B4-1

110091

Implications of Recent Theories of Victimization for Intervention Strategies

Christopher A. Innes, Ph.D.

American Society of Criminology Annual Meetings
Cincinnati, 1984

Funding for this research was provided by
The Bureau of Justice Statistics under
grant 84-BJ-CX-0007

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews recent theories of victimization and their implications for intervention strategies designed to prevent violence. Theories which stress lifestyle, routine activities, or vulnerability are discussed in terms of their assumptions and the intervention strategies they suggest. An alternative perspective is proposed which synthesizes the notions of lifestyle and vulnerability using the concept of life chances. This concept draws on Weber and was suggested in another context by Darendorf (1979). Longitudinal data from the National Crime Survey is then presented in terms of the relative size of different victim populations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The data used in this paper was made available by the Criminal Justice Archive at the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. It was originally collected by the Bureau of the Census under funding by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. The funding for the research reported here was also funded by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. The author wishes to thank Ms. Tamara Newton, the research assistant on this project, for her contribution.

Each life has associated with it, by virtue of its biographical and social history, a set of chances. While we often think of these chances in positive ways, as in opportunities for educational attainment or economic advancement, they may have negative aspects as well. Such negative chances are the risks associated with a person's life, including the risk of criminal victimization. For a few people, this risk is a continuing condition and results in their repeated victimization. While a relatively small proportion of the population, they may bear a far greater burden of crime and account for a substantial proportion of the crimes known to police or victimizations reported in surveys. The National Crime Survey (NCS) is one resource to identify these people and examine the extent their victimization experiences. The size of this survey and the potential it has for longitudinal analysis makes it the best source of information despite some design and measurement problems it poses. The emphasis here will be upon victimizations as a part of people's lives, in some cases a frequent part, rather than an isolated event.

To date, much of the analysis employing the NCS data has not fully used information about repeat victimizations, and this has obscured some important aspects of criminal victimization in the United States. Biderman (1981) and Skogan (1981) both point out that many analyses have focused on victimization incidents as isolated events and have been preoccupied with the estimation of

rates. Additionally, most of the official reports using the NCS data exclude incidents not conducive to such estimates. Those categorized as series incidents and referring to several events of the same type are often omitted from tabulations. Multiple and repeat victimizations reported by the same person are not explicitly reported. For clarity, a person will be referred to as a multiple victim if they report more than one victimization and a repeat victim if they make multiple reports all of the same type. The discussion below will concern itself with repeat victims of the major types of personal crimes, rape, assault and robbery.

Theories of Victimization

Research on victimization using the survey method began in earnest with the work under the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice (Biderman et al., 1967; Ennis, 1967; Reiss, 1967) and rapidly expanded (see Lehman and Skogan, 1981). From the outset, the distribution of victimization was found to be consistently associated with a limited set of demographic characteristics. Rates of victimization have been commonly found to be higher for males, for younger rather than older people, and non-whites more often than whites (Boland, 1976; Hindelang, 1976; 160ss, 1967; Sparks, Glenn and Dodd, 1977; see also, Bureau of Justice Statistics reports for 1974-1979). Patterns for income and education have

proved to be more complex and tend to vary more by type of crime (see Hindelang, Gottfredson and Garofalo, 1978).

Explanations for these patterns have generally fallen into two broad types. Sparks (1981) has contrasted between accounts which employ the notion of vulnerability and those which use some form of exposure hypothesis. Reiss (1980) makes a similar distinction referring to victim proneness as opposed to victim vulnerability. In the first case, proneness explanations concentrate on the characteristics of persons as potential victims and their relation to potential offenders. The latter view emphasizes the victimization situation or the characteristics of offenders. In the discussion below, vulnerability and exposure or opportunity, will be treated as dual aspects of victimization associated with specific conditions in a person's life.

The concept of vulnerability has been articulated in a number of ways. In the National Acadamy of Sciences (NAS) report on the NCS (Penick and Owen, 1976) vulnerability was specifically related to repeat victimizations and three types of vulnerability identified. The report argued that the existence of a relatively small number of repeatedly victimized persons implied that they "...may be exposed to crime-correlated circumstances that represent conditions of existence" (p 94). The NAS report discussed three types of vulnerability. Ecological vulnerability refers to the place and type of residence including the kind of

neighborhood one lives and works in as well as the physical conditions of their residence. The concept of status vulnerability is intended to refer to risks associated with a person's social status, broadly defined to include race, gender, and class as well as income and occupation. Finally, role vulnerability was defined as referring "... to specific and relatively durable social relations from which an individual cannot readily withdraw" (p95). To these types also might be added physical vulnerability including physical strength, reaction time, and visual or auditory acuity, all of which might aid in detecting, avoiding or resisting a victimization attempt. This separate type, of purely physical vulnerability, has been often noted in discussions of the elderly's reactions to crime (Singer, 1977). While these concepts of vulnerability have been criticized as too broad (Sparks, 1981), they do share a common theme. All represent situations or conditions which would be difficult or impossible for and individual to alter and all have associated with them a greater risk of victimization.

