the context of South Africa. The moral dilemma of individuals in South Africa is not only caring for others, but also that there are multiple claimants that become important in societies that are increasingly diverse culturally.

Hoffman (2001) has clearly described empathy as a product which is multi-determined, and that there are specific models of empathic arousal that affect an individual's behaviour. He draws on previous theory of behavioural conditioning, such as motor mimicry, classical conditioning, and making direct associations with the victim's situation and one's own painful past experiences. This makes the theory highly relevant in a South African context, it considers such behavioural activation was learned through one's life, as such it is a principle that contemplates an individual's past and socially conscious awareness of situations, and one's actions in certain situations (Hoffman, 2001). Hoffman's theory outlines higher-order cognitive modes which affect one's decisions in helping victims. First, is the mediated association, where an individual takes cues from the victim and this is mediated by the semantic processing of information from the victim's situation, with one's own painful past experiences. Role or perspective taking is a higher order cognitive mode in which one imagines how the victim feels or how one would feel in the victim's situation. However, an important aspect to consider, is the dialogical one of an individual having the capacity to voluntarily control these cognitive modes (Hoffman, 2001). Similarly, despite having empathy for a victim's distress or situation, one can still voluntarily choose not to intervene and empathise with victims, despite not being present. It is indicative of individuals in South Africa who may have existing modes of empathy, but voluntarily choose not to intervene due to an individual's painful past experiences and fear of crime. Hoffman (2001) suggested that the arousal modes are consistent across cultures, due to each individual's mimicry and conditioning in association to matching similar events, people and feelings. The theoretical framework suggests that children exhibit empathic moral development in stages, and that an individual's feelings and experiences when growing up, may respond differently to circumstances, and despite feeling highly empathic they may contradict this by exhibiting the opposite behaviour by not helping others (Hoffman, 2001).

It should be clear by now that cognition plays an important role in empathic distress and an individual's action or behaviour in certain situations. Humans tend to attribute events and other's distress to a moral understanding of situations, and to transform it into voluntary action when they cognitively feel that prosocial behaviour is needed and that their own lives are not at stake. Hoffman (2001) outlines how empathy can transform into different types of empathy for certain individuals. An important disparity exists between the victim's character and the victim's destiny, and the violation of justice, which may transform into an empathic feeling of injustice (Lemanski, 2006). It is a sad reality that most individuals in South Africa face, the feelings of injustice, fear of crime and fear of reciprocity when trying to intervene. These ideologies are closely linked to children's early socialisation at home and the prototypic encounters that motivates their empathic distress. Of importance is the many individuals in South Africa who were born and raised in violent environments, it is suggestive of individuals maintaining empathy, despite their behaviours in victim-based situations (Lemanski, 2006). South African residents have, in numerous studies, indicated their fear of crime in all areas of South Africa, and this may be suggestive of a situational and environmental factor which plays a role in an individual exhibiting helping behaviour towards victims (Jürgens & Gnad, 2002; Powdthavee, 2005).

Operational Definitions

The study uses the following operational definitions for its variables:

Helping attitudes: Helping attitudes in this study are defined on a multidimensional scale, which considers not only individuals' helping behaviours towards others, but also their own beliefs and feelings about helping others (Aydinli et al., 2014).

Crime: The Legalistic Typologies (Brodie, 2013) and the South African Police Service (SAPS) have defined and included crimes which are used in legal classifications,

these are used as the definition of crime in this study. Categories that will be considered are "crimes against the person", which are crimes that are generally referred to in South Africa as "contact crimes"; they include instances where a person or people are injured/harmed or threatened with injury/harm during a criminal incident. "Crimes against property" consist of crimes that occur when the victim is not aware of the crime while it is being committed, for example theft or a vehicle theft (Brodie, 2013).

Fear of crime: This study uses Asencio et al. (2014) definition of fear of crime. Asencio et al. (2014) differentiate between fear of crime and perceived risk, and define these as an emotional response to potential victimisation and cognitive fear, respectively.

Empathy: The current study utilises Bekkers and Wilhelm's (2006) definition of empathy, which indicate that it is expressed as the emotional reaction of compassion, concern or sympathy in reply to the needs of others. Nava's (2007) definition is also utilised, defining empathy as the subject's emotional state, however, here there is a division between the self and the object where there is an aptitude to help the other. They describe cognitive empathy as the subject representing the object's state with the ability to culminate in assistance.

Prosocial behaviour: Presuming attitudes and behaviour to minimise the object's unease.

Conclusion

Fear of crime and victimisation represent both a physical and a psychological intrusion in university culture and in the lives of many university students. Combined with the lack of awareness of crime on campus, fear of crime has also been associated with students becoming victims of campus crime. Overall, fear of crime on campus also affects students' sense of community and helping attitudes towards others. This is also influenced by the recent social protests associated with the #FeesMustFall movement, which intensified the

need to understand students' fear of crime and its relationship to empathy and helping attitudes towards others on South African campuses.

CHAPTER 3: Methodology

Introduction

The research used a quantitative design to attempt to answer the following research hypotheses and research questions. Information regarding the research design, including sampling method, data collection, data analysis, quality and ethical considerations will now be discussed.

The following research questions guided this study:

1) Are helping attitudes of students on Wits campus affected by fear of crime, victimisation and empathy?
2) Does the gender influence helping attitudes, empathy and fear of crime on campus?
3) Do students with higher levels of empathy exhibit higher levels of helping attitudes towards others?
4) In cases where students have not been victimised, how do their levels of fear of crime on campus, empathy, and helping attitudes affect each other?
5) In cases where students have been victimised, how will specific forms of victimisation affect individuals' levels of helping attitudes, fear of crime and empathy?

Hypotheses

1) It is predicted that students who have higher levels of empathy will exhibit higher levels of helping attitudes towards others.
2) It is predicted that students' fear of crime will have a significant negative effect on helping attitudes.

3) It is predicted that female students will exhibit higher levels of fear of crime as well as higher levels of helping attitudes and empathy than males students.
4) It is predicted that students who have experienced victimisation will have a significant effect on helping attitudes.
5) It is predicted that students who have experienced victimisation will have a significant effect on fear of crime on campus.
6) It is predicted that students who have experienced victimisation will significantly affect empathy levels.
7) It is predicted that students who have been exposed to crime and victimisation will significantly affect helping attitudes, fear of crime on campus and empathy levels.

Research Design

The research design is a non-experimental, cross-sectional survey design intended to measure the levels of empathy, victimisation, fear of crime and helping attitudes in students who were willing to participate in the study. The study has chosen a quantitative methodology, as this was considered the best fit in accordance with the research questions chosen. Creswell (2013) outlines limitations to the use of such a method because of the potential for validity issues, threats to statistical conclusion validity, and external validity threats.

Sample and Sampling

A university student non-probability convenience population was chosen as an appropriate source of data, in accordance with previous research conducted. Volunteer sampling also occurred as participants were free to choose whether to participate in the study or not, also classified as convenience sample. A large-scale convenience non-probability sampling was utilised to gain a diverse sample of students, a cross section of students from

various disciplines will allow for this (Bedenbaugh, 2003). Wits students across faculties – Humanities; Engineering and Built Environment; Health Sciences; Commerce, Law and Management; and Science – disciplines, and years were invited to voluntarily participate in this study. Past research has indicated that university students or youth populations are the individuals most likely to engage in pro bono projects (Mogekwu, 2005). University settings tend to entail a diverse set of individuals, with diverse and varying degrees of helping attitudes, fear of crime on campus and empathy levels. A university sample was chosen due to this study conducting research on fear of crime on campus. The selection of a varied university student group was included for several other reasons including: the diversity of day students and residential students; levels of independence; greater exposure to different types of people and situations; and differing cultures. These are all factors which are likely to lead to differing levels of helping attitudes and fear of crime on campus.

Any students under the age of 18 were excluded for this research. Past research has indicated that there is scarce literature on student populations and fear of crime and victimisation on campuses (Ayenibiowo, 2010; Bedenbaugh, 2003). Wits students were used on a large scale not only for the purposes of obtaining a diverse sample, but so that the sample can also be generalised to other South African universities.

The demographic characteristics of the sample are depicted in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample (N=264)

Variable		Frequency	Percent
Age	18 - 25	240	90.9
	26-35	13	4.9
	36-45	7	2.7

	46 and Over	2	.8
	Missing data	2	.8
Gender	Male	82	31.1
	Female	178	67.4
	Missing data	3	1.5
Population Group	Black	113	42.8
	White	98	37.1
	Indian	30	11.4
	Coloured	12	4.5
	Other	8	3.0
	Missing data	3	1.1
Home Language	Afrikaans	21	8
	English	124	47
	Sepedi	18	6.8
	Siswati	1	.4
	Sesotho	11	4.2
	Xitsonga	6	2.3
	Setwona	10	3.8
	Tshivenda	10	3.8
	IsiXhosa	13	4.9
	IsiZulu	32	12.1
	Other	15	5.7
	Missing Data	3	1.1
Faculty	Humanities	86	32.6

	Engineering and Built Environment	45	17
	Health Sciences	51	19.3
	Commerce, Law & Management	31	11.7
	Science	47	17.8
	Missing data	4	1.5

Instruments

This study uses four self-administered questionnaires as well as a short demographic questionnaire.

Independent Variables.

Gender, empathy, fear of crime on campus and victimisation

Participant self-report measures.

Demographic Questionnaire.

A demographic questionnaire (Appendix A) was used to gain demographic information on a participant. Participant's identities were not requested and will remain anonymous. The demographic questionnaire was adjusted for the present research. Gender, sex, race, and faculty were included.

Empathy Scale.

The Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI) (Appendix B) (Davis, 1994) is a multidimensional scale of 28 items that measures the cognitive and emotional components of empathy. The items are answered on a five-point Likert scale ranging from (1) "*does not*

describe me well" to (5) "*describes me well"*. The measure is made up of four subscales, which consists of: 1) Perspective taking, 2) Fantasy, 3) Empathic Concern; and 4) Personal Distress. *Perspective taking* denotes the tendency to spontaneously assume the psychological point of view of others. The construct of *Fantasy,* taps into respondents' propensities to imaginatively put themselves into the emotional state and actions of others. *Empathic Concern* measures the emotional state of sympathy and concern for unfortunate others. Lastly, *Personal Distress* subscale assesses "self-oriented" emotions of personal anxiety and unease in stressed interactive relationships. The subscale scores range from 0 to 28 and is the scores utilised for each subsection, no overall scale total. Overall the IRI has demonstrated a respectable intra-scale and test-retest reliability and convergent validity, the scale has consistently shown high reliability (r =.92) (Robins, Meltzer, & Zelikovsky, 2009) and validity for many populations with different cultural backgrounds (Peloquin & Lafontaine, 2010).

Fear of Crime on Campus Instrument.

Fear of crime on campus instrument (Appendix C) is a 14-item measure taken from Bedenbaugh's (2003) study and was adapted for a South African sample by changing certain Westernised language. Originally these questions were a sub scale of Bedenbaugh's (2003) study on fear of crime on campus. However, since this study will only be looking at fear of crime on campus, only this subsection will be utilised. The items are measured on a Likert scale of 10, ranging from (1) "not afraid*"* to (10) "very afraid". The scale is totalled into scores ranging from 0-140. A score of zero indicates that an individual is "not afraid" of crime on campus and a score of 140 indicates an individual is 'very afraid' of crime on campus.

Victimisation Instrument.

A victimisation instrument (Appendix D) has been taken from Bedenbaugh's (2003) study which included questions regarding the type of crimes a student might have experienced. Only five items out of seven were included: sexual assault, being beaten up, being mugged, having anything stolen or being threatened. The questions will be dichotomous items of "*Yes"* and "*No"*.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable for this study is helping attitudes.

Participant self-report measures

Helping attitudes Scale.

