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Highlights

* Living in cautioned areas could influence self and emotions
* Cautioned areas living could generate fear of unknown
* Gender reflect different levels of proneness to fear of unknown

**Abstract**

Participants belonging to demarcated areas, 100 from a cautioned area and 100 from not a cautioned area located in close vicinity of a district including 50 male and 50 female in each area, equated on education and residing in urban and rural areas were tested for the level of self-efficacy with Self-efficacy Scale and the levels of fear of unknown with a self-evolved scale based on some borrowed items from Beck Anxiety Inventory assuming that both groups of participants may behave differently due to nature of residing area? The results reflected a difference in self-efficacy and unknown fear, the response difference on both measures were also observed in urban and rural areas, significant negative relationship between self-efficacy and unknown fear was also observed. Some gender related information emerged as well. Implication regarding the relationship of residing briefly discussed with reference to town planning, law enforcement and adventurism.
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**Introduction**

Human emotions are as old as is a human being; aestesiologyis the emotional experience of the self to the ‘stimuli of lived experience’(Bourke, 2003). The modern world is a ‘risky place’ that is capable of evoking certain ‘fears’ those could be associated with health and well-being (Ropeik, 2004).Fear is opposite of hope (Mackinnon, 1944). Fear is a reaction to consciously perceived threatening situation perceived as danger. It is “caused by particular patterns of threat-related stimuli” (Adolphs, 2013),animal studies reflect a ‘common structure’ of the reactions in this situation (Harrison, Ahn&Adolphs, 2015). According to LeDoux (2013) fear can be defined in two ways the ‘negative irreality’ and the ‘positive irreality’ that creates hopes and fears (Mackinnon, 1944). When a person comes across a threatening situation it is the ‘assessment’ of that situation as a ‘risky situation’that determines the patterns of fear response(Blanchard, Griebel, Pobbe& Blanchard, 2011).

Fear is a biological reaction;amygdala plays a “central role in processing fear” by evoking specific“circuits” (Gross &Canteras, 2012). It has been reported the damaged amygdala effectsfear (Feinstein, Buzza, Hurlemann, Follmer, Dahdaleh, Coryell, &Wemmie, 2013) and produces abnormal reactions likereduced fear (Feinstein, Adolphs, Damasio&Tranel, 2011). Fear represents a biological state of “increased arousal, expectancy, autonomic and neuroendocrine activation, and specific behavior patterns” (Steimer, 2002).LeDoux (2017a) suggests that the words used for subjective experiences should be avoided while using non-subjective controlled behaviors. Perhaps because, ‘brief expressions’ could ‘produce a robust bodily signals’(Bornemann, Winkielman& van der Meer, 2012).

Fear is an oldest and strongest emotion of mankind ([Joshi & Schultz, 2001](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0887618516300251#bib0470)).It reflects the evolutionary advantage of human kind for ‘threat detection’ (Bertini, Cecere&Làdavas, 2013).Threat evaluation steps of fear takes place step by step to cause fear (Mobbs, Hagan, Dalgleish, Silston&Prévost, 2015) although fear effects ‘everyone’ in the same way in various situations social and political to feel ‘unsafe’ in almost in all situations is common (Condon, Lieber, &Maillochon, 2007) perhaps it is the feel that plays probably a role in ‘collective insecurity’ (Riezler, 1944) or a fear of unknownthat is a fear experienced in ‘perceived absence of information’(Carleton, 2016): the oldest kind of human fear(Carleton, 2016) as is the fear of death (Mikulincer, Florian &Tolmacz, 1990), fear of radiation is an example of fear of unknown (Groen, Bae& Lim, 2012). Fear situations could condition human biological reactions because of its influence on CeMneurons (Duvarci, Popa&Paré, 2011) that explain chemistry of fear (Ciocchi, Herry, Grenier, Wolff, Letzkus, Vlachos,., ...& Müller, 2010) that could be due tothe human ability to feel ‘unseen emotionalsignals’ (Bertini, Cecere&Làdavas, 2013) those probably play a role in fear, therefore, fear appeals influence human behavior (Witte& Allen, 2000). Witte (1993) has provided some definitions of fear whereas Matthen (1998) has discussed some philosophical explanation about fear.