In contrast are theories of victimization which emphasize exposure or opportunities for victimization. Hindelang, Gottfredson, and Garofalo (1978) used the concept of lifestyle to examine exposure. They postulated that role expectations and structural constraints combine to determine lifestyle. The assumption is that lifestyle is strongly related to demographic characteristics such as age, sex, marital status, family income

and race. Some of these lifestyles, which have associated with them higher levels of exposure, are presumed to be more common in some groups who thus have higher rates of victimization. Exposure in this account is generally defined in terms of the amount of time an individual spends in public places, particularly at night and the degree of contact with potential offenders, especially non-family members. In Gottfredson's (1981) recent statement, exposure involves identifying "...the time-space-person coordinates in which victimization is most likely ...[and]...describing the characteristics of persons and objects that are most likely to intersect those coordinates".

A similar approach is represented by the use of the closely related notion of routine activities to explain direct-contact predatory violations (Cohen and Felson, 1979; Cohen, Kluegel, and Land, 1981). Once again, the lifestyle or routine activities of an individual or group are argued to determine the amount of contact between them and potential offenders. Cohen, Kluegel and Land (1981) present five factors which mediate the effects of sex, age, race, and income to account for their relation to victimization. Foremost among these are exposure, the "...physical visibility and accessibility of persons and objects..." and proximity, defined in terms of the physical distance between potential victims and populations of potential offenders. Also important is guardianship, defined as the presence of anyone or anything (e.g. alarms or locks) which could

prevent victimizations. Finally, the attractiveness of an object and the ease with which a particular type of victimization could be carried out will affect exposure. Risk is thought to increase as exposure, proximity, and attractiveness increase and to decline as guardianship goes up.

While obviously informative, each viewpoint focuses, implicitly or explicitly, on specific types of victimization and this affects the image of victimization they project and the responses they imply. Initial presentations of the lifestyle hypothesis tended to discuss victimization in a limited set of circumstances. Crimes for gain carried out by strangers or assaults between acquaintances away from home were favored examples. In the routine activities approach, these limits are explicitly recognized by restricting the discussion to "direct-contact predatory violations". In both views, however, there remains an element of normative bias in their assumptions about the typical victim. Such victims, young males for the most part, are believed to come into frequent contact with potential offenders, also young males, in situations conducive to victimizations (i.e. the streets or places of entertainment). Measuring exposure directly, however, appears to be very difficult and the viewpoint is frequently in danger of a fatal circularity. With available data, the only way to determine if some one was exposed is to find out if they were victimized. In explaining violence this is a serious problem, since only the true

misanthrope would be safe. The accounts actually work better for property crimes than violence, and no doubt owe some of their popularity to some of their implications for responses to crime.

Since exposure is a necessary condition for a victimization, the obvious way to prevent victimizations is to limit exposure. This view has produced, with considerable governmental encouragement, a number of programs which seem to be making crime prevention a national pastime and one of the more popular community activities. The crime prevention programs presented generally contain three elements, improved home security, marking property, and increased citizen surveillance (Feins, 1983; Cirel, et al., 1977). The existence of these programs represent the belief by local law enforcement agencies that manpower can be used more efficiently, response times improved, and clearance rates maintained if citizens can be enlisted to aid them. However, the typical crime prevention program, as designed by law enforcement personnel, is directed primarily at important crimes as legally defined and at saving the police money. In most communities, the problem of crime is one of many and goes beyond the bounds of FBI index crimes to include all manner of minor events and "Incivility" (Hunter, 1978). In reviewing the effectiveness of such programs, Greenburg, et al. (1983) argues that their mixed success is often the product of a very differing perceptions and priorities by the residents from those of the police.

