

Threatened Halos of Perception: Residents' Accuracy of Crime Changes in a Developing Tourist Area

Ashley V. Reichelmann*, James E. Hawdon, John Ryan

Department of Sociology, Virginia Tech, VA, USA

ABSTRACT

Background: Large-scale memorial development has become a growing trend around the world. While numerous studies have tracked the effects of such development on objective measures of community welfare, far less is known about the social effects of memorial tourist attractions on communities where they are placed. This study explores one such impact: how do changes in the social and physical landscape as a result of memorial tourist development affect residents' perceptions of the crime rate in their community?

Methods: Secondary crime data was coupled with a longitudinal residential survey (n=135), measuring actual and perceived crime rates before and after the attraction's opening.

Results: While race, income, and political party affiliation predicted pre-opening beliefs, post-opening perceptions of crime change were associated with prior beliefs, residential status, media consumption, and median income. When compared against the objective crime change, residential status was the only predictor of inaccurate perceptions of both property and violent crime.

Conclusions: Aspects of residents' immediate communities bias their ability to accurately perceive crime change after the opening of a public memorial. The findings encourage researchers to take a more holistic, and yet nuanced, look at the effects of tourism on communities where they are placed. In the present case, such perceptions may have a significant impact on whether or not the objectives of the memorial developers are met. Given the current wave of memorial development world-wide, these findings may contribute to the success or failure of these efforts.

Key words: Tourism; Memorials; Residents; Fear of crime; Perceptions; Criminal behavior; Theory

INTRODUCTION

Public memorials may serve a number of functions, including preserving history, remembering victims, facilitating the grieving process, promoting reconciliation between conflicting groups, and offering educational experiences about often forgotten or misrepresented histories [1-3]. In recent years, the sheer number of memorials has been increasing in hopes of fulfilling some combination of these functions, and as potential attractions to draw visitors to the memorial site, perhaps economically revitalizing the surrounding area. Yet, a large-scale memorial is not only a tourist attraction that alters the physical landscape, it also creates ripples in the social landscape of the community.

The ripples created by large-scale memorials can range from individual feelings of safety to perceptions of outsiders and their effect on the community. The change in physical landscape also has social consequences for the residents' collective memory of their

city as well as their relationships with one another. In this way, the meaning of a memorial design is not solely about the design, but, as stated by Stevens, also about "its spatial relationships to other buildings and memorials, and public activities that occur around it" [4]. Some of the ripples include the intended consequences of community revitalization, such as business growth and an increase in tourism revenue. At the same time, others are unintended and have potential negative consequences. For example, a number of studies have shown that increased tourism may attract more criminals as well as provide more opportunities for those already there, due to the growing number of targets in the area [5-9]. Thus, the fear that crime will rise with more visitors to the community is a legitimate concern [10].

There is a large literature on factors influencing fear of crime as well as research showing the disconnect between perceptions of crime in an area and the actual likelihood of victimization [11-

*Correspondence to: Ashley V. Reichelmann, Department of Sociology, Virginia Tech, VA, USA, Tel: + 5402315651; E-mail: avr@vt.edu

Received: July 28, 2020; Accepted: August 14, 2020; Published: August 21, 2020

Citation: Reichelmann AV, Hawdon JE, Ryan J (2020) Threatened Halos of Perception: Residents' Accuracy of Crime Changes in a Developing Tourist Area. J Tourism Hospit 9:441. doi: 10.35248/2167-0269.20.9.441

Copyright: © 2020 Reichelmann AV, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

14]. However, less is known about the complex array of factors potentially influencing the accuracy of residents' perceptions of the level of crime in their community [15,16]. Yet, this is a question of considerable significance because it is likely that there is a correlation between the perception of the level of crime in a community and the lived fear of crime victimization. And, as stated by Curiel and Bishop, "Fear of crime is a problem...with costly and long-lasting consequences to the social life of a city and therefore, understanding its causes and the reasons why it emerges as a social phenomenon plays a key role in the correct design of policies". In this paper, we aim to address this issue by exploring how changes in the social and physical landscape, brought about by the development of a high profile and emotionally-charged large-scale memorial, affected the residents' perceptions of the crime rate in their community.

This research contributes to three distinct literatures. First, we contribute to the literatures on tourism and crime. While most current literature focuses on the victimization of tourists themselves, this research highlights how tourism development might affect residents' perceptions of crime, which is a specific component of their perceived quality of life [17]. Second, we also contribute to the literature on moral panics and racial threat by highlighting how the collective memory of lynching-the memorial's content-might spark views on who will attend the memorial and whose memory it is invoking, both of which could affect residents' perceptions and expectations of crimes. Finally, the research contributes to work on tourism and community effects by arguing that an important part of the success or failure of a community-based memorial in achieving its goals depends on residents' perceptions of its impact on their community.

To provide this empirically-based contribution, we surveyed residents in Montgomery, AL, during and after the development of The Memorial for Peace and Justice (MPJ), the first large-scale memorial to victims of lynching in the United States. During the memorial development phase (time 1), we gathered data to see how residents in the community were anticipating its effects on crime. Four months after the memorial opened (time 2), we gathered data again to see if the same residents believed that crime had in fact changed. The time 2 data were then compared against the official crime data to assess the accuracy of residents' perceptions.

When assessing perceptions of change against the reality of a change, there are five potential groups that residents could fall into: inaccurate pessimist, inaccurate optimist, inaccurate neutralist, accurate neutralist, or an accurate prophet. However, in this case, city-level crime as measured with official statistics slightly decreased after the memorial's opening, meaning that there are only three potential groups: accurate prophet, inaccurate neutralist, and inaccurate pessimist. In this paper, we assess how many residents adopted each of these modes of perception. We also demonstrate what factors were associated with each of these categories, including a number of demographic characteristics, political ideology, residential status, proximity to the memorial, and media exposure. An important point is that, if perceptions vary by these categories, then the intended effect of the memorial could also vary by these categories as well. In other words, and this is key to the process of memorialization, the stronger the variation across these factors, the less likely the memorial will achieve its community-wide intended effect of healing and reconciliation. In addition, we also highlight how interaction with the memorial directly or indirectly impacts the perceptions of crime. Is it a reciprocal relationship where

perceptions impact the interaction with the memorial, and contact with the memorial may or may not impact the perceptions? Is the memorial able to mitigate some of the negative perceptions that might hinder its success, or does it have no effect, or does it make outcomes worse? The data collected during this natural experiment allows us to answer these unique questions.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The memorial

The Memorial for Peace and Justice is the first national memorial to victims of lynching. Founded by the non-profit Equal Justice Initiative, it opened in downtown Montgomery, Alabama on April 26, 2018. The memorial sits atop a six acre site on the edge of the largely residential Cottage Hills/Five Points neighborhoods [18]. The land was purchased from the city in 2015 as "a stimulus for economic development and revitalization" of the city through "developing a public space and memorial park...[that] will create a tour loop for visitors, tourists and Montgomery residents who are interested in history or civil rights" [19]. The memorial includes statues and placards to make connections between historical racial violence and oppression and modern issues, such as police brutality and mass incarceration.