Psychological theories about the fear of crime reflect theoretical orientations those play a role in the generation of a fear of crime (Gabriel & Greve, 2003).Venerability of crime is related with fear and women appears to more venerable in such kind of fear (Jackson, 2009), some gender related information about ‘fearless male/fearful female’ (Goody, 2017) is also available and some context studies about elderly people are also there (Yin, 1980) since fear is different from anxiety (Perusini & Fanselow, 2015)and anger (Lerner & Keltner, 2001) moreover, people related with criminal realities interpret fear differently (Ferraro, 1995), therefore, fear of crime needs more experimentations (Garofalo, 1981).

**Method and Procedure**

The country in which the study was conducted is a developed country, however; still crime rate in certain areas of the country is high because of various reasons and it is matter of concern and cause of ‘caution’ for the people those live in these areas. The present study was designed to study that how do living in an area that is declared as a ‘cautioned area’ due to high crime rate noticed there and in the same vicinity any area that was not perceived as ‘cautioned’ for any reason influence certain comparable human reactions of equated sample of both areas on similar assessment devices? This was to assess the impact of caution that is a kind of unknown fear on general human behavior? An equal number of sample total 200 equated on education levels and residence in urban and rural localities of cautioned area 100 including 50 male and 50 female and the same number from not declared cautioned area were tested on Schwarzer and Matthias (1993)Self-efficacy Scale for overall self-efficacy of the participants. A few borrowed items from Beck, Epstein, Brown & Steer, (1988) inventory arranged in the format of a questionnaire with scale rating from 0 (not at all) to 3 (severely) to assess the level of fear of unknown among the participants. The question that was asked from each participant was, “Rate how each of the listed situations bothered you in the past week”? Each participant before equating and testing signed willingness to participate in the study and was informed to withdraw from testing at any stage of study in case of inconvenience as approved by Riphah Research Ethics Committee. Before the study a survey was conducted to locate cautioned area and not cautioned area, the survey assessment was based on the opinion and perception of local residents based on the simple questions like ‘ Do you live in the area where crime rate in comparatively high than the other areas? How frequently crimes take place in the area you reside?.

**Results**

The assessment of responses of the participants were made with the help of SPSS (24.0) Cronbach alpha for response reliability, bivariate correlation to compare the group sample and independent t-test was applied for comparison. Table-(1-1) reflects the demography of the sample, a difference in self-efficacy and unknown fear was also observed among both area participants (Table-1-2), in case of gender self-efficacy was found higher among male respondents than female respondents and mean score of unknown fear was higher among female respondents than male (Table-1-3) moreover, the results of differences were observed between rural and urban respondents revealing a significant difference in self-efficacy and unknown fear response (Table-1-4) the findings revealed negative significant correlation between self-efficacy and unknown fear (because of caution) (Table-1-5),.

**Discussions and Recommendation**

The study provided useful information about the influence of ‘residing’ in various types of areas on emotion. The impact of residing in cautioned area on self also came in light. The findings could be helpful for future town planning and law enforcement necessities in various areas. Gender role situation emerged regarding the area of conduct of study that could be studied in cultural influences context but its cross cultural recommendation deserves caution because of sampling and focused area of the study. Fear has a role in adventure (Carnicelli-Filho, Schwartz &Tahara, 2010) therefore findings hint towards tourism and adventure usage.
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Table 1-1

*Frequency Distribution of Demography*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Respondent’s Characteristics | | *f (%)* |
| Gender | Male  Female | 100 (50.0)  100 (50.0) |
| Education | Intermediate  Graduation  Post- graduation | 108 (54.0)  25 (12.5)  67 (33.5) |
| Residence | Urban  Rural | 95 (47.5)  105 (52.5) |
| Sample | Normal Area  Cautioned Area | 100 (50.0)  100 (50.0) |

The Table reveals the frequency and percentage distribution demography. In gender, 100(50.0%) were male and 100(50%) were female. In education, 108(54.0%) were having intermediate education, 25(12.5%) were having graduation education and 67(33.5%) were having post graduation education. Regarding residence, 95(47.5%) respondents were from urban residence and 105(52.5%) respondents were from rural residence. In the area wise sample, 100(50.0%) respondents were from normal area and 100(50.0%) respondents were from cautioned area.