Many crimes, particularly those of violence, occur between people who are relatives or well known to each other, often at home. Law enforcement personnel have commonly tried to avoid involvement in such domestic violence or personal dispute cases because they believe there is very little they could do. Until recently, the conventional wisdom in such cases was to adjudicate the dispute or otherwise defuse the situation (Berk and Sherman, 1984). The literature dealing with these types of victimization situations is more likely to be based on case studies. It is also dominated by vulnerability theories of victimization. Thus, for instance, Walker's (1979) well known account of cycles of violence in wife battering stresses the degree to which the victim is trapped. In this and similar accounts the vulnerability of the victim and their social, economic, and eventually emotional restrictions are emphasized. If the accounts have a weakness it is that their concentration on the helplessness of the victim, combined with a long tradition of avoiding any implication of "blaming the victim", seems to leave victims with little hope. The option most often recommended is for victims to seek help from social service organizations or professionals.

Such participation by professionals is not, in itself, necessarily negative except for the fact that the resources of the mental health community are very limited relative to the problem. Common intervention strategies cover a wide range of crisis intervention, community and legal services, and a variety of

individual, group, and family therapies (Barnett, et al., 1980; Morgan, 1982). While crisis intervention and emergency social service programs often benifit clients in obvious ways, longer term treatments are very expensive, especially if they involve offenders. Chronic delinquents, violent offenders, and spouse or child abusers are notoriously difficult to work with and require intensive attention even when cooperation is obtained. If estimates of the true extent of these types of problems are realistic then, given the current funding climate for social services, other community mental health concerns would have to be virtually ignored to gain any progress against the problem.

If community crime prevention programs meet with mixed success and community mental health approaches are generally expensive and frustrating, the conclusion might be reached that nothing really works. It is possible that in fact, nothing really does work in the sense that either law enforcement can eliminate crime or mental health professionals eradicate violence. But, like rehabilitation for offenders, such programs can serve useful functions both for the persons they are intended to benefit and the agencies that administer them. Given this rather modest goal, a question arises about the relative emphasis which might be assigned to the different types of programs. That is, of the potential beneficiaries of these programs, what proportion might be considered victims of exposure versus victims of vulnerability.

Discussion of Concepts and Data

Before discussing the specific problem of the relative size of these two populations, there is first the issue of how they can be related to one another in a theoretical context, and second, the question of the data to be used. A very brief discussion of some theoretical concepts will be followed by a somewhat longer treatment of the data source, the National Crime Survey. The approach outlined here seeks to address these issues by explicitly differentiating between victimization types. These types are defined in terms of such situational qualities as place of occurrence and the relation of the victim to the offender. By contrasting vulnerability and exposure and relating each to both victimization situations and life conditions, a more broadly applicable account is produced.

In addressing these issues, the notion of life chances has been invoked above. This concept is based on suggestions by Dahrendorf (1979) who drew on a variety of viewpoints presented by Weber (1947). Central to the view is the treatment of a probabilistic concept of chance as a defining quality of social relations. In this view, a social relation can be defined as essentially a set of chances or probabilities that various events can occur given defined conditions. Dahrendorf argues that life chances are functions of the combination both of options available

and of restrictions or bonds attached to a position. While the concept has not been used in this way, substituting it for lifestyle in thinking about victimization provides some useful insights.

It allows the use of a broader concept which synthesizes the two aspects of vulnerability and exposure. Above, vulnerability was defined as the risk of victimization associated with some condition or situation difficult to alter. By contrast, exposure might be defined as the risk associated with the other opportunities available to a person by virtue of their particular situation or position. People with higher risk occupations or trapped in abusive domestic situations are thus vulnerable, while those who increase their risk as a result of elected activities are exposed. Reducing one might raise the other, as when a runaway leaves home to avoid abuse, but in the process increases their exposure to other types of victimization. This distinction allows a more balanced discussion of victimization experiences by distinguishing fundamental differences between some types of victimization. It allows the exposure view to be broadened and applied to a variety of victimization situations. In part, this draws on some of the victimization typologies which were common in earlier work (Toch, 1969, von Hentig, 1948). Specifically, the place of the incident and the relation of the victim to the offender will be taken into account.

Such considerations also provide the potential for a more unified view of the types of victims, offenders, and offender-victim relationships. While many people take the opportunity to be offenders, some might better be thought of as vulnerable to offending. Thus a person, as result of alcohol abuse or a childhood history of violent victimization, might be vulnerable to becoming an abusive spouse or parent. Similarly, drug addiction, as a condition difficult to alter, makes the addict vulnerable to offending. Opportunity, of course, has commonly been referred to in discussing the size, nature and patterns of activity of the offender population. Another way of describing this view would be to paraphrase the common exposure hypothesis by substituting 'vulnerable or exposed' for the frequently used term 'potential'. Thus, the task would become to 'specify the situations or conditions under which those vulnerable or exposed to victimization come into contact with those vulnerable or exposed to offending and which results in victimizations occurring'. While the analysis described below will focus on victims, an examination of the types of victimization events, including the relationships of victim to offender, will allow some inferences about both. The main emphasis will be upon repeated victims of personal crime who are, in the terminology being used here, vulnerable.