Montgomery's memoryscape—"landscape interpreted and imagined using the memories of others" – is tense with a racial history that harbors interrelated yet conflicting national moments: the Civil War and the Civil Rights Movement [20]. It houses monuments, memorials, and markers like the First White House of the Confederate States of America (CSA), a statue to the first and only president of the CSA Jefferson Davis, Dexter Avenue King Memorial Baptist Church where Martin Luther King Jr. was pastor, and the bus stop where Rosa Parks boarded a bus and then refused to move, sparking a crucial moment in the Civil Rights movement. The tension in the memoryscape indicates that the host community would likely have competing views on the placement of the memorial and, in turn, the memorial would have effects on the residents' views. For these reasons, we believe that Montgomery, AL offers unique insight into how memorial placement, content, and memorialization more broadly affects the host city's residents, an area of focus that is severely understudied.

Potential explanations for perceptions of changes in crime

Much of the literature on tourism and resident expectations is framed through Social Exchange Theory, whereby it is theorized that those who stand to receive the most benefit or anticipate positive outcomes from the development are likely to provide the strongest support [20,21]. These outcomes of tourism development are often categorized into three groups: economic, socio-cultural, and environmental [22,23]. However, the literature offers inconclusive findings, thereby providing unconvincing evidence of the theory's universal applicability. Mostly research shows considerable variance in resident opinion, ranging from ambivalence of any attraction that will increase tourism to unmet expectations [24,25]. Crime, our topic of interest, falls into the socio-cultural category. While an array of work has explored the potential relationship between tourism development and crime rates, the potential disconnect between perceptions of change and actual changes remains unexplored [26-28]. For these reasons, this paper focuses on understanding factors that affect the construction of those expectations as well as their accuracy.

We believe that perceptions of the memorial's potential impact on

crime could be influenced by three elements: direct exposure to the memorial, indirect exposure to the memorial, and/or individual biases and ideology.

Direct exposure: Direct exposure to the memorial could affect perceptions of crime, based on a respondent's interaction with and interpretation of the area and/or the visitors present. Factors, such as distance lived from the memorial, frequency of driving by the memorial, and if a respondent visited the memorial, would affect residents' direct knowledge of the attraction and its surrounding location. For instance, if a resident regularly drives by the memorial, they would observe a number of factors that could solidify or change their perception of crime in the area. Examples include a number of interrelated factors: 1) an increase in the presence of "outsiders" in the area, some of whom may be perceived as likely targets/victims or perpetrators, 2) an increase in the presence of black people as primary consumers of the memorial based on its content, and thus more present in the area (if the resident/respondent stereotypes blacks as a high crime group), 3) tourists behaving in such a way that a resident believes (based on direct or indirect experience) they are obvious suitable targets, 4) individuals observed engaging in property or violent crimes, 5) the presence of police officers or others who appear to be willing and able to prevent crimes from occurring, 6) the presence of increased physical disorder (e.g. more trash outside of garbage cans) or "social disorder," such as panhandling or others trying to benefit from an increased flow of tourists.

Factors one through five are extensions of Routine Activities Theory which predicts that motivated offenders will rationally choose to commit a crime when they come into contact with suitable targets in environments lacking capable guardians. In this case, we are using the theory to predict when a resident might rationally assume that crimes are likely to be committed [29]. Factor two could be seen as drawing from Racial Threat Theory. Factor six draws from Broken Windows Theory, which predicts that visible forms of disorder such as graffiti or panhandlers encourage criminality [30]. We extend this perspective to the notion that such a visibly disordered environment, or the anticipation of future disorder, might lead to a perception that crime is increasing or likely to increase. Similarly, the development of an area into an attractive tourist attraction that decreases perceived disorder could result in a perception of a decrease in crime.

The examples are only some of the elements that could alter one's perception of crime if a person is directly exposed to the memorial, but the limited list clearly demonstrates the potential effect direct exposure can have on perceptions. Therefore, we add distance from the memorial, frequency of driving by the memorial, and visits to the memorial as variables representing direct exposure to the memorial.

Indirect exposure: Indirect exposure to the memorial through media coverage could also affect perceptions of crime as the relationship between consumption and perception is well documented. Generally, research finds that reading or watching crime-related media significantly elevates perceptions of risk and fear of crime, and this effect is especially pronounced when consuming local print or television news [31-33]. Often, media stories covering crime are sensationalized and rely on racialized depictions of crime to stimulate fear and a moral panic [34-37]. Thus, it is possible that indirect exposure to the memorial through the media may lead to respondents perceiving that crime will increase after the memorial's opening, via a "moral panic" where concern over the

misbehavior of individuals becomes heightened and exaggerated. However, given that this memorial is focused on racial injustice and was promoted locally as a source of economic growth through increased tourism, the coverage of the memorial was most likely overwhelmingly positive. Coupled with the memorial's positive national media coverage, media consumption in this case may create a "halo effect," leading residents to believe there will be a decrease in criminal activity. We predict that this effect would be most likely when local media is consumed. Therefore, we include variables of frequency of exposure to stories about the memorial and exposure to local news as proxies of indirect exposure to the memorial.

Individual biases and ideology: Finally, perceptions of crime could be affected by one's social position, including their age, race, gender, and socio-economic status [38-41]. Significance of a respondent's racial identification as white, for instance, could offer evidence of racial threat, which is a prejudiced action or behavior that results from white Americans feeling that their prestige, wealth, and/or power, or their economic and political privilege, are threatened by either the presence of the memorial and the history it displays, or the increased number of black visitors [42,43]. Conversely, if the memorial elevates a group's prestige, wealth, or power, it can produce a halo effect for that group's members. Therefore, demographic variables are also included as predictors.

Based on the background literature as well as theoretical propositions, we offer the following hypotheses:

H1: Socio-demographic variables predict pre-opening beliefs about the memorial's effect on the community (also known as prior belief score). These are, in part, a function of racial threat/halo vis-à-vis a resident's social position [44,45].

H2: There will be a positive relationship between pre-opening beliefs and post-opening crime predictions.

H2A: Pre-opening pessimists will be more likely to predict a post-opening increase in crime.

H2B: Pre-opening optimists will be more likely to predict a post-opening decrease in crime.

H3: Direct exposure will be positively related to accurate perception of crime change after the memorial's opening.

H4: Indirect exposure will be inversely related to accurate perception of crime change after the memorial's opening.

METHODS

Data collection

Surveys were fielded between March 2018 and January 2019 across two populations: residents of the city of Montgomery, and residents of wider Alabama. The residents of Montgomery were randomly selected from a purchased mailing list and received their choice of paper or online surveys at four time periods: one month prior to the memorial's opening, and then one month, four months, and eight months after. The residents of wider Alabama were selected by Survey Sampling International (SSI) from their online panel and received a survey at two time periods: one month prior to the memorial's opening and four months after. Survey items included feelings about and interactions with the memorial as well as a range of social, political, and attitudinal measures commonly used and previously validated on nationally fielded and well respected surveys. All Montgomery participants received a \$10 gift card

after the first wave, a \$10 gift card after the third wave, and \$10 after the fourth wave, while the wider Alabama respondents were compensated by SSI.