Helping Attitudes Scale (HAS) (Appendix E) is a 20-item measure of participants' beliefs, positive and negative feelings, and attitudes towards helping others, and behaviours linked to helping. The items are answered on a five-point Likert scale ranging from (1) "*Strongly disagree"* to (5) *"Strongly agree".* The scale also makes use of reverse scoring 6 items, which are reversed and then all scores are added up for a total. The scores for each item are added to form a complete score ranging from 20 to 100. According Nickell (1998), the author, a score of 60 is a neutral score. The internal consistency of the measure has indicated Cronbach's alpha of r =.869 and the test-retest reliability indicating a Cronbach alpha of r = .84 (Fernandes, Sanyal, & Fatima, 2015).

Procedure

After ethical clearance to commence with the study was obtained (MACC/16/009 IH, Appendix F), the Registrars of the Faculties of Engineering and Humanities were asked for permission to allow the survey to be added to all students' electronic mailing addresses. Once

permission was granted, an email was sent requesting students to participate in the survey, and it provided all the information about what participation entailed (Appendix G). The letter explained that the group information from the survey might be given to programmes within the university, such as the Counselling and Careers Development Unit (CCDU). However, it was also made clear that participants would be anonymous and that no identifying information was requested in the survey.

Participants were told in the letter that, by them answering the survey, they were giving informed consent for the study and for the subsequent write-up of the group results in the form of a research report, possible conference presentations and publications. The survey was available through the online portal SurveyMonkey. It consisted of 67 items in total, and was set in easy language so that participants would spend less time on the items, overall the survey would take about 30 minutes to complete. Students were informed that it would not be possible to give individual feedback due to the anonymous nature of the survey. Group results would be distributed in the form of a one page summary which would be available to students through the registrars.

The link for the survey stayed open for participants to complete for the month of August 2016, where after it was closed due to no new responses.

Data Analysis

First, descriptive statistics such as: frequencies were performed for all categorical and continuous variables.

Second, reliability statistics were performed to observe the reliability coefficients of the instruments. A correlation was used to look at the relationship between levels of empathy

and levels of helping attitudes. A second correlation was run to determine the relationship between fear of crime on campus and helping attitudes.

An ANOVA was performed to determine the variance of helping attitudes, fear of crime and empathy in gender groups.

A MANOVA was performed with victimisation groups, helping attitudes, fear of crime on campus and empathy.

A Linear Regression Model was performed to determine whether individuals who had been exposed to crime/victimisation exhibited decreased or increased helping attitudes, empathy and fear of crime on campus.

Ethical Considerations

In this research, no information that can lead to the identification of an individual participants was requested, and thus participants were anonymous. There is no identifying information in the data or material to be linked to an individual who participated in the study. Participants were informed on the participation information sheet that the data collected may be disseminated for educational or professional use, however, their anonymity would still be protected.

This research will adhere to the principle of autonomy in ethical research. This states that participants who can deliberate about individual choices, should be handled with reverence because of their capacity for self-determination, and they should be afforded the chance to make informed choices about their participation in research (HPCSA, 2016). The participants in this research were provided with an information/explanation statement of their right to decline to participate.

The current research posits to uphold the principle of non-maleficence and the principle of beneficence. Non-maleficence does not pose a risk in this research as the surveys that were used, ensured that questions were asked in a sensitive manner. Should the participants have felt distress or unease after completing the survey, they would be provided with a referral information sheet which would allow them to make use of the counselling services offered on campus at CCDU and at the Emthonjeni Centre which was available at the end of survey monkey to allow for anonymity. For participants who did feel vulnerable when completing the questionnaires, information was given to direct them to the CCDU and Emthonjeni Centre, which would have been able to provide them with free counselling services, if needed. Beneficence, in the present study, is illustrated through the benefits of this research outweighing the risks to the research participants. The results of this research offer a complete safeguard for participants' individual information.

Conclusion

This chapter has addressed the most pertinent methodological issues related to the implementation of this research. It has outlined, in detail, the study's research questions, design, sample and demographics, instruments utilised, and ethical considerations. The results of the proposed data analysis and additional analysis will be discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 4: Results

Introduction

The results of the study are presented in order of the outlined hypothesis. Raw data was assembled and then imported and analysed by IBM SPSS (version 21) Statistics software (IBM Corporation and other(s), 2012). After analysis, it was discovered that there were participants with missing data, the data was therefore cleaned. The missing responses were substituted with the sample mean for that variable. The total sample consist of 261 subjects, of which 178 were female and 82 were male participants, with 4 missing values for gender. Data was examined to ensure the assumptions of parametric testing were met. Overall, the variables indicated no violation of normality, linearity, homoscedasticity or multicollinearity. Reliability statistics were performed for all measures utilised in this study. The hypothesis was tested using correlations, Independent T-tests, an ANOVA, and a MANOVA test.

Preliminary Descriptive Data Analyses

Victimisation Frequencies

Frequency results for victimisation indicated that there were 261 valid responses and 3 missing values.

Table 2

Frequencies of Victimisation

Frequency Table					
	Rape/Sexual assault/attempted assault	Beaten up	Mugged	Stolen on campus	Threatened with a knife or gun
Yes	31	30	105	61	90
No	230	229	154	198	171

IRI Scale

Descriptives of the empathy subscales indicated a minimum score of 8 on Perspective Taking, Fantasy and Empathic Concern, with a minimum score of 5 on Personal Distress. The maximum scores indicate Perspective Taking, 26; Fantasy, 27; Empathic Concern, 23 and Personal Distress 22. Overall, the results for the Empathy scale indicate a minimum score of 30 and a maximum score of 102.

Table 3

Descriptives for Empathy Subscales

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Perspective Taking Scale	255	8	26	16.09	3.05
Fantasy Scale	250	6	27	15.82	3.23
Empathic Concern Scale	249	8	23	15.03	2.15
Personal Distress Scale	246	5	22	13.92	2.94
Empathy Total	263	35	102	71.66	11.22

Fear of Crime on Campus Scale

Descriptives indicate a minimum score of 12 and a maximum of 120.

Table 4

Descriptives Fear of Crime on Campus Scale

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Fear of Crime Total	263	12	120	59.27	29.45

Helping Attitudes Scale

Descriptives indicate a minimum score of 34 and a maximum score of 79, and an overall mean of 68.

Table 5

Descriptives of Helping Attitudes Scale

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Helping Attitudes Total	248	34	72	58.95	6.62

Reliability Analysis

Reliability statistics was run to ensure the validity and precision of the statistical analysis. Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the relationship between parameters and to rule out chance processes.

Reliability for IRI Scale

The Perspective Taking subscale consisted of 7 items (α =.76), the Fantasy Scale consisted of 7 items (α =. 77), and the Empathic Concern subscale consisted of 7 items (α = .73), lastly the Personal Distress subscale consisted of 7 items (α = .67). Overall the Empathy Scale consisted of 28 items (α = .81), indicating that it was highly unreliable within the South African university sample. Other studies have indicated a satisfactory internal consistency in the IRI subscales with internal scores ranging from α=.73 to α=.83 (De Corte et al., 2007).

Table 6

Reliability measure for IRI scale

Scale	Number of items	Cronbach Alpha
Perspective Taking	7	.76
Fantasy Scale	7	.77
Empathic Concern	7	.73
Personal Distress	7	.67

Reliability for Fear of Crime on Campus

Cronbach's alpha for the fear of crime on campus scale was found to be highly reliable (12 items, α =.94) within this sample.

Table 7

Reliability Measure of Fear of Crime

Scale	Number of items	Cronbach Alpha
Fear of Crime on Campus	12	.94

Reliability for Helping Attitudes Scale

The Helping Attitudes scale was found to have low internal consistency (20 items, α = .41). Where other studies have indicated high reliability for the HAS, α = .90 (Nickell, 1998). The HAS item analysis indicated that if certain items were deleted, the reliability would indicate high internal consistency. Previously the Cronbach α = .41, however, after deleting the items; "I would avoid aiding someone in a medical emergency if I could"; "I rarely contribute money to a worthy case"; "Helping people does more harm than good because they come to rely on others and not themselves" and lastly "I dislike giving directions to strangers who are lost" the Cronbach α = .74 (Table 8). When examining the items that lowered the Cronbach's alpha coefficient, it may in part be attributed to language difficulties. The items were not straightforward and were not easily understandable to individuals whose first language might not be English. As such, it gave relative justification for the removal of these items. It indicates what items on the Helping Attitudes Scale are not reliable or valid within a South African context. Perhaps this suggests a need for research on these items and this scale, and a need for adjustment in these items.

Table 8

Item Total Statistics of Helping Attitudes Scale

Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach Alpha if item deleted
Helping others is usually a waste of time	-.498	.494
When given the opportunity, I enjoy aiding others who are in need	.413	.331
If possible, I would return lost money to the rightful owner	.196	.376
Helping friends and family is one of the great joys of life	.382	.346
I would avoid aiding someone in a medical emergency if I could	-.367	.501
It feels wonderful to assist others in need	.564	.308
Volunteering to help someone is very rewarding	.543	.299
I dislike giving directions to strangers who are lost	-.255	.491
Doing volunteer work makes me feel happy	.588	.281

I donate time or money to charities every month	.212	.366
Unless they are part of my family, helping the elderly isn't my responsibility	-.368	.497
Children should be taught about the importance of helping others	.451	.337
I plan to donate my organs when I die with the hope that they will help someone live	-.045	.456
I try to offer my help with any activities my community or school groups carrying out	.449	.299
I feel at peace with myself when I have helped others	.568	.297
If the person in front of me at the check-out line at a store was a few rand short, I would pay the difference	.311	.346
I feel proud when I know that my generosity has benefited a person in need	.507	.314
Helping people does more harm than good because they come to rely on others and not themselves	-.324	.495

I rarely contribute money to a worthy case	-.402	.519
Giving aid to the poor is the right thing to do	.401	.339

Correlational Analyses

Table 9 indicates the correlations found, for this study, there is some support that Helping Attitudes and Empathy are correlated and that Fear of Crime on Campus and Empathy are correlated. There is a significant positive relationship between Helping Attitudes and Empathy; $r(263)=.36$, $p=>.01$. The scales of Fear of Crime and Empathy also indicate an apparent significant positive relationship; $r(263) =.15$, $p=<.05$. Table 10 and 11 indicate the first hypothesis testing and its relevant outcomes.

Table 9

Pearson Correlation between Helping Attitudes, Empathy and Fear of Crime on Campus

Note: *=p<.05

		Helping Attitudes	**Empathy**	**Fear of Crime**
Helping Attitudes	Correlation	1	.36*	.09
Empathy	Correlation		1	.15*
Fear of Crime	Correlation			1

Table 10

Hypothesis 1: Levels of empathy and levels of helping attitudes.

Hypothesis	Outcome
Ho: there will be no significant difference in levels of empathy and helping attitudes	Rejected
Ha: there will be a significant difference between levels of empathy and degrees of helping attitudes	Accepted

Table 11

Hypothesis 2: Levels of fear of crime on campus and helping attitudes

Hypothesis	Outcome
Ho: there will be no significant difference in levels of fear of crime on campus and helping attitudes	Accepted
Ha: there will be a significant difference between levels of fear of crime on campus and degrees of helping attitudes	Rejected

Despite these findings, additional correlational findings indicated a significant relationship between individuals' empathy levels and their fear of crime on campus.

ANOVA Results

A one-way independent measure ANOVA with an alpha level of .05 was used to examine the response of Fear of Crime on Campus, Helping Attitudes and Empathy in Males

and Females. Examination of the Shapiro-Wilk Statistics showed that the supposition of normality was reinforced for each of the conditions. Levene's statistic was non-significant, $F(1, 258) = .80$, $p=.37$; $F(1,243)=.14$, $p=.70$; $F(1,211) = .05$, $p=.82$ for Fear of Crime, Helping Attitudes and Empathy respectively. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was therefore not breached.