Data and Analysis

To examine the issues raised above, some preliminary data from the National Crime Survey, national sample will be presented focusing on adult victims of repeated personal crime. The national sample has been collected since 1972, using a large sample of housing units drawn through a complex multistage cluster design (Bureau of the Census, 1974). Interviews are conducted in approximately 60,000 housing units at six month intervals. In theory, a household remaining in a selected unit could be visited every six months for up to three and-a-half years with each interview after the first used to bound in time the next interview. Bounding is the use of information from the last interview to confirm that new reports represent event which have occurred in the six month period, in practice mobility in and out of the sample and non-interviews result in many reports being unbounded. Bounding, repeated interviews and the effects of recall or memory decay, all affect reporting. This data is drawn from national sample rotation groups brought into the survey after 1975. The interview records for repeated visits to a unit were matched for each unit for the first four visits. Since the sample is continuously being refreshed by introducing new subsample groups, the four waves were overlapping but not contemporaneous for different groups.

The National Crime Survey program traces its immediate origins to the work performed for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, empaneled in 1965. The commission was the second presidential commission in this century to attempt a comprehensive examination of crime and law enforcement, the first being the Wickersham Commission established in 1929 by President Hoover. Both commissions were established during periods in which crime appeared to be rising significantly and when public concern was widespread. One important issue for both commissions was the need for accurate information on the amount and distribution of crime.

Traditionally, such information was limited to official statistics on the activities of law enforcement agencies or the judiciary. These figures had long been criticized as representing only a small fraction of the events occurring in society which might be characterized as criminal. The earlier commission focused on questions related to the collection and reliability of statistics available from law enforcement agencies such as those reported through the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) system, which was then in its infancy. Significant problems were seen in the reliance upon official statistics of crimes known both because many events are not reported to police and many other organizational and administrative influences may be affecting particular jurisdictions and their reports.

By the 1960's, however, the methodology of sample surveys had become available and ways were explored to apply them to the problem of measuring crime. Such surveys were seen as a means by which accurate measurements of crime were possible which could then serve as a sensitive indicator of the incidence of crime and provide detailed information on the characteristics and circumstances of events which were defined as criminal. It was also believed that accurate and timely estimates of the incidence of crime could be developed to allow comparisons over time and assess statistics available from official sources, especially the the UCR counts of crime known to the police.

Several field surveys were conducted for the President's Commission and revealed both that statistics on crimes known to the police under-represented the amount of crime and that the measurement of victimization with sample surveys was feasible, though for many reasons difficult (Biderman, et al., 1967; Ennis, 1967; Reiss, 1967). One of the major problems identified in the developmental stage was the varying ability of respondents to recall victimization experiences. Many victimization experiences appear to be of low salience to their victims and may be forgotten rather quickly, most within a year. Other issues of methodological importance included questionnaire design, especially the screen questions used to elicit victimization reports, respondent selection, and classification of incidents (See Skogan, 1981 for a recent review of measurement issues in

victimization surveys).

The National Crime Survey samples are of addresses in the United States, interviewers conduct interviews with the current residents of the unit. All persons age twelve and older in selected households and group quarters are interviewed, usually in person or by telephone. Proxy interviews are taken for household members aged 12 or 13 and for persons incapable of responding due to physical or mental incapacity.

Each respondent is asked a series of screener questions to determine if he or she was victimized during the six month reference period preceding the interview. In the household survey, six screen questions concern crimes against the household are asked only of a single household respondent. These questions ask about break-ins or attempts, and stolen household items, including motor vehicles. Although all household members are not asked these screen questions, a household incident will still be recorded if it is mentioned by another household member. Another 13 screen questions concern specific types of personal crimes, other things reported to the police, or any events the respondent thought might be a crime and are asked of all respondents. An individual victimization report is filled out for each one of the incidents identified by the screen questions.

The report is designed to obtain detailed data on the

characteristics and circumstances of the victimization. Items such as time and place of occurrence; injuries suffered; medical expenses incurred; number, age, race and sex of offender(s); relationship of offender(s) to victim (stranger, casual acquaintance, relative, etc.), and other detailed data relevant to a complete description of the incident are included in the report. Legal and technical terms, such as assault and larceny, are avoided during the interview. Instead, respondents are asked if they were attacked or threatened, if anything was taken from them or their homes, and if they were injured. These responses are used by the Bureau of the Census to place the incidents in a classification intended to be compatible with that used by the Uniform Crime Reports System. Addition demographic data are also collected on each household member's age, sex and race and on such dimensions as education, migration, labor force status, occupation, and family income.