Secondary data were used from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and the National Historical Geographic Information System (NHGIS). The FBI data included aggregate crime statistics from 2016 to 2018 in Montgomery, Alabama. This data is considered city-level data because it was reported by the Montgomery Police Department to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports through the Federal Reporting System. NHGIS maps were used to pair residents' addresses with geo-markers for the purposes of generating the distance between where the respondents lived and the memorial. This information was also used to match these geo-markers to Census block variables, such as average levels of median income and the percentage of black residents in a residential area.

Sample

The total sample consists of 135 respondents who answered all variables of interest in two waves of data collection: prior to the memorial opening in March 2018 and four months after the opening in September 2018. The sample of Montgomery (n=72) and the sample of Alabama residents (n=63) were exposed to almost identical surveys focused on their views and understanding of the memorial, its perceived effects on the community, and their socio-political attitudes.

Variables

Dependent variables: The primary dependent variables in the analysis are beliefs about how the memorial will affect certain community elements. The analysis was three-layered: 1) what predicts belief in the memorial's effect on the community before it opens, 2) how does this belief, direct exposure, and indirect exposure affect respondent perceptions about how crime has changed after the memorial opened, and 3) related, how do the same factors affect the accuracy of these perceptions.

For the analysis of pre-opening data, the dependent variable, *prior belief score*, refers to the respondent's belief in how the memorial would change certain community elements and was captured before the memorial opened. The factor score was generated from six items that addressed belief in the memorial's effect on the community: overall effect, race relations, home values, employment opportunities, business revenue, and tourism. All items had five point ordinal response options, coded from negative to positive belief in the memorial's effect. An exploratory factor analysis demonstrated that the items load on one factor with sufficient loading coefficients (between .743 and .874), high internal consistency ($\alpha=.891$), and 69.5 percent of the total variance in the items explained. A factor score was generated from the items after orthogonal rotation. Higher values demonstrate more positive belief in the expected effect of the memorial on the community. This variable is used as the dependent variable in the first analysis and an independent variable in models analyzing post-opening data.

For the analysis of post-opening data, the dependent variables focus on perceptions of how crime has changed due to the presence of the memorial. Perceptions were measured for both property and violent crimes with one item in each wave. Perceptions of property crime change was measured with the item, "How do you believe the presence of the memorial is impacting the occurrence of the following community elements? Property crimes (theft, vandalism, graffiti)." The item measuring perceptions of violent crime change

included the same lead-in, but asked about "Violent crimes (assault, murder, robbery)." The response values were on a five point scale: decrease a lot, decrease a little, no change, increase a little, increase a lot. Both the questions and the response values were consistent across all waves of the survey. The dependent variables were collapsed into three ordinal categories: belief in decrease (1), belief in no change (2), and belief in increase (3).

For the final analysis assessing accuracy of perceptions, we constructed a variable utilizing both the self-reported survey data and the city-level crime statistics reported to the FBI. Given that the memorial opened in the middle of 2018, we measured a change in the crime rate by averaging the yearly crime statistics from 2016 and 2017 and comparing them to the yearly 2018 rate for the same type of crime. Under this calculation, the rates for both types of crimes decreased. The 2016/2017 average rate for property crime was 4462.1 per 100,000 residents, and that rate decreased to 4268.6 in 2018, making a crime rate difference of -193.5. Similarly, but in a much smaller decline, the average violent crime rate went from 625.1 per 100,000 in 2016/2017 to 612.1 in 2018, for a difference of -13.0. By these metrics, the city of Montgomery saw a decrease in both property and violent crime between the years of 2016 and 2018. For this reason, any respondent who accurately perceived the crime rates as having declined was coded as 1, and all other perceptions were coded as 0.

Independent variables: Independent variables in the analysis relate to direct and indirect exposure to the memorial as well as prior belief about the memorial's effect.

The direct exposure variables include items that capture physical interaction with the space surrounding the memorial. *Frequency of driving past the memorial* was captured with the item, "Based on the memorial's placement in Cottage Hill, how often are you likely to drive by it?" The response options were: multiple times a day; once a day; multiple times a week; once a week; once a month; a few times a year; once a year; once every few years; and never. For analytical purposes, the variable was reverse coded, whereby higher values refer to more frequently driving by the memorial. *Visited memorial* refers to if the respondent visited the memorial one or more times in the four months since it opened, and was coded 1 if visited, and 0 if not. *Resident of Memorial City* refers to if the respondent was a resident of Montgomery or a resident of another part of Alabama, where residents of the city were coded as 1 and other respondents as 0.

The indirect exposure variables include items that capture interaction with the memorial via media. Exposure to local news refers to if the respondent consumed one or more stories about the memorial in a local newspaper or on a local television news broadcast, with 1 coded as yes and 0 coded as no. *Amount of media observed about memorial* refers to the number of total stories that the respondent recalls seeing about the memorial in any media. The response options were: none (0); 1 to 2 (1); 3 to 4 (2); 5 or more (3). Prior belief score retains the same analytical format as described in the dependent variable section.

Control variables: Pre-opening belief in increase in type of crime is controlled for as a measure of previous bias. This measure is a replica of the perceptions of crime change post-opening with three ordinal categories: 1 is coded as belief that the memorial will decrease a type of crime, 2 as there will be no change in crime, and 3 as crime will increase.

A number of socio-demographic variables are also included to

accurately test elements of both bias and racial threat. *Self-identified race as white* refers to a respondent's self-reported racial identity. Due to the hypotheses focusing around a racial threat hypothesis, white is coded as 1, black is coded as 0. All other respondents were dropped from the analysis (n=15) due to the limited number of respondents who identified as a member of another racial group. *Age* is coded numerically. *Annual income* refers to a respondent's family income before taxes in 2017. The item offered ten response options: less than \$10,000; \$10,000 to less than \$20,000; \$20,000 to less than \$30,000; \$30,000 to less than \$40,000; \$40,000 to less than \$50,000; \$50,000 to less than \$75,000; \$75,000 to less than \$100,000; \$100,000 to less than \$150,000; \$150,000 to less than \$200,000; and more than \$200,000. This coding is retained for the analysis. *Bachelor's degree or higher* refers to highest completed education, where a bachelor's degree or higher is coded as 1 and anything below as 0. *Republican* refers to a respondent's political party affiliation, where Republican is coded as 1 and all other options (Democrat, Independent, and Other) as 0. (Gender, pride in racial identity, and relative deprivation were also tested in all full scale models. However, they did not exhibit any significant relationships with the dependent variable, nor did they significantly change the models. Therefore, they were not included in the displayed final models).

Two community-level variables were also controlled for at the Census block level. *Median income in Census block* refers to the raw value of the median income in \$10,000 level increments. *Percentage black in Census block* refers to the percentage of residents in a respondent's Census block that self-identify as black on the Census. These community-level variables were constructed by pairing geo-coded data with maps from NHGIS. The descriptive statistics of the variables are presented in Table 1.