The ANOVA revealed that there was a significant difference in gender for Fear of Crime, $F (1, 259)=37.89$, $p=<.01$; Empathy, $F (1,212)= 4.67$, $p=.03$. Helping Attitudes Scale indicated a non-significant difference in gender $F (1, 244)= 2.57$, $p=.11$

Table 12

Hypothesis 3: Gender differences in fear of crime on campus, helping attitudes and empathy.

Hypothesis	Outcome
Ho: there will be no significant difference in levels of fear of crime on campus, helping attitudes and empathy between males and females.	Rejected
Ha: there will be a significant difference in levels of fear of crime on campus, helping attitudes and empathy between males and females.	Accepted

Independent T-tests

Fifteen independent t-tests were used to determine if there were any significant effects between variables such as Fear of Crime on Campus, Empathy and Helping Attitudes, and the

different kinds of victimisation: being mugged on campus; being sexually assaulted or attempted assault; being threatened with a knife or a gun; being beaten up; or having something stolen from you on campus.

Independent t-tests Helping Attitudes and Victimisation

The independent t-test results indicated that on average, individuals who experienced exposure to crime (Beaten up, Mugged, Sexual Assault and threatened) did not experience greater helping attitude levels (Table 13).

Table 13

Independent t-tests Helping Attitudes and Victimisation

Note *= p<.05

Helping Attitudes			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Beaten Up	.48	244	.63
Mugged	.92	245	.36
Sexual Assault	-.22	246	.83
Threatened	-.44	246	.66
Stolen on Campus	1.94	245	.05

Table 14

Hypothesis 4: Different victimisations will have an effect on helping attitudes in students

Hypothesis	Outcome

Ho: there will be no significant difference in victimisation and helping attitudes	Accepted
Ha: there will be a significant difference in victimisation and helping attitudes	Rejected

Independent t-tests Fear of Crime on Campus and Victimisation

The independent t-test results indicated that on average, individuals who experienced exposure to crime (Beaten up, Mugged, Sexual Assault and threatened) did not experience greater fear of crime on campus (Table 15). However, on average, participants who had something stolen from them on campus did experience greater fear of crime on campus, $t(257) = 3.09$, $p<.05$.

Table 15

Independent t-tests Fear of Crime and Victimisation

Note *=p<.05

Fear of Crime			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Beaten Up	.08	257	.94
Mugged	.98	257	.33
Sexual Assault	1.59	259	.11
Threatened	-.85	259	.39
Stolen on Campus	3.09	257	.00 *

Table 16

Hypothesis 5: Different victimisations will have an effect on fear of crime on campus in students

Hypothesis	Outcome
Ho: there will be no significant difference in victimisation and fear of crime on campus	Accepted for victimisation groups: Beaten up Mugged Sexually Assaulted Threatened
Ha: there will be a significant difference in victimisation and fear of crime on campus	Accepted for victimisation group: Stolen on campus

Independent T-tests Empathy and Victimisations

The independent t-test results indicated that on average, individuals who experienced exposure to crime (beaten up, mugged, sexually assaulted, something stolen on campus and threatened) did not experience greater empathy results (Table 17).

Table 17

Independent t-tests Empathy and Victimisation

Note *= p<.05

Empathy			
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Beaten Up	-.50	213	.62
Mugged	.20	213	.84
Sexual Assault	.18	214	.86

Threatened	-1.18	214	.24
Stolen on Campus	-.32	212	.75

Table 18

Hypothesis 6: Different victimisations will have an effect on students' empathy

Hypothesis	Outcome
Ho: there will be no significant difference in victimisation and empathy	Accepted
Ha: there will be a significant difference in victimisation and empathy	Rejected

MANOVA Results

Using Pillai's trace, there was no significant effect of exposure to crime on an individual's fear of crime on campus, empathy and helping attitudes, V=0.007, F (3, 205) = .51, p =.68. Wilks's statistic indicated similarly that there was no significant effect of exposure to crime on and individual's fear of crime on campus, empathy and helping attitudes, F (3, 205) = .51, p >.05. Separate univariate ANOVA's on the outcome variables revealed non-significant treatment effects on Fear of Crime on Campus, F(1, 207)= .004, p = .95, and Helping Attitudes, F(1,207) = 1.11, p= .29 and Empathy, F(1,207) = .95, p=.33.

Table 19

Hypothesis 7: Exposure to crime and effect on fear of crime on campus, empathy and helping attitudes.

Hypothesis	Outcome

Ho: there will be no significant difference in levels of fear of crime on campus, helping attitudes and empathy in individuals who have been exposed to crime	Accepted
Ha: there will be a significant difference in levels of fear of crime on campus, helping attitudes and empathy in individuals who have been exposed to crime	Rejected

Hierarchical Multiple Regression

Despite the MANOVA results indicating no significant differences in the groups, further analysis was run. Hierarchical multiple regression analysis (MRA) was conducted with an alpha level of α=.05 to assess the extent to which fear of crime and empathy predict the use of helping attitudes in students who have had exposure to crime on campus. For the first step in the regression model, fear of crime was entered, secondly, empathy was entered. Expectations of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity for all hierarchical tests were met, and comparatively great tolerances for all tests in the regression models showed that multicollinearity would not inhibit the explanation of the hierarchical regressions.

A hierarchical regression analysis was run to investigate the predictive value of fear of crime and empathy on the use of helping attitudes of students who have been victimised on campus, thus only cases of participants reporting having been previously victimised on campus was included into the regression model.

Table 20

Results of the Hierarchical Multiple Regression on Helping Attitudes of students who have been victimised on campus.

	B	**SE b**	**β**	**Sig.**	R^2
Step 1					.02
Constant	57.40	1.18		.00	
Fear of Crime	.03	.02	.17	.04*	
Step 2					.26
Constant	40.01	2.86		.00	
Fear of Crime	.02	.02	.11	.16	
Empathy	.25	.04	.49	.00*	

Note * = p<.05

On step 1 of the hierarchical MRA, fear of crime accounted for 3% of the variance in helping attitudes, R^2=.02, F(1,131) = 4.05, *p* <.05. On step 2, Empathy was added to the regression equation, and accounted for an additional 24% of the variance in helping attitudes of students who indicated exposure to crime, ΔR^2=.26, $\Delta F(2, 131) = 23.9$, *p*<.01. In combination, the 2 predictor variables significantly explain 24% of the variance in helping attitudes in students who have been victimised, R^2= .27, adjusted R^2=.26, F (2,131) =23.9, *p* <. 001.

Table 21

Results of the Hierarchical Multiple Regression on Helping Attitudes of students who have not been victimised on campus

	B	**SE b**	**β**	**Sig.**	R^2

Step 1					.00
Constant	57.80	1.73		.00	
Fear of Crime	.01	.03	.06	.62	
Step 2					.02
Constant	52.05	5.62		.00	
Fear of Crime	.01	.03	.04	.75	
Empathy	.09	.08	.13	.29	

On step 1 of the hierarchical MRA, fear of crime accounted for .3% of the variance in helping attitudes, R^2=-.01, F(1,76) = .25, p >.05. On step 2, Empathy was added to the regression equation, and accounted for an additional 1.9% of the variance in helping attitudes of students who indicated no exposure to crime, ΔR^2=-.00, $\Delta F(1, 76) = .70$, p>.05. In combination, the 2 predictor variables did not significantly explain the variance in helping attitudes in students who have been victimised.

Table 22

Hypothesis 7: Exposure to crime and effect on fear of crime on campus, empathy and helping attitudes.

Hypothesis	Outcome
Ho: there will be no significant difference in levels of fear of crime on campus, helping attitudes and empathy in individuals who have been exposed to crime	Rejected
Ha: there will be a significant difference in levels of fear of crime on campus, helping	Accepted

Additional Analyses

Additional analysis was run due to the Helping Attitudes scale indicating a very low Cronbach α (.41). The results indicated that if certain items were deleted from the scale it raised the Cronbach exponentially. It is speculated that such differences may be due to other factors such as population group, culture, and language differences. As such, additional analysis were performed to understand the data further.

A one way independent measures ANOVA with an alpha level of .05 was used to examine, firstly; the effects of different population groups on fear of crime, secondly the effects of different population groups on helping attitudes, and lastly, the effects of different population groups on empathy. Overall, population groups showed no significant differences with Helping Attitudes or Empathy Levels, however, there was a significant difference in population groups and levels of fear of crime on campus.

ANOVA Population groups and Fear of Crime On Campus

Inspection of the Levene statistic indicated that the postulation of homogeneity of variance was not violated. The ANOVA revealed that there was a noteworthy difference between at least two of the groups $F(4,260)=3.58$, $p<.001$. There was a statistically significant influence on fear of crime between population group “black” and population group “white”. Post hoc analyses with Tukey’s HSD (using an α of .05) revealed that black participants (M= 64.54, SD= 30.97) indicated a higher level of fear of crime compared to white individuals (M=53.82, SD= 26.80), with p=.03. These are considered medium differences with d= 0.40.

Summary of Results

Statistical analyses compared the data between individuals who had been victimised and those who had not. Reliability scales were calculated for the measures which had not been utilised within a South African context, and were found to be highly reliable. A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality determined that the data was normally distributed and that parametric tests could thus be used. A series of independent sample t-tests were performed on the scores of students who had been victimised and the type of victimisations, most of the scores had no statistically significant effect on the scores of helping attitudes, fear of crime on campus and empathy. A MANOVA was performed on the scores of individuals who had been victimised and it was determined to have had no statistically significant effect on the scores of their helping attitudes, fear of crime on campus and empathy. Despite the MANOVA indicating no statistically significant results, further analysis was run. A hierarchical multiple regression was performed to create a model in order to compare the scores of individuals who had been victimised, and these scores indicated a statistically significant effect on the scores of helping attitudes, fear of crime and empathy.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

This chapter summarises the main findings of the study in relation to its general aims, explained using a synopsis. This chapter further discusses the findings of the results section and the interpretations thereof. The interpretation of the results will be sectioned into the subsequent research questions that guided this research. The research questions to be discussed in accordance with the interpretation of the results include: whether helping attitudes of students on Wits campus are affected by fear of crime, victimisation and empathy; whether gender has an effect on helping attitudes, empathy and fear of crime on campus; whether individuals with higher levels of empathy exhibit higher levels of helping attitudes towards others; whether in cases where individuals have not been victimised, how their levels of fear of crime on campus, empathy and helping attitudes have affected each other, and lastly whether in cases where individuals have been victimised, how their levels of fear of crime on campus, empathy, and helping attitudes have affected each other. The chapter ends off with a discussion of the methodological issues relevant to the study.

A Synopsis

Given the increasing levels of crime in South Africa, specifically crime on campuses around South Africa, this study aimed to more closely examine the link between the effect of fear of crime on campus, victimisation, helping attitudes and empathy. Furthermore, gender has in previous research shown that females are more highly empathetic and fearful of crime, the gender differences became an area of interest.

The aim of this research was to investigate the relationship between the levels of empathy in South African students at the University of the Witwatersrand, and the helping attitudes of the same student cohort. A secondary aim, was to determine whether these

variables were influenced by fear of crime and victimisation on campus. Theoretically, this study aimed to explore the usefulness, reliability and validity of the measures used in a South African context. A quantitative, non-experimental research design was chosen, given the time constraints and research interest of this study. The aim was to measure each variable of interest and explore the relationships. A convenience sample of university students was used; this sample was of great interest to this study's hypothesis.

Findings

Firstly, it was hypothesised that individuals who exhibited higher empathy levels would exhibit higher levels of helping attitudes. Results supported the hypothesis that individuals who had higher levels of empathy would exhibit higher levels of helping attitudes towards others, further results supported the correlation between fear of crime and empathy, however, the results contradicted the hypothesis that fear of crime would have a significant effect on helping attitudes. This gave partial support for the second hypothesis of this study, but it was rejected. In addition, the third hypothesis was supported, indicating that men and women were found to differ significantly in their levels of fear of crime on campus, helping attitudes and empathy.