The National Sample of 72,000 households yields approximately 60,000 household interviews in the 50 states and the District of Columbia for a six-month period. Because of the continuing nature of the National Sample Survey, a rotation scheme was devised to avoid interviewing the same household indefinitely to avoid poor cooperation or biased responses resulting from repeated interviewing. The sample of housing units is divided into six rotation groups with each group being interviewed every six months for three years (a total of up to seven interviews per household).

Within each rotation group six panels are designated, with a different panel interviewed each month during the six-month period. The first interview for a housing unit in a group is used only for bounding and is not included in in the regular public use data. However, if a new household moves into a sample unit, the members of that household are interviewed and their, unbounded, interviews are included in the data. Thus, the number of incident reports associated with a household may be affected by its tenure in the sample. New households will have unbounded information while older units may display time in sample effects.

Evidence from the National Crime Survey

The data presented here represents some preliminary results from a longitudinal file constructed from recent NCS collection quarters. To construct the file, rotation groups within the sample were selected as they were brought into the survey. The first four visits to a household were thus identified and all of the interviews for the two year period used. Interviews were retained even if a new household moved into the sample unit. Because of the rotating nature of the sample, the initial interview in a household might have occurred anytime between 1976 to 1979 and the final visit between 1978 and 1981. Since the discussion above focused on the victim population and the appropriate response to them, tables are presented which relate

their experience to the victim total population. In the tables, the number of incidents for each type is compared to the total number of persons who reported any type of personal victimization during the two year period they could have been interviewed in their household.

In Table 1, the number of incident reports of each type is shown for males versus females. The Table indicates that while rapes tend to be episodic exclusively, assaults (both serious and minor) are more likely to have occurred a number of times. Of the total population of victims, most are assault victims and almost all have only 1 or 2 incident reports altogether. These tables show both series and non-series reports. As mentioned above, series reports are incidents in which at least three similar victimizations have occurred and the victim can not differentiate between them. In such a case the questions about the incidents apply only to the most recent in the series.

In tables 2-5 the number of victimization reports is shown separately for series and non-series incidents and by relation to the offender. Very small fractions of the total victims report rapes and none report more than two. The number of rapes reported with a relative or well-known person is suspiciously low. Generally, one problem with victimization surveys is that victimizations between non-strangers are under-reported. The NCS instrument contributes further to under reporting because it does

not ask directly about rapes or attempted rapes.

In Tables 3 and 4, similar data are shown for assaults. In the case of both serious and minor assaults, non-series incidents are most common. In identifying a group of the chronically victimized, persons with series reports or more than one non-series reports should appear. This group is small relative to the group experiencing only one victimization experience. The evidence presented here is less informative on the issue of relation to the offender. Some significant number of victims are related to or know well the person(s) they identified as attacking them. However, there are enough for acquaintance or know by sight and for strangers to give support to the view that they are primarily victims of exposure.

Table 5, on robbery, is the strongest evidence for exposure viewpoints and thus crime prevention interventions. Here, the greatest number of victims were victimized once by a stranger. This argues for a rather direct preventive response of the sort now commonly presented. That is the instruction of people in strategies for avoiding situations in which they are likely to be robbed.

In so far as the information discussed above can be used to recommend some intervention over the other, community crime prevention campaigns would appear more effective. If the

discussion is limited to the numbers of victims, then the most common victim appears to be one who experiences an episodic event. This implies that the main emphasis in responding to crime should be preventative. However, many accounts of the experiences of victims stess the traumatic impact on people's lives it has. These people, even if victimized only once, may feel the effect of the trauma for the rest of their lives. The current vogue enjoyed by exposure accounts and the policies they imply risks a situation in which these victim's needs are slighted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barnet, E., et al., Family Violence: Intervention Strategies, National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, Washington, D.C., 1980.

Biderman, A., et al. Report on a Pilot Study in the District of Columbia on Victimization and Attitudes Toward Law Enforcement, U.S. Govt. Printing Office Washington, D.C. 1967.

- - "Notes on Measurement by Crime Surveys" in S. Fienberg and A. Reiss (eds.) Indicators of Crime and Criminal Justice: Quantitative Studies U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1981.