Table 1-2

*Comparison between Norma Area and Cautioned Area Sample Using Independent Sample t-test among Self-efficacy and Unknown Fear (N=200)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Normal (*n* = 100) | | Cautioned (*n* = 100) | |  | |  | *95%CI* | |
| *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | t | *p* | | *LL* | *UL* |
| Self-efficacy | 36.09 | 4.75 | 31.62 | 4.85 | 6.59 | .00 | | 3.13 | 5.81 |
| Unknown fear | 11.01 | 9.97 | 20.08 | 10.95 | -6.13 | .00 | | -11.99 | -3.15 |

The results of differences between normal and cautioned area respondents revealed a significant difference in self-efficacy and unknown fear. While the mean score of self-efficacy is higher among normal area respondents (M = 36.09 and SD = 4.75) than cautioned area respondents (M = 31.62 and SD = 4.85). Whereas, the mean score of unknown fear is higher among normal area respondents (M = 20.08 and SD = 10.95) than cautioned area respondents (M = 11.01 and SD = 9.97).

Table 1=3

*Comparison between Gender (Male & Female) Using Independent Sample t-test among Self-efficacy and Unknown Fear (N=200)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Male (*n* = 100) | | Female (*n* = 100) | |  | |  | *95%CI* | |
| *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | t | *p* | | *LL* | *UL* |
| Self-efficacy | 35.29 | 4.53 | 32.42 | 5.61 | 3.98 | .00 | | 1.45 | 4.29 |
| Unknown fear | 12.88 | 9.87 | 18.21 | 12.21 | -3.40 | .00 | | -8.43 | -2.23 |

The gender responses revealed a significant difference in self-efficacy and unknown fear. While the mean score of self-efficacy is higher among male respondents (M = 35.29 and SD = 4.53) than female respondents (M = 32.61 and SD = 5.61). Whereas, the mean score of unknow fear is higher among female respondents (M = 18.21 and SD = 12.21) than male respondents (M = 12.88 and SD = 9.87).

Table 1-4

*Comparison between Rural and Urban Residency Sample Using Independent Sample t-test among Self-efficacy and Unknown Fear (N=200)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Rural (*n* = 105) | | Urban (*n* = 95) | |  | |  | *95%CI* | |
| *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | t | *p* | | *LL* | *UL* |
| Self-efficacy | 35.21 | 4.62 | 32.36 | 5.59 | 3.95 | .00 | | 1.42 | 4.28 |
| Unknown fear | 13.44 | 10.47 | 17.87 | 11.95 | -2.80 | .01 | | -7.56 | -1.31 |

The results of differences between rural and urban respondents revealed a significant difference in self-efficacy and unknown fear. While the mean score of self-efficacy found higher among rural respondents (M = 35.21 and SD = 4.63) than urban respondents (M = 32.36 and SD = 5.59). Whereas, the mean score of unknown fear are higher among urban respondents (M = 17.87 and SD = 11.95) than rural respondents (M = 13.44 and SD = 10.47).

**Table 1-5**

*Correlation between Self-efficacy and Unknown Fear (N=200)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | Self-efficacy | Unknown Fear |
| Self-efficacy | - | -.53\*\* |
| Unknown fear |  |  |

The results of relationship between self-efficacy and unknown fear indicated the negative significant correlation (r= -.53, p < .01) between self-efficacy and unknown fear. Meaning thereby that high score on self-efficacy are associated with low scores in unknown fear.