Results for the hypothesis surrounding victimisation and its effect of helping attitudes, fear of crime on campus and empathy indicated that the differing victimisation types had no significant effect on helping attitudes, and only partial significance with individuals who had something stolen on campus. Furthermore, the differing victimisation types had no significant effect on fear of crime on campus and empathy. Secondly, findings suggest that students who have indicated being victimised on campus did significantly affect their scores on helping attitudes, fear of crime on campus and empathy over individuals who had not been victimised on campus. Overall, the results indicated that individuals who had been victimised by having

something stolen from them on campus, did exhibit higher levels of fear of crime on campus. No other victimisations had significant effects of victimisation types and helping attitudes, fear of crime and empathy scores.

The results from the study indicated that fear of crime and empathy were significant predictors on the helping attitudes scores of students who had been victimised on campus. The hypothesis that students who had been exposed to crime and victimisation would significantly affect their helping attitudes, fear of crime on campus and empathy levels, was accepted, and further results only gave partial support to this hypothesis. The multiple regression supported the hypothesis fully, however, the MANOVA results only had partial support.

Interpretation of Results

Research Question 1 (Are helping attitudes of students on Wits campus affected by fear of crime, victimisation and empathy?)

Authors such as Crush (2008), Kramer (2013) and Neocosmos (2010) have stressed the importance of examining the relationship between victimised students and helping behaviour. Penner, Fritzsche, Craiger and Freield (1995) emphasised social responsibility and empathic concern as important factors in relation to prosocial behaviour. The current study supported previous research and indicated that individuals' helping attitudes were correlated to empathy levels (Abdullahi & Kumar, 2016; Davis, 1994; Penner et al., 2005). However, the current study further indicated a positive correlation between empathy levels and fear of crime on campus, suggesting that individuals who exhibited higher levels of empathy also exhibited higher levels of fear of crime.

The results of the current study showed that while demographic variables and exposure to crime may affect the levels of fear of crime, fear of crime is the variable that is

constantly significant. Research by Van Velzen (1998) indicated in general, that people who had been previously victimised were more fearful of crime than those who had not. Overall, the present study agreed with such findings. Individuals who were previously exposed to crime indicated higher levels of fear of crime, compared to individuals who had indicated no exposure to crime. Furthermore, involvement from communities had been found to decrease fear of crime, however, the current research rebuked this statement and indicated that there was no correlation between helping attitudes and fear of crime. This may be suggestive of the sense of community at Wits. Previous research indicated that psychologically, the fear of crime on campus generated feelings of anxiety, general mistrust, suspicion and alienation (Box, Hale, & Andrews, 1988; Eagle , 2015). Such feelings led to consequences such as: breakdown of social cohesion; perpetuation of the violent subculture; avoidance of situations associated with crime; disappearance of willingness to help others; and avoidance of strangers.

Van Velzen (1998) suggests that vulnerability is the most prominent factors that affects fear of crime. When conducting this research, it became apparent that previous exposure to crime on campus could be related to individuals' vulnerability. It implied a sense of powerlessness on the part of individuals to protect themselves from being victimised. It was indicated that social cohesion and a sense of community might decrease fear of crime and vulnerability in individuals. Integration, solidarity, trust, support and involvement are degrees of cohesiveness and could lead to university residents feeling less isolated and afraid (Berkowitz, 1972; Box et al., 1988; Clark & Word, 1972). Bedenbaugh, (2003) and Eagle (2015) suggest that knowledge of crime, whether directly or indirectly obtained, affects people's fear of crime. There is no simplistic relationship that exists between fear of crime and previous victimisation, however the current research indicates that previous victimisation and exposure to crime are a significant predictor of fear of crime, helping attitudes, and

empathy levels. This supports Van Velzen's (1998) research which reported that previous victims were more fearful than non-victims. Overall, this research indicated a relatively small number of victims compared to non-victims, and thus their higher level of fear might not affect the overall fear of the general university population. Furthermore, the current research indicated that the types of crimes committed were correlated to fear of crime. Previous research indicated that personal victimisation was associated with higher levels of fear of crime compared to property victimisation and fear of crime (Penner et al., 2005; Staub, 2001). However, current research disputed this finding, and suggested that instead, students who experienced property victimisation such as having something stolen from them on campus, increased individuals' fear of crime on campus. It might be an indication that students were experiencing fear of crime regarding property crime, and were indicating that personal violence was not expressed as much on campus.

Research Question 2 (Does gender have an effect on helping attitudes, empathy and fear of crime on campus?)

Snedker (2006) indicated that empathy was a factor which provided vicarious emotional experiences, and conceptualised that as such, fear might be exhibited differently due to gender roles, and that women roles are characterised by fears and caring. Present research suggested that despite there being no true difference in gender and helping attitudes, there was still a difference in fear of crime and empathy between genders. Such research might indicate that there were certain factors interacting that were not previously hypothesised, such as fear of crime and empathy levels. It might be suggested that individuals with higher empathy levels exhibited higher levels of fear of crime, which might be due to their higher levels of personal distress and perspective taking over individuals who had lower empathy levels.

Extensive previous research has predicted the positive correlation between gender and fear of crime (Bedenbaugh, 2003; Berkowitz, 1972; Ferraro, 1996; Van Velzen, 1998). Holmgren, Eisenberg, and Fabes (1998), and that gender and culture were important indicators of social behaviour, and also suggested that females indicated higher levels of prosocial and empathic behaviour, compared to males. The current study found that gender was indeed a predictor of fear of crime, females indicating higher levels of fear of crime on campus. Various authors opine that men might be reluctant to admit to fear because of the expectations associated with certain cultures, the overall expectations of society, and the idea that women should be considered more vulnerable (Box, Hale, & Andrews, 1988; Lane et al., 2009; Neff, 2003). Laner and Benin (2001) indicated that males were generally more likely to help due to their stronger physical attributes, however, such results were not indicated in this study. Further analysis indicated that females also indicated higher levels of empathy compared to their male counterparts. Previous research seems to agree that males are less likely to seek help (Addis & Mahalik, 2003). However, further studies have indicated contrary findings in relation to gender and prosocial behaviour (Abdullahi & Kumar, 2016; Davis, 1994; Grusec et al., 2002). Abdullahi and Kumar (2016) suggested that gender differences were not predictive of prosocial behaviour, but instead that certain subscales indicated differences between males and females. Their study suggested that females indicated higher empathic levels on subscales of perspective taking. Suggesting that females who indicated higher levels of empathy would not necessarily result in females being more helpful. Ferrari and Bristow (2005) similarly indicated that females had dispositional factors such as empathy which might dispose them to be more empathic, with a higher level of helping attitudes. Instead, the study suggested that males and females were almost equal on prosocial behaviours and helping attitudes. The current study supported these results, showing that despite women being perceived to be more nurturing and helpful, there was no

difference between males and females and their helping attitudes towards others. Empathic helping has indicated differing levels between females and males in the current study, supporting previous findings (Grusec et al., 2002; Lane et al., 2009).

Research Question 3 (Do individuals with higher levels of empathy exhibit higher levels of helping attitudes towards others?)

As previously indicated by Bekkers and Wilhelm (2006), empathy has been identified as an important determinant of helping behaviour. A large body of previous research has supported these findings (Decety et al., 2016; Davis, 1994; Eisenberg et al., 1991; Roberts et al., 2014; Schroeder & Graziano, 2015), which founded the present study's hypothesis and research questions. The current results support the hypothesis that empathy is correlated positively to helping behaviour. Batanova et al., (2014) previously similarly found that individuals with empathic characteristics predicted helping and intervening attitudes. The present study is in accordance with many other researchers who found that empathic concern was positively related to helping behaviours (Barchia & Bussey, 2011; Pöyhönen et al., 2010; Pozzoli et al., 2012). Batson et al. (2002) and Eisenberg et al. (2005), similarly to this study, gave evidence that when feelings of empathy were increased, the need to help consequently increased. Despite the study indicating a significant relationship to helping attitudes and empathy, it only focussed on helping attitudes in general, and as such neglected that there were many differing helping behaviours and forms of empathy, as Batson (1998) summarised: "variables that predict one form of prosocial behaviour might not predict another". Furthermore, Penner et al. (1995) supported this finding and motivated that helping or prosocial behaviour cannot be predicted by specific other variables such as empathy. In addition to this, Bekkers and Wilhelm (2006) suggested that there were certain determinants of helping behaviour, as previous research indicated that empathy was a principle determinant, however, they indicated that there were differing kinds of empathy and

principles of care, suggesting that there were a multitude of variables that are interlinked and could be predictors of each other. This brings to light the principle that empathy and helping attitudes might tap into benevolence and universalism, both are likely to predict help directed towards others (Bekkers & Wilhelm, 2006). Likewise, as suggested by Metz and Gaie (2010), there might be certain values that are expected within certain cultures in South Africa.

Overall, it is indicated that African and Indian cultures hold values which expect one to define positive relationships with others in the community, leading to communal terms such as *ubuntu* being used (Ally & Laher, 2008; Metz & Gaie, 2010). There is also the notion of a moral obligation which supposes that individuals should be concerned about the good of others, and the perceived moral obligation to think of oneself as bound up with others. These ethics are associated with harmonious relationships where individuals exhibit both solidarity with others, and identify with others. As such, it might be hypothesised that values will exhibit higher helping attitudes within a South African context. However, additional analysis was run and indicated that there was no significant difference between population groups and their levels of helping attitudes. Eisenberg (1986) further argued that there were two types of altruism, one being based on values, and another based on empathy. Despite previous research arguing that there is a difference between cultures and prosocial behaviour (Bekkers & Wilhelm, 2006), the present research did not focus on these variables and cannot dispute such claims. Finally, despite present research finding a relationship and associations between empathy and helping attitudes, cause and effect was not discussed. Evidence in this study indicates that at least one variable may be causational, but is suggested for future research to focus on. It is important to note that these previous studies have not considered what an individual's fear of crime or experience of victimisation may illicit in an individual's helping attitudes and empathy, further analysis was run for the present study to overcome such overlooked variables from previous research. Frazier et al. (2013) make an important

argument in their study, that despite empathy being previously correlated to helping behaviour, it may also be correlated to trauma exposure, also suggested in the present study, that fear of crime may have an influence on such a positive correlation.

Research Question 4 (In cases where individuals have not been victimised, how do their levels of fear of crime on campus, empathy and helping attitudes affect each other?)

The hierarchical multiple regression indicated that individuals who had not been victimised, did not indicate significant differences in their fear of crime on campus, empathy, and helping attitudes. Furthermore, the results indicated contrary findings to previous studies, Frazier et al. (2013) suggested that individuals who did not experience trauma, made it easier to engage in helping attitudes towards others. Piferi, Jobe and Jones (2006) indicated that students who did not experience first-hand trauma were much more willing to engage in helping behaviours. Others have indicated that individuals who had not been previously victimised, did not indicate increased fear of crime on campus (Bendenbaugh, 2003; Eagle, 2015).

Griese et al., (2016) summarised that individuals who had been victims, would engage more actively in prosocial behaviour. Others have agreed and indicated that students who had reported victimisation, had reported greater empathy and helping attitudes (Batanova et al., 2014; Hoxmeier et al., 2015). The socialisation and personal standards framework suggests that individuals overall used ideals of social responsibility and reciprocity to promote positive self-images and fulfilment. However, this was contrary to the current study, individuals who were not victimised did not report having more helping attitudes to their victimised counterparts. Numerous previous articles cited the differences in individuals' empathy, helping attitudes and fear of crime on campus, and attributed these differences to age, gender and race (Abdullahi & Kumar, 2016; Ayenibiowo, 2010; Bedenbaugh, 2003; Berkowitz,

1972). However, there were very few studies done in a South African context regarding exposure to crime or non-exposure to crime, and the differences and effects on these variables. Overwhelming research has suggested that individuals who had been victimised, demonstrated more fear of crime than their non-victim counterparts, the present study indicated that despite previous indications, non-victims did not show any significant results to their levels of fear of crime on campus, empathy, and helping attitudes. Contrary to the current study, previous research indicated that non-victims were significantly more fearful of personal victimisation (sexual assault, being beaten up, etc.) (Dull & Wint, 1997). However, these results were not consistently found in the present study, instead the results indicated no significant results of those who comprised of the non-victim category.