Boland, B. "Patterns of Urban Crime" in W. Skogan (ed.) Sample Surveys of the Victims of Crime, Ballinger, Cambridge, Mass. 1976.

Bureau of the Census, National Crime Survey, National Sample Survey Documentation, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1974.

Bureau of Justice Statistics, Criminal Victimization in the United States (annual reports for 1974-1979), U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Cirel, P., et al., Community Crime Prevention Program, Seattle, Washington, LEAA, Washington, D.C., 1977.

Cohen, L. and Felson, M., "Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach", Am. Soc. Rev. 44:588-607 1979.

Cohen, L.; Kluegel, J. and Land, K. "Social Inequality and Predatory Criminal Victimization: An Exposition and Test of a Formal Theory", Am. Soc. Rev. 46:505-524, 1981.

Dahrendorf, R., Life Changes, Approaches to Social and Political Theory, Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1979.

Ennis, P., Criminal Victimization in the United States: A Report of a National Survey, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967.

Feins, J., Partnerships for Neighborhood Crime Prevention, National Institute of Justice, Washington, D.C., 1983.

Greenberg, S., Rohe, W, and Williams, J, Informal Social Control and Crime Prevention at the Neighborhood Level: Synthesis and Assesment of the Research, Denver Research Institiute, Denver, 1983.

Gottfredson, M., "On the Etiology of Criminal Victimization", Jo. of Crim. Law and Criminology, 72:714-726, 1981.

Hentig, H. von, The Criminal and his Victim: Studies in the Sociobiology of Crime, Yale Univ. Press, New Haven, 1948.

Hindelang, M.; Gottfredson, M. and Garafalo, J. Victims of Personal Crime: An Empirical Foundation for a Theory of Personal Victimization, Ballinger, Cambridge, Mass., 1978.

Lehman, R. and Skogan, W. (eds.) The National Crime Survey: Working Papers, Vol I: Current and Historical Perspectives, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1981.

Morgan, S., Conjugal Terrorism: A Psychological and Community Treatment Model of Wife Abuse, R and E Research Associates, Palo Alto, 1982

Penick, B. and Owen, M., Surveying Crime, Nat. Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., 1976.

Reiss, A., Public Perceptions and Recollections about Crime, Law Enforcement, and Criminal Justice, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1967.

- - "Victim Proneness in Repeat Victimization by Type of Crime", in S. Fienberg and A. Reiss (eds.) Indicators of Crime and Criminal Justice: Quantitative Studies, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1980.

Singer, S. "The Concept of Vulnerability and the Elderly Victim in the Urban Environment." in J. Scott and S. Dinitz (eds.), Criminal Justice Planning. Praeger, New York, 1977.

Skogan, W., Issues in the Measurement of Victimization U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washinton, D.C., 1981.

Sparks, R., "Multiple Victimization: Evidence, Theory, and Future Research", Jo. Crim. Law and Criminology, 72:762-778, 1981.

Toch, H., Violent Men, An Inquiry into the Psychology of Violence, Aldine, Chicago, 1969.

Walker, L., The Battered Woman, Harper, New York, 1979.

Weber, M., The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, A. Henderson and T. Parsons (trs.), Free Press, New York, 1947.

TABLE 1
TOTAL NUMBER OF VICTIMIZATIONS FOR ALL TYPES

SEX	NONE	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTALS
				RAPES				
MALE	3,563	23	1	0	0	0	0	3,587
Row %	99.3	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	2,009	162	6	0	0	0	0	2,177
Row %	92.3	7.4	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,650	189	7	0	0	0	0	5,846
Row %	96.6	3.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
				SERIOUS ASSAULTS				
MALE	2,329	1,133	102	16	5	2	0	3,587
Row %	64.9	31.6	2.8	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	1,645	501	30	1	0	0	0	2,177
Row %	75.6	23.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	4,024	1,665	133	17	5	2	0	5,846
Row %	68.8	28.5	2.3	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
				MINOR ASSAULTS				
MALE	1,686	1,622	218	45	13	3	0	3,587
Row %	47.0	45.2	6.1	1.3	0.4	0.1	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	949	1,073	131	19	2	2	1	2,177
Row %	43.6	49.3	6.0	0.9	0.1	0.1	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	2,680	2,730	350	64	16	5	1	5,846
Row %	45.8	46.7	6.0	1.1	0.3	0.1	0.0	100.0

SEX	NONE	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOTALS
				ROBBERY				
MALE	2,885	646	46	9	1	0	0	3,587
Row %	80.4	18.0	1.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	1,793	367	16	1	0	0	0	2,177
Row %	82.4	16.9	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	4,742	1,028	63	12	1	0	0	5,846
Row %	81.1	17.6	1.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