Analysis

The overall goal of the analysis is to acquire a deeper understanding of what factors affect the accuracy of a respondent's perceptions

of crime change in a community, where a large-scale memorial was constructed as a tourist attraction. In order to test the stated hypotheses, we employed different regression analyses. Hypothesis 1 was tested with three OLS models using different dependent variables: prior belief score, perception of memorial's effect on property crime prior to the memorial's opening, and perception of memorial's effect on violent crime prior to the memorial's opening. Hypotheses 2 through 4 were tested with five multinomial logistic models per type of crime that included the following independent variables: 1) prior belief score; 2) prior belief score and perception of memorial's effect on said crime prior to the memorial's opening; 3) prior belief score, prior perception, and direct exposure; 4) prior belief score, prior perception, and indirect exposure; and 5) prior belief score, prior perception, direct exposure, indirect exposure, and socio-demographic variables. Hypotheses 2-4 were further explored through one binary logistic model for each type of crime, where accurate perception of crime change was coded as 1, and inaccurate perception was coded as 0.

FINDINGS

The findings are divided into two sections. The first explores predictions about changes in crime before the memorial opened, and the second investigates the factors that affect residents' perceptions of how crime changed after the memorial opened as well as the accuracy of such perceptions.

Perceptions of crime rate changes

Pre-opening beliefs: To determine the accuracy of perceptions, we establish a baseline of respondents' pre-opening beliefs about the memorial's comprehensive effect on the community as well as what socio-demographic factors affect such beliefs. Given the memorial's contextual focus on lynching, we predict that variables that influence racial attitudes, such as race, gender, education, age, and income, will effectively predict belief in the memorial's positive or negative impact [46]. Table 2 presents an OLS regression,

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables.

Variable	Mean	Std.Dev	Min	Max
Prior belief score	-.11	.91	-2.49	2.18
Belief in increase of property crimes, pre-opening	2.11	.53	1	3
Belief in increase of violent crimes, pre-opening	2.08	.42	1	3
Belief in increase of property crimes, post-opening	1.99	.49	1	3
Belief in increase of violent crimes, post-opening	2.01	.45	1	3
Accurate prediction of a decrease in property crimes, post-opening	.13	.33	0	1
Accurate prediction of a decrease in violent crimes, post-opening	.10	.30	0	1
Frequency of driving past memorial	1.49	1.01	1	6
Exposure to local news	.55	.50	0	1
Amount of media observed about memorial	1.94	.92	0	3
Visited memorial	.19	.39	0	1
Resident of Memorial City	.53	.50	0	1
Self-identified race as white	.63	.49	0	1
Age	48.79	16.10	19	87
Annual income	5.24	2.25	1	10
Bachelor's degree or higher	.60	.49	0	1
Self-identified political party as Republican	.25	.44	0	1
Median income in Census block (in \$10,000s)	5.43	2.58	.92	13.91
Percentage black in Census block	37.97	32.35	0	100
n=135				

regressing perception of the memorial's positive effect on socio-demographic variables.

Only two socio-demographic variables were statistically significant predictors of belief in the memorial's positive impact: race and political party. Self-identifying as white and Republican were inversely related to positive belief in the memorial's effect. Respondents who identified as white were significantly less likely to believe the memorial would have a positive effect on the community in comparison to respondents who identified as black ($b = -.609$; $p < .001$). Those who identified as Republicans were also substantially less likely to believe that the memorial would have a positive effect on the community ($b = -.490$; $p < .05$) than Democrats or Independents. However, respondents' baseline predictions of how the memorial would affect crime change exhibited differing patterns. For instance, income played a consistent and significant role. Annual income was inversely related to belief that the memorial's opening would result in increased property crimes ($b = .067$; $p < .01$) and violent crimes ($b = -.048$; $p < .05$). In other words, wealthier individuals were more likely to believe that both types of crimes would decrease once the memorial opened. In addition, respondents who self-identify as white were more likely to believe there would be an increase in violent crimes, while Republicans were more likely to believe there would be an increase across the board in crimes. These results mirror the overall finding that whites and Republicans were more likely to believe the memorial would have an overall negative effect on the community. These initial preopening findings of whiteness' relationship to negative perceptions about the memorial's effect provide preliminary evidence of the role racial threat plays in patterning perceptions.

Post-opening perceptions: Hypotheses 2 through 4 predict that the effects of racial bias will be mediated by direct and indirect exposure after the memorial's opening.

Property Crimes: Table 3 presents the results of multinomial logistic regressions, examining regression perception of how property crimes

have changed in the four months since the memorial opened.

For those who believed that property crimes decreased post-opening compared to no change, Table 3 shows evidence that prior beliefs, direct and indirect exposure, and community-level variables had significant effects on such perceptions. As predicted in hypothesis 2B, prior overall belief in the memorial's positive effects on the community and pre-opening belief that the memorial would result in a decrease in property crimes were significant in the first three models of inclusion. However, both effects were neutralized, while new relationships arose, once community elements and socio-demographic variables were included in the final model. Model 5 demonstrates that once all items of interest were included, four variables were significantly related to perceiving that property crimes had decreased rather than believing there was no change since the memorial opened. The impact of exposure, both direct and indirect, became apparent only after controlling for socio-demographics and community variables. The direct exposure of being a memorial city resident was inversely related to perception of a decrease in property crimes ($rrr = .054$; $p < .05$), while indirect exposure through local news ($rrr = 6.194$; $p < .1$), and multiple media stories ($rrr = 4.424$; $p < .1$) were positively associated with perceiving a decrease. In addition, the median income in a respondent's Census block was related to a decrease in relative risk that a respondent believed a decrease in property crime had occurred in comparison to no change ($rrr = .486$; $p < .05$). In other words, respondents who lived in areas with higher incomes had a higher likelihood of believing that the memorial had no effect on property crime.

For those who believed that property crimes had increased post-opening, Table 3 shows similar predicting variables, save the exposure variables: prior belief score, pre-opening belief in crime change, and community-level variables. In four of the five models, prior positive belief score was unintuitively associated with a substantial increase in relative risk whereby respondents were more likely to believe that property crimes had increased within

Table 2: OLS unstandardized results, regressing perception of memorial's effect.

	Prior belief score	Pre-opening belief in property crime increase	Pre-opening belief in violent crime increase
Self-identified Race as White	-0.609*** (0.162)	0.176 (0.124)	0.194* (0.081)
Age	0.006 (0.005)	-0.002 (0.003)	-0.000 (0.002)
Annual Income	0.052 (0.039)	-0.067** (0.024)	-0.048* (0.021)
Bachelor's degree or higher	0.040 (0.155)	-0.044 (0.101)	0.026 (0.084)
Self-identified Political Party as Republican	-0.490* (0.190)	0.237* (0.112)	0.228* (0.103)
Median Income in Census Block (\$10,000 increments)	-0.001 (0.031)	0.021 (0.019)	0.008 (0.016)
Percentage Black in Census Block	0.002 (0.003)	0.003 (0.002)	0.002 (0.001)
Constant	-0.246 (0.285)	2.185*** (0.211)	2.039*** (0.136)
Adjusted R2	0.235	0.103	0.117
n = 135; Standard errors in parentheses			
+ p < 0.10, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001			

Table 3: Multinomial logistic relative risk ratio results, regressing perception of change in property crime.