Research Question 5 (In cases where individuals have been victimised, how will specific victimised groups affect individuals' levels of helping attitudes, fear of crime and empathy?)

Results of the additional analysis, which comprised of fifteen independent t-tests, indicated that individuals who fell into specific victimised groups did not show a significant difference in their levels of helping attitudes, fear of crime on campus and empathy. Previous studies indicated the research on victimisation had been limiting and omitted the link between types of victimisation and levels of fear of crime on campus. The present study tried to overcome this previous limitation by including types of victimisation, which previous research indicated to be highly prevalent on campuses (Bedenbaugh, 2003; Judge, 2008). Previous findings by Fox et al. (2009) and Dull and Wint (1997), suggested that fear of crime might be specifically associated with types of victimisation, as such the present study categorised victimisation types into: sexual assault; being beaten up; being mugged; having anything stolen; and being threatened. Others have consistently cited that the culture of crime experienced in South Africa has developed and influenced certain factors that might have

influenced individuals' fear of crime (Bowman et al., 2015). Oddly, a study done by Brewer and Kerslake (2015) found that individuals who were previously victimised did show a correlation to having higher levels of empathy, however, this was not correlated or associated with helping attitudes or fear of crime.

The additional analysis of the independent t-tests was split into groups of victimisations and the three variables: helping attitudes, fear of crime on campus, and empathy. The results indicated that individuals who had previously reported being beaten up, mugged, sexually assaulted, threatened or had something stolen from them on campus, did not experience increased levels of fear of crime. Furthermore, individuals who had fallen into the categories of being beaten up, mugged, sexually assaulted, or threatened, had not indicated a significantly increased experience of fear of crime on campus. Interestingly, individuals who experienced having something stolen from them on campus, also indicated experiencing a greater fear of crime on campus. Lastly, individuals who experienced exposure to being beaten up, mugged, sexually assaulted, having something stolen from them on campus, or being threatened, did not experience greater empathy. These results were contradictory to previous studies which suggested that high rates of crime and violent crime caused fear of crime to become quite pervasive throughout the country (Kramer, 2013; Meth, 2016). Ayenibiowo (2010) previously indicated that sexual victimisation occurs pervasively in university residences, however, the present study indicated no significant sexual victimisation results. Instruments utilised in the present study may have been scarce on the types of victimisations on campus, Kramer (2013) remarked that such research is scant in all South African universities, it is a void that needs filling.

Singh, Mudaly, & Singh-Pillay (2015) indicated that despite popular beliefs, serious crimes presented mainly in deprived communities, university environments encountered crimes in a similar manner. The present study indicated a high prevalence of individuals

experiencing crime and victimisation with an overall response rate of 317 incidents of victimisation experienced by 261 participants at Wits. These numbers, although small compared to the larger student population, suggested the insurmountable issue that university campuses might not always be sanctuaries and that many students encountered victimisation while on campus. A previous study by Bedenbaugh (2003) similarly indicated that fear of crime on campuses was felt significantly by students. Another aspect which was analysed, was the extremity of the disproportion between black and white victims. Additional analysis agreed with previous research, which specified that black students experienced more victimisation on campus, the participants also indicated a disproportionate amount of black students who experienced an elevated fear of crime on campus, compared to white students at Wits (Silber & Geffen, 2016). Metz and Gaie (2010) further explained that crime and fear of crime was not always felt equally across South Africa by all individuals. They reject the notion that such variables are felt similarly across communities, racial groups, class and cultures. The present study similarly indicated that such a notion was rejected, as black student participants felt considerably increased levels of fear of crime on campus and of victimisation, compared to white student participants. There may be a hypothesis as to the ratio of black and white students on campus, and similarly the ratio of students who live in residences on campus.

A hierarchical multiple regression was performed in order to examine the predictive value of fear of crime and empathy on the use of helping attitudes of students who had been victimised on campus, the model indicated that fear of crime on campus and empathy did predict helping attitudes. Compared to its MRA comparison of individuals who had experienced no victimisation, did not significantly fit a model. Such results affirmed the hypothesis that fear of crime on campus would significantly predict students' helping attitudes and empathy. Eagle (2015) argued that fear of crime was a large aspect of

contemporary South Africa and as such contributed either directly or indirectly to the feelings of mistrust and alienation of individuals, which in turn enforced a mistrust in helping others. The present study found this statement to be true in Wits students' perceptions. Contrary to this, previous findings by Griese, Buhs and Lester (2016) suggested that individuals who had been victimised, engaged in prosocial behaviour as a protective function. These helping behaviours of victims served as a protective function and motivated their need to help others due to their own history of victimisation. Hoxmeier et al. (2015) found that both males and females felt more likely to help after victimisation had occurred, but that there was less of an inclination to help mid-victimisation. Such results were indicative of the present studies model, suggesting that fear of crime and victimisation might predict helping attitudes and empathy. Pozzoli et al. (2012) stated that studies had overlooked the willingness victims might have towards helping other victims or intervening for other victims, and said this was of great importance, the current study denied such willingness and reported that individuals who were previously victimised could not predict their helping attitudes towards others. As predicted, self-reported victimisation was negatively associated with willingness to help. This model has not only indicated that these variables were interlinked, but had similarly given insight to students' risks and perceptions of safety on campus. Building on this, it was suggested that individuals who did exhibit high levels of empathy, might be hindered due to their feelings of fear of crime and their previous victimisation, and might consequently hinder their helping attitudes towards other students who might be in danger, further accepting the notion indicated by Williams et al. (2007) that fear of crime might hinder helping behaviours of individuals who are typically high in empathic levels.

Hoffman's (2000) Moral Developmental Theory accounts for person-situation differences in empathy and helping attitudes, and how these are affected by an individual's past experiences. The following research was in accordance with Hoffman's theory, further

giving evidence for this theory and showing that past experiences (such as victimisation) significantly affects an individual's empathic concern and how this affects their helping attitudes.

Methodological Issues

There is a list of key considerations that need to be discussed regarding the present study's methodology. Firstly, one of the key methodological issues there is the population-based sample which does not allow for detail about the actual circumstances of fear of crime on campuses (e.g. the various emotions of fear, what level of fear exists at certain times of the day on campus or in certain areas of campus, such as residences). Secondly, it is important to raise the difficulty of defining victimisation for the current study. Using a lower threshold for defining a person who has been victimised, allowed for this study to gain a larger sample of individuals who had been victimised, however, it might have taken away from the need to describe certain types of victimisation. Furthermore, the standardisation and validation of the measurements utilised within this study and its reliable outcome may be useful within the South African context.

Conclusion

Campus crime and fear of crime on campuses has been front of mind for many South Africans over the past few years. As the resent study suggested, fear of crime does affect an individual's empathy and helping attitudes, whether they had or had not been victimised on campus. The results of the study have given insight into risks and perceptions of safety on campus, and may be significant for future interventions with students and other populations on campuses.

Chapter 6: Conclusion, Strengths, Limitations and Future Recommendations

This chapter evaluates the study to provide an overview of its strengths, weaknesses, and limitations. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the consequences of the research and recommendations for future studies.

Strengths of the Study

This study possesses numerous strengths and has resulted in some important contributions. This research adopted a quantitative design, which prevented the possibility of bias from the researcher and results through selection, design, data collection, scoring, analysis and interpretation. Furthermore, the majority of research conducted on fear of crime on campus, empathy, and helping attitudes, largely demonstrated a relationship between these variables (Bedenbaugh, 2003; Clark & Word, 1972; Grusec et al., 2002; Penner et al., 2005). In addition, given the use of non-convenience sampling from a university population, the findings may allow for external validity and generalisability. The research indicates a good distribution over the different faculties of Wits University. In addition there is a fairly decent distribution across population group which is a strength in terms of generalisability.

Despite these variables having relationships, previous research had not condensed all these variables into one study. Bedenbaugh (2003) suggested that future research could try to explain what factors were shaping students' fear of crime on campus. The present study attempted to achieve this by investigating more variables, such as helping attitudes, fear of crime on campus and empathy levels. By conducting such research in South Africa, the results could provide a precedent which other universities could use to further understand their student communities and their experience of fear of crime on campus. It might also inform researchers on whether further investigation might have any use. Furthermore, previous research in South Africa (Van Velzen, 1998) suggested that fear of crime and

victimisation should be viewed as a social problem, as it may generate feelings of mistrust, suspicion and a general curtailment of normal activities, and an unwillingness to help others. This research aimed to bridge this gap in substantive knowledge in literature regarding fear of crime on campus and helping attitudes. Given that the variables of interest were difficult to manipulate ethically or experimentally, this study adopted the most appropriate design to contribute quantitative and theoretical knowledge within the South African psychosocial context.

Limitations of the Study

There are a few limitations to the present study that warrant consideration. A convenience sample from only one university was used, which may limit generalisability towards all student populations. The results of this study may reveal unique characteristics of this group of university students, rather than of all university populations. This sample of university students also experienced extensive protests during the #FeesMustFall movement, whereas other universities may not have seen as much protesting and social action.

Although this study spoke to voids in the existing literature of fear of crime on campus, it is crucial to consider that this study only measured fear of crime on campus in general, along with previously victimisation types, as other scholars have done (Bedenbaugh, 2003); however, some recent research argues for the need to ask participants about their fear of certain types of crimes on campus (Ferraro, 1996; Fox et al., 2009; Wilcox et al., 2007).

Significance of the Study

Bedenbaugh (2003) stated that future research needed to examine factors that were shaping individuals' fear of crime, this study incorporated individuals who were victimised, and considered the direct effects this had on fear of crime on campus. Numerous studies

examined dispositional empathy and its relationship to helping behaviour, but had indicated limitations on the scope of factors that could influence an individual's empathetic care and their decisions to either help others or not (Bekkers & Wilhelm, 2006; Wilhelm & Bekkers, 2010). One such factor, as Bedenbaugh (2003) outlined, could be victimisation. Most studies looked at the correlation between victimisation and prosocial behaviour, however, these studies had not examined the direct impact of individual personal victimisation and the effect on helping attitudes towards others (Ferrari & Bristow, 2005).

Aydinli et al. (2014) also highlight the importance of looking at the sources of information that predicted helping behaviour. Not only was this important across countries, but it was especially important in a South African context to examine what factors could elicit or constrain helping attitudes. Helping attitudes not only depended on empathy and care, but was also associated with explicit motivational processes, such as the nature of the helping and the evaluation of the situation.

This study is the first to examine fear of crime in South African universities and the motivations and dispositional factors that could influence individuals' helping attitudes towards others on campuses. Examining these factors will take a major step toward understanding which polices, interventions and programmes to implement at universities across the Country. One of the main goals of this study, was to add to the literature on fear of crime on campuses, and helping attitudes, by examining differences in respondents' levels of fear of crime, helping attitudes and empathy, in relation to exposure to victimisation.

To advance security on campuses and to ensure students and parents are aware of fear of crime and victimisation, which is a part of life. This research hoped to achieve not only awareness, but also hoped to achieve the following results:

- Universities in South Africa will be aware of students' level of fear of being victimised, and will address that fear with safety measures and awareness programmes
- Students will be better informed about how their peers view crime on campus
- Students will become more aware of key issues surrounding crime on campus, such as the highest victimisation of campus crimes
- Additional focus to be placed on crime on university campuses so that students will be aware enough to take certain precautious
- Campus police can become more aware of the campus community's fear of crime on campus and of individuals' feelings of perceived crime
- Students may be involved in aspects that allow them to help fight crime

Furthermore, this study contributes to the literature by exploring fear of crime from differing perspectives. It explores one section of the populace, specifically the student population as a unique group and environment, and how such population may differ from the larger South African population. The significance of the current research is that it explores the development of factors that could lead to students' fear of crime on campus, knowing that such factors could provide Wits and other universities with ideas about how to act and make students aware that crime on campus was an important issue to take seriously.