TABLE 2
TOTAL NUMBER OF RAPES (SERIES AND NONSERIES) BY RELATION

SEX	NONE	1	2	TOTALS
SERIES RAPES BY RELATION/WELL KNOWN				
MALE	3,586	1	0	3,587
Row %	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	2,170	7	0	2,177
Row %	99.7	0.3	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,838	8	0	5,846
Row %	99.9	0.1	0.0	100.0
NON-SERIES RAPES BY RELATION/WELL KNOWN				
MALE	3,587	0	0	3,587
Row %	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	2,153	22	2	2,177
Row %	98.9	1.0	0.1	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,822	22	2	5,846
Row %	99.6	0.4	0.0	100.0
NON-SERIES RAPES BY ACQUAINTANCE/ KNOWN BY SIGHT				
MALE	3,584	3	0	3,587
Row %	99.9	0.1	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	2,133	42	2	2,177
Row %	98.0	1.9	0.1	100.0

SEX	NONE	1	2	TOTALS
NON-SERIES RAPES BY ACQUAINTANCE/ KNOWN BY SIGHT				
SUB-TOTALS	5,797	47	2	5,846
Row %	99.2	0.8	0.0	100.0
SERIES RAPES BY STRANGER				
MALE	3,586	1	0	3,587
Row %	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	2,176	1	0	2,177
Row %	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,844	2	0	5,846
Row %	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
NON-SERIES RAPES BY STRANGER				
MALE	3,568	18	1	3,587
Row %	99.5	0.5	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	2,085	90	2	2,177
Row %	95.8	4.1	0.1	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,733	110	3	5,846
Row %	98.1	1.9	0.1	100.0

TABLE 3
TOTAL NUMBER OF SERIOUS ASSAULTS (SERIES AND NON-SERIES) BY RELATION

SEX	NONE	1	2	3	4	TOTALS
SERIES SERIOUS ASSAULTS BY RELATION/WELL KNOWN						
MALE	3,571	15	1	0	0	3,587
Row %	99.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	2,145	32	0	0	0	2,177
Row %	98.5	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,797	48	1	0	0	5,846
Row %	99.2	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
NON-SERIES SERIOUS ASSAULTS BY RELATION/WELL KNOWN						
MALE	3,339	228	18	2	0	3,587
Row %	93.1	6.4	0.5	0.1	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	1,988	177	12	0	0	2,177
Row %	91.3	8.1	0.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,401	413	30	2	0	5,846
Row %	92.4	7.1	0.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
SERIES SERIOUS ASSAULTS BY ACQUAINTANCE/ BY SIGHT						
MALE	3,568	19	0	0	0	3,587
Row %	99.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	2,170	7	0	0	0	2,177
Row %	99.7	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SEX	NONE	1	2	3	4	TOTALS
SERIES SERIOUS ASSAULTS BY ACQUAINTANCE/ BY SIGHT						
SUB-TOTALS	5,819	26	1	0	0	5,846
Row %	99.5	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
NON-SERIES SERIOUS ASSAULTS BY ACQUAINTANCE/ BY SIGHT						
MALE	3,304	270	10	3	0	3,587
Row %	92.1	7.5	0.3	0.1	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	2,066	108	3	0	0	2,177
Row %	94.9	5.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,444	386	13	3	0	5,846
Row %	93.1	6.6	0.2	0.1	0.0	100.0
SERIES SERIOUS ASSAULTS BY STRANGER						
MALE	3,548	34	2	2	1	3,587
Row %	98.9	0.9	0.1	0.1	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	2,172	5	0	0	0	2,177
Row %	99.8	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,802	39	2	2	1	5,846
Row %	99.2	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
NON-SERIES SERIOUS ASSAULTS BY STRANGER						
MALE	2,883	657	38	7	2	3,587

SEX	NONE	1	2	3	4	TOTALS
NON-SERIES SERIOUS ASSAULTS BY STRANGER						
Row %	80.4	18.3	1.1	0.2	0.1	100.0
FEMALE	1,975	199	3	0	0	2,177
Row %	90.7	9.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	4,926	870	41	7	2	5,846
Row %	84.3	14.9	0.7	0.1	0.0	100.0