	1	2	3	4	5
Belief that Property Crimes Decreased, Post-Opening					
Prior Belief Score	2.652** (0.875)	2.237* (0.799)	2.050+ (0.793)	1.831 (0.693)	2.095 (1.102)
Ref: Belief in no change					
Pre-opening belief that prop. crimes would decrease		7.854* (6.621)	5.119+ (4.720)	6.164* (5.438)	3.947 (4.643)
Pre-opening belief that prop. crimes would increase		0.905 (0.777)	0.988 (0.857)	0.822 (0.706)	0.869 (0.931)
Frequency of Driving Past Memorial			1.262 (0.346)		1.169 (0.485)
Visited Memorial			2.437 (1.943)		2.225 (2.092)
Resident of Memorial City			0.522 (0.390)		0.054* (0.069)
Exposure to Local News				3.493 (3.086)	6.194+ (6.351)
Amount of Media Observed about Memorial				1.416 (0.574)	4.424+ (3.459)
Self-identified Race as White					0.234 (0.230)
Age					0.983 (0.024)
Annual Income					0.931 (0.177)
Bachelor's degree or higher					2.643 (2.602)
Self-identified Political Party as Republican					3.997 (4.199)
Median Income in Census Block (\$10,000 increments)					0.486* (0.138)
Percentage Black in Census Block					0.983 (0.018)
Belief that Property Crimes Increased, Post-Opening					
Prior Belief Score	2.016* (0.683)	1.680 (0.546)	1.968* (0.679)	1.926+ (0.667)	3.043* (1.482)
Ref: Belief in no change					
Pre-opening belief that prop. crimes would decrease		10.822** (9.590)	18.283** (19.450)	13.319** (12.241)	93.548* (168.236)
Pre-opening belief that prop. crimes would increase		2.714 (1.884)	3.157 (2.277)	3.062 (2.205)	2.936 (2.770)
Frequency of Driving Past Memorial			1.403 (0.431)		1.725 (0.744)
Visited Memorial			0.191 (0.217)		0.073 (0.131)
Resident of Memorial City			0.673 (0.462)		0.662 (0.766)
Exposure to Local News				0.372 (0.278)	0.292 (0.286)
Amount of Media Observed about Memorial				0.940 (0.360)	1.205 (0.549)
Self-identified Race as White					3.312 (3.197)

Age	0.967
	(0.026)
Annual Income	0.701
	(0.166)
Bachelor's degree or higher	0.444
	(0.371)
Self-identified Political Party as Republican	1.908
	(1.972)
Median Income in Census Block (\$10,000 increments)	1.571*
	(0.297)
Percentage Black in Census Block	1.030
	(0.021)
Pseudo R2	0.065 0.125 0.163 0.176 0.383

n = 135; Relative Risk Ratio Coefficients; Standard errors in parentheses; "Belief in no change" is the overall reference category.

+ p<0.10, *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

the four months after the memorial had opened. In other words, respondents who believed that the memorial would have a positive effect on the community before its opening were substantially more likely to believe that property crimes had increased as opposed to not changed. This effect became most prominent in model 5 (rrr=3.043; p<.05) once all control variables were added. Similarly, respondents who believed that property crimes would decrease prior to the memorial's opening were also substantially more likely to believe that property crimes had actually increased as opposed to not changed in the four months since the opening (rrr=93.548; p<.05), an effect which again became most prominent in model 5. The community variables behaved in expected ways based on previous models. Respondents living in areas with higher incomes had a higher relative risk of believing that property crimes had increased in comparison to those who believed there would be no change (rrr=1.571; p<.05).

Violent crimes: Table 4 presents the relative risk ratios from the multinomial logistic models in reference to factors that predict how respondents' beliefs in the violent crime rate have changed within the four months since the memorial opened.

In looking at Table 4, we see a similar pattern emerge concerning factors that affect perception of change in violent crime rates. For those who believed that violent crime had decreased after the memorial's opening, this was largely predicted by observation variables and community variables. Similar to a decrease in property crimes, prior belief score was significantly related in the first four models, but its effect became neutralized once socio-demographics and controls were held constant. In model five, the observation variable of being a memorial city resident was statistically significant, meaning respondents who lived within the city bounds had a lower risk of believing that violent crimes had decreased since the memorial's opening (rrr=.054; p<.05).

In a model assessing respondents who believed that violent crimes had increased, we see the highest number of predictors achieve statistical significance. Similar to property crimes, prior belief in the memorial's positive effect on the community was significantly and substantively related to a higher risk that a respondent believed an increase in violent crimes had occurred within the four months since the memorial's opening (rrr=9.440; p<.01), an effect that was significant in all five models. Pre-opening belief that the memorial would increase violent crimes was significant in all models except model 5, where it was trending in a positive and

expected direction. These findings indicate that when it came to violent crimes pre-opening pessimists were more likely to be post-opening pessimists. Indirect observation variables also had key effects on perceived increase. Exposure to local news was inversely related to a belief in increase (rrr=.078; p<.05), while exposure to more stories was associated with a higher risk of believing an increase in violent crimes had occurred (rrr=4.175; p<.05). In other words, respondents exposed to any local news were more likely to believe there had been no change rather than an increase in violent crime, while those exposed to multiple stories were more likely to believe violent crime increased rather than remained the same. Socio-demographic and community variables were also significant predictors of perceiving an increase in violent crime (rrr=.951; p<.1). Those who were older were more likely to believe that there had been no change in violent crime. Lastly, median income (rrr=1.939; p<.01) and percentage black in a respondent's Census block (rrr=1.045; p<.1) were positively related to a higher risk of believing violent crimes had increased.

Accurate perceptions of crime: A final set of binary logistic regressions were run to predict accuracy of crime change perception. As a reminder of the methods section, we utilized the FBI's UCR crime data reported from the Montgomery Police Department to construct variables that reflected accuracy of perception. At the city level, there was a slight decline in both the property and violent crime rates between 2016 and 2018. Therefore, the dependent variables for both the property and violent crime models were coded as 1 if the respondent predicted a decrease, and 0 if they predicted no change or an increase. While these findings can be ascertained from Tables 3 and 4, these results slightly differ due to the differing construction of the dependent variable and the resulting model change. The results of these regressions are presented in Table 5.

In the property crimes' model, a range of factors emerge as increasing the likelihood of accurately perceiving a decrease, including observation, socio-demographic, and community variables. Residents of the city had a decreased odds of accurately predicting that there was a decrease in property crimes (OR=.057; p<.05), while those who observed more media stories about the memorial had an increased odds of accuracy (OR=4.361; p<.1). In other words, residents of the city had a lower likelihood of being accurate, while those who saw more media about the memorial were more likely to be accurate. In addition, socio-demographics played a unique role in accuracy about property crimes: those who self-identified as white had a decreased odds of accuracy

Table 4: Multinomial logistic relative risk ratio results, regressing perception of change in violent crime.