Proposed Future Research

Bedenbaugh (2003) suggests that in addition to investigating how students feel about crime on campus, researchers should consider how safe members of staff feel on campus. Little or no research has been conducted on members of staff and how they perceive their campuses, on their fear of crime on and helping attitudes. It is order to begin minimising

feelings of fear of crime on campus and to increase helping attitudes between students, and to move towards a safe and healthy university environment, future research needs to develop viable ways to address fear and understanding, and perhaps also the sense of community and helping attitudes. Previous research indicated that individuals who were uninvolved in their communities, tended to report more fear of crime, this study did not integrate this variable, and future research may benefit this field by integrating a sense of community variable.

As discussed in the limitations section, fear of specific crimes on campus was overlooked, thus future research may profit by exploring fear of specific types of crimes on campus instead of aggregating all crimes into broad categories. Future research may be able to build on previous research done in the USA and UK, to further expand knowledge of fear of crime and types of victimisation, and helping behaviours in a South African context. A qualitative methods design may allow for more focus on variables such as campus security, crime victimisation and fear of crime on campuses.

Further studies, such as one done on Wits campus by Corss and Johnson (2008) indicated that xenophobic behaviours were linked to fear of crime and victimisation on campuses, such results in conjunction with the present study, indicated that fear of crime on campus was significantly felt, and this might indicate a gap in research. Specific crimes along with specific reasons for fear of crime on campuses was overlooked. Along with the #FeesMustFall movement during the year of the present study's data collection, it was suggested that further investigation into the fear of crime felt on campuses be undertaken, and contributing efforts to understanding why and in what contexts such fear of crime might be exhibited.

Implications for University Security

These findings are highly significant and have important implications for campus security. Firstly, evidence has been in favour of consistent significant reports of fear of crime by females, suggesting that gender-based systems to prevent and/or reduce this fear, is important. This study has consistently shown (as previous research has) that females were more fearful of crime on campus. Preventing victimisation is critical for campus security, and for universities across South Africa in general. These are important findings in relation to university students feeling a sense of community and a less victimised sense of environment. Individuals have indicated being victimised across different victimisation conditions, in which case it may be beneficial to teach communities more about the prevalence and impact of crime in a way that promotes understanding, rather than trepidation.

Secondly, this research has not only drawn a relationship between gender and fear of crime, but similarly has demonstrated a possible relationship between fear of crime and race. A likely explanation may be determined largely by sample size and ratio; however, it may also be due to victimisation at universities being much more noticeable to minority groups than to white students, in part because of the long history of black people being disadvantaged by white rule. Campus security may also think about implementing not only logistical challenges of crime on campuses, but also considering the psychological processes of students.

Implications for Campus Counselling Services

Fear of crime is a social problem; previous literature showed that levels of fear and actual crime were often dissimilar. Thus, a decrease in crime will not always reduce fear of crime on campuses. Group therapy aimed at fear of crime on campuses may allow for the reduction of negative physical, behavioural and health outcomes associated with the fear of

crime. The counselling services provided on campuses need to consider the victimisation rates of students and how certain groups of the population feel such fear more. Individuals with prior victimisation are likely to experience increased levels of fear of crime and fear of future attacks; the counselling services may find significant the fear of crime and future attacks, and that a significant sample indicated previous victimisation.

Starting counselling programmes and group therapy for individuals of victimisation and those with high levels of fear of crime on campus, is import. It is important to create a support structure for students because support is important for the functioning of students and for the ability to cope with life stressors. This may be done through creating a university culture through campaigns and marketing strategies and awareness campaigns that address perceptions of crime and helping attitudes.

Conclusion

The present study contributes to literature by exploring fear of crime on campus from the viewpoint of a unique segment of the populace, students. Society viewed universities as sanctuaries for individuals and as an environment far removed from the crimes elicited in the rest of the country, however, these views were rejected. Like Ferrari and Bristow (2005) the present study suggests that in accordance with the results, university campuses need to develop initiatives to address the fear of crime felt by students on campuses and the effect it has on their ability to help others or correspondingly, being able to seek help.

References

Abdullahi, I. A., & Kumar, P. (2016). Gender Differences in Prosocial Behaviour.*The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *3*(4), 171-175

Addis, M. E., & Mahalik, J. R. (2003). Men, masculinity, and the contexts of help seeking. *American Psychologist*, *58*(1), 5-14.

Ally, Y., & Laher, S. (2008). South African Muslim faith healers perceptions of mental illness: Understanding, aetiology and treatment. *Journal of Religion and Health*, *47*(1), 45–56.

Arthur, J., & Bohlin, K. (2005). *Citizenship and higher education: the role of universities in communities and society*. Routledge.

Asencio, E. K., Merrill, M., & Steiner, M. (2014). Self-Esteem, the Fear of Crime, and the Decision to Protect Oneself From Victimization (Vol. 29, pp. 587–606). Sociological Forum, Wiley Online Library.w

Aydinli, A., Bender, M., Chasiotis, A., Cemalcilar, Z., & Vijver, F. J. R. Van De. (2014). When does self-reported prosocial motivation predict helping? The moderating role of implicit prosocial motivation. *Motivation and Emotion*, *38*(5), 645–658. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-014-9411-8

Ayenibiowo, K. O. (2010). Gender and campus violence: A study of University of Lagos. *Gender & Behaviour*, *8*(2), 3017.

Bäckström, M., & Björklund, F. (2007). Structural modeling of generalized prejudice: The role of social dominance, authoritarianism, and empathy. *Journal of Individual Differences*, *28*(1), 10–17.

Badat, S. (2016). *Black Student Politics: Higher Education and Apartheid from SASO to SANSCO, 1968-1990*. Routledge. Abington, Oxon.

Barchia, K., & Bussey, K. (2011). Predictors of student defenders of peer aggression victims: Empathy and social cognitive factors. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*.

Barrett, L., Dunbar, R., & Lycett, J. (2002). *Human evolutionary psychology.* Princeton University Press. Princeton.

Batanova, M., Espelage, D. L., & Rao, M. A. (2014). Early adolescents' willingness to intervene: What roles do attributions, affect, coping, and self-reported victimization play? *Journal of School Psychology, 52*(3), 279–293. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2014.02.001

Batson, C. D. (2010). Empathy-induced altruistic motivation. Prosocial Motives, Emotions, and Behavior: The Better Angels of Our Nature, (Draft chapter of Inaugural Herzliya Symposium on "Prosocial Motives, Emotions, and Behavior") Department of Psychology, University of Kansas.

Batson, C. D., Chang, J., Orr, R., & Rowland, J. (2002). Empathy, Attitudes, and Action: Can Feeling for a Member of a Stigmatized Group Motivate One to Help the Group? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*(12), 1656–1666. doi.org/10.1177/014616702237647

Bedenbaugh, C. (2003). *Measuring fear of crime on campus: A study of an urban university* (Doctoral dissertation, Faculty of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and, University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Bekkers, R., & Wilhelm, M. O. (2006). Helping but Not Always Empathic: Helping Behavior, Dispositional Empathic Concern, and the Principle of Care. *Social Psychology Quarterly: 73 (1)*

Bell, A. (2015). I'm Black and I'm Proud… and Female: The Role of Gender and Black Consciousness for Black Female UCT Students in Social Movements in Cape Town. *Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection*. Retrieved from http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection/2157

Bénit-Gbaffou, C., & Oldfield, S. (2011). Accessing the state: Everyday practices and politics in cities of the south. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, *46*(5), 445-452.

Berkowitz, L. (1972). Social norms, feelings, and other factors affecting helping and altruism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *6*, 63–108.

Blasi, A. (1983). Moral cognition and moral action: A theoretical perspective. *Developmental Review*, *3*(2), 178–210.

Boag, E. M., & Wilson, D. (2013). Does engaging with serious offenders change students' attitude and empathy toward offenders? A thematic analysis. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, *24*(6), 699–712. https://doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2013.841973

Boda, Z., & Szabó, G. (2011). The media and attitudes towards crime and the justice system: A qualitative approach. *European journal of criminology*, *8*(4), 329-342

Bond, P., Desai, A., & Ngwane, T. (2013). Uneven and Combined Marxism within South Africa's Urban Social Movements'. *Marxism and Social Movements*, 233-255.

Boster, F., Fediuk, T., & Kotowski, M. (2001). The effectiveness of an altruistic appeal in the presence and absence of favors. *Communication Monographs*, *68*(4), 340-346.

Bowman, B., Stevens, G., Eagle, G., Langa, M., Kramer, S., Kiguwa, P., & Nduna, M. (2015). The second wave of violence scholarship: South African synergies with a global research agenda. *Social Science & Medicine*, *146*, 243–248.

Box, S., Hale, C., & Andrews, G. (1988). Explaining fear of crime. *British Journal of Criminology, 28*(3), 340–356.

Bradford, B., Huq, A., Jackson, J., & Roberts, B. (2014). What price fairness when security is at stake? Police legitimacy in South Africa. *Regulation & Governance*, *8*(2), 246–268. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12012

Brewer, G., & Kerslake, J. (2015). Cyberbullying, self-esteem, empathy and loneliness. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *48*, 255–260.

Brodie, K. (2013). *Observation, Assessment and Planning in the Early Years-Bringing It All Together*. McGraw-Hill Education (United Kingdom).

Buck, R. (2002). The genetics and biology of true love: Prosocial biological affects and the left hemisphere. *Psychological Review, 109*(4), 739-744

Byrnes, J. P. (1988). Formal operations: A systematic reformulation. *Developmental Review*, *8*(1), 66-87.

Clark, R. D., & Word, L. E. (1972). Why don't bystanders help? Because of ambiguity? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24*(3), 392.

Clinard, M. R., Quinney, R., & Wildeman, J. (2014). *Criminal behavior systems: A typology*. Routledge. Abingdon, Oxon

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

Cross, M., & Johnson, B. (2008). Establishing a space of dialogue and possibilities: Student experience and meaning at the University of the Witwatersrand. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 22*(2), 302-321

Crush, J. (2008). The perfect storm: the realities of xenophobia in contemporary South Africa. SAMP Migration Policy Series No. 50.

Davis, M. H. (1994). *Empathy: A social psychological approach*. Westview Press.

Davis, M. H., Luce, C., & Kraus, S. J. (1994). The heritability of characteristics associated with dispositional empathy. *Journal of Personality*, *62*(3), 369–391.

Decety, J., Bartal, I. B.-A., Uzefovsky, F., & Knafo-Noam, A. (2016). Empathy as a driver of prosocial behaviour: Highly conserved neurobehavioural mechanisms across species. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, *371*

Decety, J., & Jackson, P. L. (2004). The functional architecture of human empathy. *Behavioral and cognitive neuroscience reviews*, *3*(2), 71-100.

Demombynes, G., & Özler, B. (2005). Crime and local inequality in South Africa. *Journal of Development Economics*, *76*(2), 265–292. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2003.12.015

De Waal, F. (2009). *Primates and philosophers: How morality evolved*. Princeton University Press.

Dull, R. T., & Wint, A. V. (1997). Criminal victimization and its effect on fear of crime and justice attitudes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *12*(5), 748–758.

Eagle, G. (2015). Crime, fear and continuous traumatic stress in South Africa: What place social cohesion? *Psychology in Society*, (49), 83–98.

Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., Guthrie, I. K., Murphy, B. C., & Shepard, S. A. (2005). Age changes in prosocial responding and moral reasoning in adolescence and early adulthood. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *15*(3), 235–260.