TABLE 4
TOTAL NUMBER OF MINOR ASSAULTS (SERIES AND NON-SERIES) BY RELATION

SEX	NONE	1	2	3	4	5	TOTALS
SERIES MINOR ASSAULT BY RELATION/WELL KNOWN							
MALE	3,540	46	1	0	0	0	3,587
Row %	98.7	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	2,078	99	0	0	0	0	2,177
Row %	95.5	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,698	147	1	0	0	0	5,846
Row %	97.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
NON-SERIES MINOR ASSAULT BY RELATION/WELL KNOWN							
MALE	3,212	342	28	5	0	0	3,587
Row %	89.5	9.5	0.8	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	1,747	370	53	4	2	1	2,177
Row %	80.2	17.0	2.4	0.2	0.1	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,032	720	82	9	2	1	5,846
Row %	86.1	12.3	1.4	0.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
SERIES MINOR ASSAULT BY ACQUAINTANCE/ BY SIGHT							
MALE	3,524	62	1	0	0	0	3,587
Row %	98.2	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	2,145	32	0	0	0	0	2,177
Row %	98.5	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SEX	NONE	1	2	3	4	5	TOTALS
SERIES MINOR ASSAULT BY ACQUAINTANCE/ BY SIGHT							
SUB-TOTALS	5,750	95	1	0	0	0	5,846
Row %	98.4	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
NON-SERIES MINOR ASSAULT BY ACQUAINTANCE/ BY SIGHT							
MALE	3,076	460	41	6	4	0	3,587
Row %	85.8	12.8	1.1	0.2	0.1	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	1,863	287	24	2	1	0	2,177
Row %	85.6	13.2	1.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,017	751	65	8	5	0	5,846
Row %	85.8	12.8	1.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	100.0
SERIES MINOR ASSAULT BY STRANGER							
MALE	3,482	96	7	2	0	0	3,587
Row %	97.1	2.7	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	2,157	20	0	0	0	0	2,177
Row %	99.1	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,718	118	8	2	0	0	5,846
Row %	97.8	2.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
NON-SERIES MINOR ASSAULT BY STRANGER							
MALE	2,649	843	88	5	2	0	3,587

SEX	NONE	1	2	3	4	5	TOTALS
NON-SERIES MINOR ASSAULT BY STRANGER							
Row %	73.9	23.5	2.5	0.1	0.1	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	1,783	373	18	2	1	0	2,177
Row %	81.9	17.1	0.8	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	4,494	1,236	106	7	3	0	5,846
Row %	76.9	21.1	1.8	0.1	0.1	0.0	100.0

TABLE 5
TOTAL NUMBER OF ROBBERIES (SERIES AND NON-SERIES) BY RELATION

SEX	NONE	1	2	3	TOTALS
RAPES					
SERIES ROBBERY BY A RELATION/WELL KNOWN					
MALE	3,583	4	0	0	3,587
Row %	99.9	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	2,172	5	0	0	2,177
Row %	99.8	0.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,837	9	0	0	5,846
Row %	99.8	0.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
NON-SERIES ROBBERY BY A RELATION/WELL KNOWN					
MALE	3,497	87	3	0	3,587
Row %	97.5	2.4	0.1	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	2,094	78	5	0	2,177
Row %	96.2	3.6	0.2	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,670	167	9	0	5,846
Row %	97.0	2.9	0.2	0.0	100.0
SERIES ROBBERY BY ACQUAINTANCE/ BY SIGHT					
MALE	3,586	1	0	0	3,587
Row %	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

SEX	NONE	1	2	3	TOTALS
SERIES ROBBERY BY ACQUAINTANCE/ BY SIGHT					
FEMALE	2,175	2	0	0	2,177
Row %	99.9	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,843	3	0	0	5,846
Row %	99.9	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
NON-SERIES ROBBERY BY ACQUAINTANCE/ BY SIGHT					
MALE	3,511	74	1	1	3,587
Row %	97.9	2.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	2,156	20	1	0	2,177
Row %	99.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,748	95	2	1	5,846
Row %	98.3	1.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
SERIES ROBBERY BY STRANGER					
MALE	3,579	7	1	0	3,587
Row %	99.8	0.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
FEMALE	2,177	0	0	0	2,177
Row %	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,838	7	1	0	5,846
Row %	99.9	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0

SEX	NONE	1	2	3	TOTALS
NON-SERIES ROBBERY BY STRANGER					
MALE	3,041	511	32	3	3,587
Row %	84.8	14.2	0.9	0.1	100.0
FEMALE	1,900	270	6	1	2,177
Row %	87.3	12.4	0.3	0.0	100.0
SUB-TOTALS	5,008	794	39	5	5,846
Row %	85.7	13.6	0.7	0.1	100.0