	1	2	3	4	5
Belief that Violent Crimes Decreased, Post-Opening					
Prior Belief Score	2.195*	2.416*	2.240+	2.443*	2.615
	(0.764)	(0.917)	(0.984)	(1.003)	(1.566)
Ref: Belief in no change					
Pre-opening belief that violent crimes would decrease		1.489	0.850	1.002	0.694
		(1.490)	(1.002)	(1.031)	(0.982)
Pre-opening belief that violent crimes would increase		3.984	3.548	4.217	4.957
		(3.721)	(3.668)	(4.095)	(6.607)
Frequency of Driving Past Memorial			1.359		1.203
			(0.402)		(0.429)
Visited Memorial			3.018		2.160
			(2.615)		(2.067)
Resident of Memorial City			0.354		0.054*
			(0.304)		(0.072)
Exposure to Local News				0.960	1.292
				(0.802)	(1.309)
Amount of Media Observed about Memorial				2.032	3.356+
				(0.939)	(2.404)
Self-identified Race as White					0.601
					(0.533)
Age					0.991
					(0.026)
Annual Income					1.296
					(0.292)
Bachelor's degree or higher					1.963
					(1.890)
Self-identified Political Party as Republican					1.159
					(1.524)
Median Income in Census Block (\$10,000 increments)					0.753
					(0.173)
Percentage Black in Census Block					1.013
					(0.017)
Belief that Violent Crimes Increased, Post-Opening					
Prior Belief Score	1.754+	2.550**	3.028**	3.340**	9.440**
	(0.587)	(0.899)	(1.158)	(1.303)	(7.374)
Ref: Belief in no change					
Pre-opening belief that violent crimes would decrease		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
		(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Pre-opening belief that violent crimes would increase		7.368*	8.521*	9.347**	7.362
		(5.834)	(7.311)	(7.609)	(9.824)
Frequency of Driving Past Memorial			1.142		1.366
			(0.437)		(0.674)
Visited Memorial			0.000		0.000
			(0.000)		(0.000)
Resident of Memorial City			0.631		0.584
			(0.424)		(0.770)
Exposure to Local News				0.185*	0.078*
				(0.146)	(0.099)
Amount of Media Observed about Memorial				1.427	4.175*
				(0.553)	(2.834)
Self-identified Race as White					1.631
					(1.929)

Age	0.951+
	(0.026)
Annual Income	0.655
	(0.175)
Bachelor's degree or higher	0.205
	(0.213)
Self-identified Political Party as Republican	5.304
	(6.880)
Median Income in Census Block (\$10,000 increments)	1.939**
	(0.483)
Percentage Black in Census Block	1.045+
	(0.027)
Pseudo R ²	0.043 0.099 0.166 0.150 0.369

n = 135; Relative Risk Ratio Coefficients; Standard errors in parentheses; "Belief in no change" is the overall reference category.
+ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 5: Binary logistic odd ratio results, regressing accurate perception of crime rate change.

	Accurate perception of decrease in property crimes	Accurate perception of decrease in violent crimes
Prior Belief Score	2.077	1.813
	(1.065)	(0.913)
Ref: Belief in no change		
Belief in decrease of crime type	0.349	0.663
	(0.521)	(0.950)
Belief in increase of crime type	0.585	2.481
	(0.790)	(2.892)
Frequency of Driving Past Memorial	1.209	1.271
	(0.463)	(0.442)
Visited Memorial	3.581	2.926
	(3.232)	(2.692)
Resident of Memorial City	0.057*	0.062*
	(0.074)	(0.082)
Exposure to Local News	5.375	1.416
	(5.732)	(1.365)
Amount of Media Observed about Memorial	4.361+	2.668
	(3.390)	(1.779)
Self-identified Race as White	0.128*	0.530
	(0.126)	(0.461)
Age	0.986	0.996
	(0.024)	(0.025)
Annual Income	1.066	1.421
	(0.198)	(0.307)
Bachelor's degree or higher	3.211	2.271
	(3.072)	(2.224)
Self-identified Political Party as Republican	6.965+	1.265
	(7.732)	(1.687)
Median Income in Census Block (\$10,000 increments)	0.432**	0.719
	(0.122)	(0.164)
Percentage Black in Census Block	0.979	1.015
	(0.017)	(0.017)
Pseudo R ²	0.411	0.287

n = 135; Exponentiated coefficients; Standard errors in parentheses
+ p<0.10, *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

($OR=.128; p<.05$), while those who identified as Republican had an increased odds ($OR=6.965; p<.1$). Lastly, respondents who live in areas with higher levels of income had a decreased odds of accurately predicting that there was a decrease in property crimes ($OR=.432; p<.01$). In the violent crimes' model, only direct observation mattered. Specifically, respondents who lived in the memorial city had a decreased odds of accurately predicting a decrease in comparison to those who lived outside the city ($OR=.062; p<.05$).

DISCUSSION

What does it mean to drop a new tourist attraction into a community? We know that it typically alters the physical and social landscape as well as patterns of social interaction in complex ways. Undoubtedly it also changes the way people think about their community and their place within it. And what if that attraction is deliberately designed to alter the national memoryscape by reframing a contested history at both a cognitive and deeply emotional level? That is what we set out to explore in this study. In doing so, we focused on a fundamental component of quality of life within a community, perceptions of safety. Our findings demonstrate how perceptions of changes in crime rates, when a new narrative enters a contested memoryscape, are affected by a variety of interrelated factors. We also show that these factors vary widely based on the type of crime being considered.

First, as predicted in hypothesis 1, we found evidence that social positions that affect endorsement and expression of conservative racial attitudes also influenced preconceptions about the memorial's impact, even before knowing specifics about its contents. Specifically, white and Republican respondents were more likely to predict that the memorial would adversely affect crime rates, while black, Democrat, and Independent respondents were more likely to expect the memorial to produce positive changes. When looking at pre-opening beliefs specific to crime change, increased income at the individual level and self-identifying as white or Republican predicted belief that both property and violent crime would increase. These same factors have been theorized to predict perceptions of racial threat and therefore our findings provide cautious support of the racial threat hypothesis. In other words, factors that have been theorized to predict a majority group's feeling of threat were also associated with those who had pre-developed and biased views that a memorial to victims of lynching would negatively impact the community more broadly as well as through crime, specifically. If such socio-demographic factors or pre-opening beliefs were positive predictors of post-opening perception in increased crime, then we could more confidently say that inaccurate pessimists are a product, at least in part, of racial threat in its simplest form (We say in its simplest form because there are a number of modern critiques of the measurement of racial threat and a range of different ways to measure it. See Reichelmann 2020 for some discussion on the topic).

However, determining the effect of pre-opening beliefs on subsequent assessments of changes in crime was more complicated. For example, pre-opening belief in the memorial's positive effect was associated with perceived increases in both property and violent crimes; however, it had no significant relationship to belief in a decrease in either type of crime, when all other variables of interest were controlled for. Surprisingly, pre-opening beliefs in a directional change were not associated with post-opening beliefs in the same type of change, save the perception of an increase in violent crimes. However, a pre-opening belief in property crime decrease was associated with post-opening belief in property crime

increase. So, there is no clear narrative about how prejudgments impact later perceptions. While some pre-opening beliefs in crime are positively related to post-opening beliefs, others are not. It could be that some people had a deep belief in the power of the memorial's change, but were disappointed when it did not appear to produce such change, resulting in a reversal of their earlier beliefs.