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Schaller, M., Carlo, G., & Miller, P. A. (1991). The relations of parental characteristics and practices to children's vicarious emotional responding. *Child Development*, *62*(6), 1393–1408.

Fernandes, T., Sanyal, N. & Fatima, A. (2015). Helping Attitudes and Psychological Well-Being in Older Widowed Women. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology; 2(3), 1-14*

Ferrari, J. R., & Bristow, M. J. (2005). Are We Helping Them Serve Others? Student Perceptions of Campus Altruism in Support of Community Service Motives. *Education*, *125*(3), 404–413.

Ferraro, K.F., Kenneth, F. & L. Grange. (1987). the Measurement of Fear of Crime. *Criminology 57, (*4), 70-101

Ferraro, K. F. (1996). Women's fear of victimization: Shadow of sexual assault? *Social Forces*, *75*(2), 667–690.

Fisher, B. S., & Sloan III, J. J. (2003). Unraveling the fear of victimization among college women: Is the "shadow of sexual assault hypothesis" supported? *Justice Quarterly*, *20*(3), 633–659.

Fox, K. A., Nobles, M. R., & Piquero, A. R. (2009). Gender, crime victimization and fear of crime. *Security Journal*, *22*(1), 24–39. https://doi.org/10.1057/sj.2008.13

Frazier, P., Greer, C., Gabrielsen, S., Tennen, H., Park, C., & Tomich, P. (2013). The relation between trauma exposure and prosocial behavior. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, *5*(3), 286–294. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027255

Garofalo, J. (1981). The fear of crime: Causes and consequences. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* , *72*(2), 839-857.

Gilbert, D. T., Fiske, S. T., & Lindzey, G. (1998). *The handbook of social psychology* (2). McGraw-Hill New York.

Gini, G., Pozzoli, T., & Hauser, M. (2011). Bullies have enhanced moral competence to judge relative to victims, but lack moral compassion. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *50*(5), 603–608.

Graziano, W. G., Habashi, M. M., Sheese, B. E., & Tobin, R. M. (2007). Agreeableness, empathy, and helping: A person× situation perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*(4), 583.

Griese, E. R., Buhs, E. S., & Lester, H. F. (2016). Peer victimization and prosocial behavior trajectories: Exploring sources of resilience for victims. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *44*, 1–11.

Gross, R. (2015). *Psychology: The Science of Mind and Behaviour (Ed, 7)*. Hodder Education.

Grusec, J. E., Davidov, M., & Lundell, L. (2002). Prosocial and helping behavior. Smith, Peter K. (Ed); Hart, Craig H. (Ed). Blackwell handbook of childhood social development. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Gumbo, M. T. (2014). Elders decry the loss of Ubuntu. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *5*(10), 67.

Healy-Clancy, M. (2016). " Fallism" and the Politics of Being a Student in South Africa, Past and Present. *Center for the Advancement of Research and Scholarship*

Hilbig, B. E., Glöckner, A., & Zettler, I. (2014). Personality and prosocial behavior: Linking basic traits and social value orientations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *107*(3), 529.

Hilinski, C. M. (2009). Fear of crime among college students: A test of the shadow of sexual assault hypothesis. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *34*(1-2), 84-102.

Hockley, O. J., & Langdon, P. E. (2015). Men with intellectual disabilities with a history of sexual offending: Empathy for victims of sexual and non-sexual crimes. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, *59*(4), 332–341. https://doi.org/10.1111/jir.12137

Hoffman, M. L. (2001). Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice. Cambridge University Press.

Holmgren, R. A., Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1998). The relations of children's situational empathy related emotions to dispositional prosocial behaviour. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *22*(1), 169–193.

Hopkins, M., & Tilley, N. (2001). Once a victim, always a victim? A study of how victimisation patterns may change over time. *International Review of Victimology*, *8*(1), 19–35.

Hoxmeier, J. C., Flay, B. R., & Acock, A. C. (2015). When will students intervene? Differences in students' intent to intervene in a spectrum of sexual assault situations. *Violence and Gender*, *2*(3), 179–184.

Jennings, W. G., Khey, D. N., Maskaly, J., & Donner, C. M. (2011). Evaluating the relationship between law enforcement and school security measures and violent crime in schools. *Journal of Police Crisis Negotiations*, *11*(2), 109-124.

Johnston, M. E. (2009). Moral Emotion Expectancies and Moral Behavior in Adolescence. Wilfred Laurier University

Judge, M.& Nel, J.A. (2008). Exploring homophobic victimisation in Gauteng, South Africa: Issues, Impacts and Responses. Centre for Applied Psychology University of South Africa. *Acta Criminologica*, *21*, 3.

Jürgens, U., & Gnad, M. (2002). Gated communities in South Africa—experiences from Johannesburg. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, *29*(3), 337–353.

Kiguwa, P., & Langa, M. (2015). Rethinking social cohesion and its relationship to exclusion. *Psychology in Society*, (49), 1-6.

Kohlberg, L., & Kramer, R. (1969). Continuities and discontinuities in childhood and adult moral development. *Human Development*, *12*(2), 93–120.

Kramer, S. (2013). Investigating risk and protective factors to mainstream safety and peace at the University of South Africa. *African Safety Promotion: A Journal of Injury and Violence Prevention*, *11*(1), 39–60.

Krog, A. (2008). 'This thing called reconciliation…'forgiveness as part of an interconnectedness-towards-wholeness. *South African Journal of Philosophy*, *27*(4), 353–366.

Krznaric, R. (2015). *Empathy: Why it matters, and how to get it*. Tarcher Perigee.

Lane, J., Gover, A. R., & Dahod, S. (2009). Fear of Violent Crime Among Men and Women on Campus: The Impact of Perceived Risk and Fear of Sexual Assault. *Violence and Victims*, *24*(2), 172–192. https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.24.2.172

Laner, M. R, V., & Benin, M. H. (2001). Bystander attitudes toward victims of violence: who's worth helping? *Deviant Behavior*, *22*(1), 23–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/016396201750065793

Latane, B., & Rodin, J. (1969). A lady in distress: Inhibiting effects of friends and strangers on bystander intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *5*(2), 189–202.

Lemanski, C. (2004). A new apartheid? The spatial implications of fear of crime in Cape Town, South Africa. *Environment and Urbanization*, *16*(2), 101–112. https://doi.org/10.1177/095624780401600201

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), 787–802.

Leong, C. H., & Ward, C. (2006). Cultural values and attitudes toward immigrants and multiculturalism: The case of the Eurobarometer survey on racism and xenophobia. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *30*(6), 799-810.

Litvinova, A. V., & Tarasov, K. (2012). The Psychological Determinants Causing Tendency to Xenophobia at Students of Humanitarian Colleges. *Focus*, *3*.

Luescher, T. M., & Klemenčič, M. (2017). Student Power in Twenty-First Century Africa: The Character and Role of Student Organizing. *Student Politics and Protests: International Perspectives*, 113-127.

Lozano, R., Lukman, R., Lozano, F. J., Huisingh, D., & Lambrechts, W. (2013). Declarations for sustainability in higher education: becoming better leaders, through addressing the university system. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *48*, 10-19.

McAllister, P. A. (2009). Ubuntu-Beyond Belief in Southern Africa. *Sites: A Journal of Social Anthropology and Cultural Studies*, *6*(1), 48–57.

Mestre, M. V., Samper, P., Frías, M. D., & Tur, A. M. (2009). Are women more empathetic than men? A longitudinal study in adolescence. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, *12*(01), 76–83.

Meth, P. (2016). Informal housing, gender, crime and violence: The role of design in urban South Africa. *British Journal of Criminology*.

Metz, T., & Gaie, J. B. (2010). The African ethic of Ubuntu/Botho: Implications for research on morality. *Journal of Moral Education*, *39*(3), 273–290.

Mogekwu, M. (2005). African Union: Xenophobia as poor intercultural communication. *Ecquid Novi*, *26*(1), 5–20.

Møller, V. (2005). Resilient or resigned? Criminal victimisation and quality of life in South Africa. *Social Indicators Research*, *72*(3), 263–317.

Monin, B., & Jordan, A. H. (2009). The dynamic moral self: A social psychological perspective. *Personality, Identity, and Character: Explorations in Moral Psychology*, 341–354.

Morgan, M. M., Goddard, H. W., & Givens, S. N. (1997). Factors that influence willingness to help the homeless. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, *6*(1), 45–56.

Nava, A. S. (2007). Empathy and group analysis: An integrative approach. *Group Analysis*, *40*(1), 13-28.

Neocosmos, M. (2010). Analysing political subjectivities: naming the post-developmental state in Africa today. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, *45*(5), 534-553.

Neff, K. (2003). Self-compassion: An alternative conceptualization of a healthy attitude toward oneself. *Self and Identity*, *2*(2), 85–101.

Nickell, G. S. (1998). The helping attitude scale. *American Psychological Association,* San Francisco.

Penner, L. A., Fritzsche, B. A., Craiger, J. P., & Freifeld, T. R. (1995). Measuring the prosocial personality. *Advances in personality assessment*, *10,* 147-163.

Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial behavior: Multilevel perspectives. *Annual Review Psychologica*, *56*, 365–392.

Piferi, R. L., Jobe, R. L., & Jones, W. H. (2006). Giving to others during national tragedy: The effects of altruistic and egoistic motivations on long-term giving. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *23*(1), 171–184.

Piliavin, I., & Masters, S. (1981). Impact of Employment Programs on Offenders, Addicts, and Problem Youth-Implications From Supported Work. University of Wisconsin, M., Institute for Research on Poverty, & United States of America.

Powdthavee, N. (2005). Unhappiness and crime: Evidence from South Africa. *Economica*, *72*(287), 531–547.

Pöyhönen, V., Juvonen, J., & Salmivalli, C. (2010). What does it take to stand up for the victim of bullying?: The interplay between personal and social factors. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *56*(2), 143–163.

Pozzoli, T., Gini, G., & Vieno, A. (2012). The role of individual correlates and class norms in defending and passive bystanding behavior in bullying: A multilevel analysis. *Child Development*, *83*(6), 1917–1931.

Rhoads, R. A., Buenavista, T. L., & Maldonado, D. E. Z. (2004). Students of color helping others stay in college: A grassroots effort. *About Campus*, *9*(3), 10–17. https://doi.org/10.1002/abc.94

Roberts, W., Strayer, J., & Denham, S. (2014). Empathy, anger, guilt: Emotions and prosocial behaviour. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science / Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*, *46*(4), 465–474. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035057

Rodriguez, L., Kramer, S., & Sherriff, B. (2013). Investigating risk and protective factors to mainstream safety and peace at the University of South Africa. *African Safety Promotion*, *11*(1), 39–60.

Roos, V., & Wheeler, A. (2016). Older people's experiences of giving and receiving empathy in relation to middle adolescents in rural South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *46*(4), 517-529.

Schroeder, D. A., & Graziano, W. G. (2015). *The Oxford Handbook of Prosocial Behavior*. Oxford University Press.

Seedat, M., Baw, U., & Ratele, K. (2010). Why the Wretched Kill in Democratic South Africa Reflections on Rejuvenation and Reconstruction. *Social Change*, *40*(1), 15–27.

Sharma, P. (2015). Positive and Negative Affect: Impact on Empathy and Prosocial Behaviour among College Going Adolescents.*The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *2*(3)

Silber, G., & Geffen, N. (2009). Race, class and violent crime in South Africa: dispelling the'Huntley thesis'. *SA Crime Quarterly*, *30*, 35-43.

Singh, S., Mudaly, R., & Singh-Pillay, A. (2015). The what, who and where of female students' fear of sexual assault on a South African University campus. *Agenda*, *29*(3), 97–105. https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.2015.1045335

Snedker, K. A. (2006, June). Altruistic and vicarious fear of crime: Fear for others and gendered social roles. In *Sociological Forum* (Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 163-195). Springer US.

Staub, E. (2001). Emergency helping, genocidal violence, and the evolution of responsibility and altruism in children. *Visions of Compassion: Western Scientists and Tibetan Buddhists Examine Human Nature*, 165–181.

Steffen, S. L., & Fothergill, A. (2009). 9/11 Volunteerism: A pathway to personal healing and community engagement. *The Social Science Journal*, *46*(1), 29–46.

Vaes, J., Paladino, M., & Leyens, J. (2002). The lost email: Prosocial reactions induced by uniquely human emotions. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *41*(4), 521–534.

Van Baaren, R., Janssen, L., Chartrand, T. L., & Dijksterhuis, A. (2009). Where is the love? The social aspects of mimicry. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, *364*(1528), 2381–2389.

Van Langen, M. A., Stams, G. J. J., Van Vugt, E. S., Wissink, I. B., & Asscher, J. J. (2014). Explaining female offending and prosocial behavior: The role of empathy and cognitive distortions. *Laws*, *3*(4), 706-720.

Van Velzen, F. A. (1998). Fear of crime: A socio-criminological investigation.

Vromans, L., Schweitzer, R. D., Knoetze, K., & Kagee, A. (2011). The experience of xenophobia in South Africa. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *81*(1), 90–93.

Walther.,J. Walther, L. Mann, D. Radcliffe (2005). Global Engineering Education: Australia and the Bologna Process (2005) Paper presented at the ASEE/AaE 4th Global Colloquium on Engineering Education, Sydney, Australia

Wilcox, P., Jordan, C. E., & Pritchard, A. J. (2007). A multidimensional examination of campus safety: Victimization, perceptions of danger, worry about crime, and precautionary behavior among college women in the post-Clery era. *Crime & Delinquency*, *53*(2), 219-254.

Wilhelm, M. O., & Bekkers, R. (2010). Helping behavior, dispositional empathic concern, and the principle of care. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *73*(1), 11–32.

Williams, S. L., Williams, D. R., Stein, D. J., Seedat, S., Jackson, P. B., & Moomal, H. (2007). Multiple traumatic events and psychological distress: The South Africa stress and health study. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, *20*(5), 845–855. https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.20252

Wilson, R. (2001). *The politics of truth and reconciliation in South Africa: Legitimizing the post-apartheid state*. Cambridge University Press.

Woolnough, A. D. (2009). Fear of crime on campus: gender differences in use of self-protective behaviours at an urban university. *Security Journal*, *22*(1), 40–55.

Workman, L., & Reader, W. (2014). *Evolutionary psychology*. Cambridge University Press.

Wits Vuvuzela: INFOGRAPHIC: Crime spike affects Wits University (May 12, 2014)

Yakushko, O. (2009). Xenophobia Understanding the Roots and Consequences of Negative Attitudes Toward Immigrants. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *37*(1), 36-66

Zhang, W., & Ding, F.,Q. (2014). Impact of Situational Factors on College Students' Implicit Helping Attitude. *The World and Chongqing*, *4*.

APPENDIX A: Demographic Questionnaire

1. Age:
2. Gender: M F
3. Faculty:
4. Population group:

   Black

   Coloured

   Indian

   White

   Other (Please specify)
5. Home language(s)

   Afrikaans

   English

   Isindebele

   Sepedi

   Siswati

   Sesotho

   Xitsonga

   Setwana

   Tshivenda

   Isixhosa

   Isizulu

   Other (please specify)

APPENDIX B: The Interpersonal Reactivity Index

INTERPERSONAL REACTIVITY INDEX

The following statements inquire about your thoughts and feelings in a variety of situations. For each item, indicate how well it describes you by choosing the appropriate letter on the scale at the top of the page: A, B, C, D, or E. When you have decided on your answer, fill in the letter next to the item number. READ EACH ITEM CAREFULLY BEFORE RESPONDING. Answer as honestly as you can. Thank you.

ANSWER SCALE:

A	B	C	D	E
DOES NOT DESCRIBE ME WELL				DESCRIBES VERY WELL

1. I daydream and fantasize, with some regularity, about things that might happen to me. (FS)

2. I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me. (EC)

3. I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the "other guy's" point of view. (PT) (-)

4. Sometimes I don't feel very sorry for other people when they are having problems. (EC) (-)

5. I really get involved with the feelings of the characters in a novel. (FS)

6. In emergency situations, I feel apprehensive and ill-at-ease. (PD)

7. I am usually objective when I watch a movie or play, and I don't often get completely caught up in it. (FS) (-)

8. I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision. (PT)

9. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them. (EC)

10. I sometimes feel helpless when I am in the middle of a very emotional situation. (PD)

11. I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective. (PT)

12. Becoming extremely involved in a good book or movie is somewhat rare for me. (FS) (-)

13. When I see someone get hurt, I tend to remain calm. (PD) (-)

14. Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal. (EC) (-)

15. If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments. (PT) (-)

16. After seeing a play or movie, I have felt as though I were one of the characters. (FS)

17. Being in a tense emotional situation scares me. (PD)

18. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them. (EC) (-)

19. I am usually pretty effective in dealing with emergencies. (PD) (-)

20. I am often quite touched by things that I see happen. (EC)

21. I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both. (PT)

22. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person. (EC)

23. When I watch a good movie, I can very easily put myself in the place of a leading character. (FS)

24. I tend to lose control during emergencies. (PD)

25. When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in his shoes" for a while. (PT)

26. When I am reading an interesting story or novel, I imagine how I would feel if the events in the story were happening to me. (FS)

27. When I see someone who badly needs help in an emergency, I go to pieces. (PD)

28. Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place. (PT)

NOTE: (-) denotes item to be scored in reverse fashion PT = perspective-taking scale FS = fantasy scale EC = empathic concern scale PD = personal distress scale

A = 0 B = 1 C = 2 D = 3 E = 4

Except for reversed-scored items, which are scored:

A = 4 B = 3 C = 2 D = 1 E = 0

APPENDIX C: Fear of crime on campus instrument

Please answer the following questions by giving a ranking of 1 to 10, with 10 being the strongest answer.

A. Please indicate on scale of 1 to 10 **how afraid** you are of being a victim of crime **on campus during the day**
Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

B. Please indicate on scale of 1 to 10 **how afraid** you are of being a victim of crime **on campus at night** (Please circle)
Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

C. Please indicate on a scale of 1 to 10 **how afraid** you are of being a victim of the following crimes **on campus** :
1. Being raped/sexually assaulted (Please circle)
Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid
2. Being beaten up (Please circle)
Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid
3. Having someone break into your dorm or apartment while you are there (Please circle)
Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid
4. Having someone break into your dorm or apartment while you are gone (Please circle)
Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid
5. Having something taken from you by force/mugged (Please circle)
Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid
6. Having something stolen from you while in class (Please circle)
Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid
7. Having something stolen from you while in the library (Please circle)
Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid
8. Having your car stolen while on campus (Please circle)
Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid
9. Having your car vandalized while on campus (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

10. Being threatened with a knife, club or gun (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

11. Being murdered (Please circle)

Not afraid at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very Afraid

APPENDIX D: Victimisation Instrument

Have you ever been the victim of the following crimes?
1. Being raped/sexually assaulted/attempted rape (Please circle) Yes No
2. Being beaten up (Please circle) Yes No
3. Having something taken from you by force/mugged (Please circle) Yes No
4. Has anything ever been stolen from you on campus (Please circle) Yes No
5. Being threatened with a knife, club or gun (Please circle) Yes No
6. Other (Please specify) _____

APPENDIX E: Helping Attitudes Scale

INSTRUCTIONS: This instrument is designed to measure your feelings, beliefs and behaviors concerning your interactions with others. It is not a test, so there are no right or wrong answers. Please answer the questions as honestly as possible. Using the scale below, indicate your level of agreement or disagreement in the space which is next to each statement.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree

___ 1. Helping others is usually a waste of time.

___ 2. When given the opportunity, I enjoy aiding others who are in need.

___ 3. If possible, I would return lost money to the rightful owner.

___ 4. Helping friends and family is one of the great joys in life.

___ 5. I would avoid aiding someone in a medical emergency if I could.

___ 6. It feels wonderful to assist others in need.

___ 7. Volunteering to help someone is very rewarding.

___ 8. I dislike giving directions to strangers who are lost.

___ 9. Doing volunteer work makes me feel happy.

___10. I donate time or money to charities every month.

___11. Unless they are part of my family, helping the elderly isn't my responsibility.

___12. Children should be taught about the importance of helping others.

___13. I plan to donate my organs when I die with the hope that they will help someone else live.

___14. I try to offer my help with any activities my community or school groups are carrying out.

___15. I feel at peace with myself when I have helped others.

___16. If the person in front of me in the check-out line at a store was a few cents short, I would pay the difference.

___17. I feel proud when I know that my generosity has benefited a needy person.

___18. Helping people does more harm than good because they come to rely on others and not themselves.

___19. I rarely contribute money to a worthy cause.

___20. Giving aid to the poor is the right thing to do.

Scoring:

Items 1, 5, 8, 11, 18, 19 are reverse scored. The scores for each item are summed up to form an overall score, ranging from 20 to 100. According to the author, a 60 is a neutral score.

APPENDIX F: Ethical Clearance Certificate

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, JOHANNESBURG

HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE (SCHOOL OF HUMAN & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE	**PROTOCOL NUMBER: MACC/16/009 IH**
PROJECT TITLE:	Fear of crime and its relationship to helping attitudes and empathy in a South African student sample
INVESTIGATORS	Buitendag Juandri
DEPARTMENT	Psychology
DATE CONSIDERED	31/05/16
DECISION OF COMMITTEE*	Approved

This ethical clearance is valid for 2 years and may be renewed upon application

DATE: 31 May 2016

CHAIRPERSON
(Prof. Brett Bowman)

cc Supervisor:

Prof. Tanya Graham
Psychology

DECLARATION OF INVESTIGATOR (S)

To be completed in duplicate and **one copy** returned to the Secretary, Room 100015, 10th floor, Senate House, University.

I/we fully understand the conditions under which I am/we are authorized to carry out the abovementioned research and I/we guarantee to ensure compliance with these conditions. Should any departure be contemplated from the research procedure, as approved, I/we undertake to submit a revised protocol to the Committee.

This ethical clearance will expire on 31 December 2018

PLEASE QUOTE THE PROTOCOL NUMBER IN ALL ENQUIRIES

APPENDIX G: Participant letter

Good day,

My name is Juandri Buitendag and I am conducting research for the purposes of obtaining a Master's degree at the University of the Witwatersrand. My research is based on the title "Fear of Crime and its Relationship to Helping Attitudes and Empathy in a South African Student Sample.", and I invite you to participate. Your participation will help me gain some insight into an area that has been under researched in South Africa and on the campus of the University of Witwatersrand.

Involvement in this research requires you to take part in an online questionnaire. The questionnaire consists of 67 questions that will take you approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. Completion and return of the questionnaire will be considered to indicate permission for your responses to be used for the research project. Please note that your participation in this study is completely voluntary, you will not be rewarded or penalized in any way. You have the right to withdraw from the research at any point. You may also refuse to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable. Data collected from your answers will be kept strictly confidential, all material will only be seen by myself and my supervisor. All data that will be collected will be kept in a safe location with restricted access. The results of this study will be written up in the form of a research report. They may also be written up as a research article or presented at a conference. Since I will only be looking at group trends, and have no way of linking any individual's identity to a particular questionnaire, I will not be able to give any individual feedback.

It is my understanding that the study will not pose any risks or result in any benefits to you. However if you feel you have any concerns or that you have been made to feel vulnerable through the study, or if you require any additional information for referrals, please feel free to contact the Counselling and Careers Development unit (CCDU) on West Campus in the CCDU building, Wits University, closest entrance is gate 9, or telephonically on 0117179140/32 or email on: info.ccdu@wits.ac.za.

Kind Regards

Juandri Buitendag