We expected that direct and indirect exposure to the memorial would impact both crime change predictions as well as the accuracy of such predictions. The results were mixed. Direct exposure actually served a predictor of an accurate prophet, while the indirect exposure variables were more complicated, upending hypotheses three and four. Specifically, lack of direct exposure in the form of living outside the memorial city had an effect on the belief that both property and violent crimes had decreased, making the respondents who essentially lived further from the memorial more accurate prophets of crime change. Indirect exposure, on the other hand, had a more nuanced relationship with perception. For instance, respondents with exposure to local news or more stories about the memorial were more likely to believe in a decrease than no change, making them accurate prophets. However, while an increase in media stories was related to belief in a decrease in violent crimes, it was also significantly associated with the belief that violent crimes had increased since the opening (both in comparison to no change), making those respondents inaccurate pessimists. In addition, exposure to local news was inversely related to belief in an increase. When it comes to accuracy, direct exposure through residency is the only consistent predictor, whereby those who live outside the city are more likely to accurately perceive the decrease in crimes. In addition, exposure to multiple news stories also leads to an accurate prophet of property crimes.

The finding that being a memorial city resident was related to no perceived change in property and violent crime indicates that the further removed one is from the location in question, the more likely they are to accurately predict changes. This is possibly due to non-residents being more objective and less invested in the memorial's overall effect on the community. It is possible that being distant from Montgomery meant that respondents had little knowledge about the scope and scale of the memorial and would therefore not necessarily predict significant changes in crime.

On the other hand, living locally creates the possibility of direct observation. One of those observations might be increased tourists in the neighborhood. As tourists are by definition community outsiders, the observation may lead to the belief that crime would increase. Likewise, with increased tourism, the overall perception that the community is orderly may decrease, even if the tourists are not engaging in criminal acts. If this is the case, this would suggest support for the Broken Window's claim that perceived "social disorder" leads to greater fear of crime, even if this perceived disorder is brought about by increased tourism.

Next, the indirect effects observed in the data provide a basis for understanding the existence of perception halos. For instance, since exposure to local news resulted in greater belief in no change in violent crimes, it appears the reporting of the local news possibly promoted feelings of safety and security among local residents. This is contrary to the typical finding that local news consumption often leads to a moral panic and heightened concern about crime [47]. In this case, however, this may very well make theoretical sense. The local community was invested in the memorial's success, and this success was predicated on the memorial bringing in tourism

dollars and providing a potential means of racial reconciliation and healing. The media frame adopted in this case would be far more positive and try to appeal to the audience's sense of community instead of its sense of division and fear. Such effects are witnessed after mass tragedies where the local media appeals to the community and, in turn, media consumption is related to community solidarity rather than widespread panic and fear [48-53]. However, the more stories that respondents were exposed to, the less predictable the pattern. More media exposure about the memorial resulted in an accurate prediction about property crimes, but not violent crimes. In fact, the more media stories, the more likely respondents were to believe there was a change in violent crimes. The most alarming relationship was that respondents were likely to develop an erroneous perception that violent crimes had increased (in comparison to no change). Perhaps the multitude of differing facts in the multiple stories provided a convoluted image of the reality on the ground. Therefore, both direct and indirect observations were important when it came to a resident's accurate understanding of local violent crime rates, but not in the ways predicted.

Related to the racial threat hypothesis, we found that community variables were the most consistent predictors of perceptions about changes in crimes. Individual level factors were related to both accurate and inaccurate beliefs. For instance, age played a role in believing that violent crimes had increased, with older respondents being more likely to believe the crime rate remained unchanged. Race and political party were also predictors of being an accurate prophet concerning the decrease in property crimes. Overall, white respondents were more likely to be inaccurate, while Republicans were more likely to be accurate. At the community level, median income was the only consistent significant predictor of perceiving both an increase and decrease in crime. Respondents who lived in areas with higher median income were more likely to be inaccurate pessimists who believed both property and violent crimes had increased since the memorial's opening. When assessing accuracy, our findings indicate that only a decrease in the median income of a Census block was associated with belief in a decrease in property crime. Such findings are consistent with the effects of racial threat.

CONCLUSION

This study highlights factors that affect accurate perception of crime in a newly developed tourist area. The results demonstrate that residency and community demographics were the most important predictors of accuracy in assessing crime rates. Due to the particularities of this attraction, these findings must be taken in context, since the study's small sample, charged geographic placement, and content of the memorial limit its generalizability. Also, the study's longitudinal nature resulted in approximately a 75% drop between waves one and three (the two waves utilized in the study), which is normal for this data collection design. The memorial's placement in Montgomery, Alabama, also makes the findings specific to that location. Had the memorial been placed in a different region, or even a different city, the findings may have been different, but the same variables would likely still be important. With that being said, the size, location, and subject matter of a memorial are the factors that we believe affect perceptions of crime.

In addition, some of our findings are limited by the available data. For instance, we used broader city-wide crime data, rather than a scope tailored to the area surrounding the memorial. We were unable to gain access to the city's complete crime data, due to restrictions from the MPD and lack of resources, and therefore,

resorted to using the FBI's data. In addition, our data was not collected until the memorial was already under construction. With these limitations, the findings demonstrate a need for further research, particularly that which utilizes more complete data from transparent agencies and captures a complete set of data prior to any physical change in the land.

Despite the limitations, such findings are important in a number of ways. First, they shed light on the ways that expected increases in tourism affect local residents' perceptions of crime. Perception of crime is related to fear of crime and taken together, they impact quality of life. In addition, the success of an attraction, in this case a highly symbolic memorial created in the hopes of significant social impact, may be highly dependent on such perceptions. This is important given the current trend toward using memorials as instruments of social change. Lastly, in most cases, we assume that community-level factors related to race and income would consistently affect a respondent's view. The significance of the community-level factors indicate that our immediate surroundings have far more effect on perception of crime as opposed to any direct or indirect exposure of where that crime might be taking place.

Such contributions encourage us to take a more holistic look at the effects of tourism on local communities. Tourist attractions are often built for outsiders (i.e. tourists). But we know little about how such attractions affect residents. This manuscript offers a first insight into one way such attractions affect the surrounding community: vis-à-vis crime and perceptions of such crime. Understanding the factors that impact accurate perception helps us to more deeply understand the ways that the attraction affects the community. In this particular case, the content of the attraction could deeply play a role in perceptions, which not only complicates the story, but also makes it more complete.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 1822295: Memorialization and Community. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

REFERENCES

1. Barsalou J, Baxter V. Stabilization and reconstruction series. United States Institute of Peace 2007.
2. Americansc.org.uk. Public memorials in American life. 2010.
3. Ozer B, Gurler EE. The effects of public memorials on social memory and urban identity. *Procedia-Soc Beh Sci*. 2013;82:858-863.
4. Stevens Q. Masterplanning public memorials: An historical comparison of Washington, Ottawa and Canberra. *Plan Persp*. 2015;30(1):40.
5. Bianca B, Brandano MG, Detotto C. The effect of tourism on crime in Italy: A dynamic panel approach. *Econ*. 2012;6:1-24.
6. de Albuquerque K, McElroy J. Tourism and crime in the Caribbean. *Ann Tour Res*. 1999;26(4):968-84.
7. Lisowska A. Crime in tourism destinations: A research review. *Tour*. 2017;27(1):31-39.
8. Mawby RI. Crime and disorder, security and the tourism industry. The handbook of security. London: Palgrave Macmillan; 2014;383-403.
9. Mawby RI, Tecău AS, Constantin CP, Chițu IB, Tescașiu B. Addressing the security concerns of locals and visitors for the sustainable development of tourist destinations. *Sustainability*. 2016;8:524.

10. Baker D, Stockton S. Tourism and crime in America: A preliminary assessment of the relationship between the number of tourists and crime in two major american tourist cities. *Internat J Safet Tour.* 2014;5:1-25.
11. Austin M, Furr LA, Spine M. The effects of neighborhood conditions on perceptions of safety. *J Crim Jus.* 2002;30(5):417-427.
12. Box S, Hale C, Andrews G. Explaining fear of crime. *Brit J Crim.* 1988;28(3):340-356.
13. Hawdon J, Rasanen P, Oskanen A, Vuori M. Social responses to collective crime: assessing the relationship between crime-related fears and collective sentiments. *Eur J Crim* 2014;11(1):39-56.
14. Brantingham P, Brantingham P. Criminality of place. *Euro J Crim Policy Res.* 1995;(3):5-26.
15. Curiel RP, Bishop SR. Fear of crime: the impact of different distributions of victimisation. *Palgr Comm.* 2018;4(46):1-8.
16. Schaefer L, Mazerolle L. Predicting perceptions of crime: Community residents' recognition and classification of local crime problems. *Aus New Zeal J Crim.* 2018;51(2):183-203.
17. Cohen E. Tourism-related crime: Towards a sociology of crime and tourism. *Vis Leis Bus.* 1997;16(1):4-13.
18. Oseid J. Montgomery's potent new national memorial for peace and justice garners accolades. *Forbes.* 2019.
19. Council of the City of Montgomery. Adopted Regular Meeting Council Minutes. Montgomery, AL: City Council; 2015.
20. Butler T. *Memoryscape: Integrating oral history, memory and landscape on the river Thames. People and their Pasts: Public History Today.* London: Palgrave Macmillian. 2008;223-239.
21. Andereck KL, Valentine KM, Knopf RC, Vogt CA. Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Ann Tour Res.* 2005;32(4):1056-1076.
22. Styliadis D, Biran A, Sit J, Szivas EM. Residents' support for tourism development: The role of residents' place image and perceived tourism impacts. *Tour Manag.* 2014;45:260-274.
23. Mason P, Cheyne J. Residents' attitudes to proposed tourism development. *Ann Tour Res.* 2000;27(2):391-411.
24. Perez EA, Nadal JR. Host community perceptions: A cluster analysis. *Ann of Tour Res.* 2005;32(4):925-941.
25. Trivellas P, Kakkos N, Vasiliadis L, Belias D. Residents' perceptions toward cultural, social and economic benefits and costs of tourism industry: An empirical survey. *Tourism and Culture in the Age of Innovation.* 2016:171-181.
26. McPheters LR, Stronge WB. Crime as an environmental externality of tourism: Miami, Florida. *Land Econ.* 1974;50(3):288-292.
27. Pizam A. Tourism and crime: Is there a relationship? *J Trav Res.* 1982;10:7-10.
28. Pelfrey WV. Tourism and crime: A preliminary assessment of the relationship of crime to the number of visitors at selected sites. *Inter J Comp App Crim Just.* 1998;22(2):293-304.
29. Cohen LE, Felson M. Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *Am Soc Rev.* 1979;44(4):588-608.
30. Wilson JQ, Kelling GL. Broken windows. *The Atlantic.* 1982.
31. Andrew JB. Media construction of crime revisited: Media types, consumer contexts, and frames of crime and justice. *Interdiscipl J.* 2018;56(4):679-714.
32. Callanan VJ. Media consumption, perceptions of crime risk and fear of crime: Examining race/ethnic differences. *Soc Persp.* 2012;55(1):93-115.
33. Lowry DT, Nio TCJ, Leitner DW. Setting the public fear agenda: A longitudinal analysis of network TV crime reporting, public perceptions of crime, and FBI crime statistics. *J Comm.* 2003;53(1):61-73.
34. Cohen S. *Folk devils and moral panics: The creation of mods and rockers.* London: Granada; 1972.
35. Katz K. The enemy within: The outlaw motorcycle gang moral panic. *Am J Crim Just.* 2011;36(3):231.
36. Macek S. *Urban nightmares: The media, the right, and the moral panic over the city.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota. 2006.
37. Welch M, Price EA, Yankey N. Moral panic over youth violence: Wilding and the manufacture of menace in the media. *Youth Soc.* 2002;34(1):3-30.
38. Borooah VK, Carcach CA. Crime and fear, evidence from Australia. *Brit J Crim,* 1997;37(4):635-665.
39. Brunton-Smith I, Sturgis P. Do neighborhoods generate fear of crime? An empirical test using the British Crime Survey. *Crim.* 2011;49(2):331-369.
40. Carro D, Valera S, Vidal T. Perceived insecurity in the public space: Personal, social and environmental variables. *Qual Quant.* 2010;44:303-314.
41. Will JA, McGrath JH. Crime, neighborhood perceptions, and the underclass: The relationship between fear of crime and class position. *J Crim Just.* 1995;23(2):163-176.
42. Levin J, Reichelmann AV. From Thrill to Defensive: The Role of Group Threat in the Changing Nature of Hate-Motivated Assaults. *Am Behav Sci.* 2015;59(12):1546-1561.
43. Stults BJ, Swagar N. Racial and ethnic threat: Theory, research, and new directions. *The handbook of race, ethnicity, crime, and justice.* Hoboken: Wiley. 2018;147-171.
44. Green DP, Strolovitch Z, Wong JS. Defended neighborhoods, integration, and racially motivated crime, *Am J Soc.* 1998;104(2):372-403.
45. King R, Wheelock D. Group threat and social control: race, perceptions of minorities and the desire to punish. *Soc Forces.* 2007;85(3):1255-1280.
46. Tuch SA, Hughes M. Whites' racial policy attitudes in the twenty-first century: The continuing significance of racial resentment. *Ann Am Acad Pol Soc Sci.* 2011;634:134-152.
47. Callanan VJ. Media consumption, perceptions of crime risk and fear of crime: Examining race/ethnic differences. *Soc Persp.* 2012;55(1):93-115.
48. Gortner EM, Pennebaker JW. The archival anatomy of a disaster: Media coverage and community-wide health effects of the Texas A&M bonfire tragedy. *J Soc Clin Psy.* 2003;22:580-603.
49. Hawdon J, Agnich L, Wood R, Ryan J. Framing mass gun violence: A content analysis of print media coverage of the virginia tech and sandy hook elementary school tragedies. *Gun Violence in American Society.* New York: University Press of America; 2016;214-232.
50. Hawdon J, Oksanen A, Räsänen P. Media coverage and solidarity after tragedies: The reporting of school shootings in two nations. *Compar Soc.* 2012;11(6):845-874.
51. Hawdon J, Agnich LE, Ryan J. Media framing of a tragedy: A content analysis of print media coverage of the Virginia Tech Tragedy. *Traumat.* 2014;20(3):199-208.
52. Letukas L, Olofsson A, Barnshaw J. Solidarity trumps catastrophe? An empirical and theoretical analysis of post-tsunami media in two Western nations.
53. Udspace.udel.edu. Institutional repository. 2020.