

1986

The impact of crime on victims a comparative study between crime victims and non-victims of crime among university students.

Bruno. Ierullo
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Ierullo, Bruno., "The impact of crime on victims a comparative study between crime victims and non-victims of crime among university students." (1986). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 4034.

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Services des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

THE IMPACT OF CRIME ON VICTIMS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN
CRIME VICTIMS AND NON-VICTIMS OF CRIME
AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

by

© Bruno Ierullo

A Thesis
submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
through the Department of
Sociology and Anthropology in Partial Fulfillment
of the requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts at
the University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, 1986

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-29302-0

(c) Bruno Ierullo 1986

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this treatise involves a comparative study of crime victims to non-victims of crime, as well as a comparison of the various severity groups of victims. With a particular emphasis on anemia, the t tests exemplify a high level of attachment to society among victims and non-victims. Furthermore, the cross-tabulations reveal a higher rate of victimization for males than females, and denote three variables associated with severity. The frequency distributions expose several emotional reactions to criminal victimization, and depict the people most frequently requested for assistance by the victims of crime. Evidence concerning the attitudes towards the criminal justice system indicate that crime victims maintain a more liberal view of law enforcement and retribution than non-victims of crime. Finally, on the average, crime victims undergo minor changes in security behavior.

DEDICATION

To those that I love: Stacey, Anna Maria, Ismenico,
and Rino. I thank God!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A laborious and time consuming task, such as this, could not be completed without the invaluable help and kind support of others. I would like to thank my chairman, Dr. Claude L. Vincent. Thank you for recognizing my abilities and believing in me. You motivated me during my lethargic moments and commended me in the midst of my productivity. Professor Don Stewart also deserves my appreciation. He was not only patient with me, but he also directed my enthusiasm towards the manageable and relevant. I wish to extend my gratitude to Dr. Ray Daly. Without his expertise in the areas of methodology and quantitative research, this thesis would have lacked substance and statistical validity. Again, I am grateful to all my committee members for their suggestions and contributions.

A great deal of gratitude and appreciation is credited to my family who, throughout my academic career, provided me with emotional and financial support too precious for words. To Stacey, who expressed an interest in my work and endured my occasional complaints, I offer my love in return. I am also indebted to all the members of the Potts family who have made me feel very welcome. Thank you!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iv
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
CHAPTER I: Introduction	1
CHAPTER II: Theoretical Framework	4
Introduction	4
Crime and Social Solidarity	4
The Theory of Anomie	7
Srole's Conception of Anomia	12
Anomie and Anomia: A Contrast	14
Conclusion	15
CHAPTER III: Review of the Literature	16
Introduction	16
Victimization and Anomia	16
Emotional Reactions to Victimization	18
Changes in Attitude	23
Security Behaviour	25
Secondary Victimization	26
Conclusion	27
CHAPTER IV: Methodology	29
Finding A Sample	29
Data Collection	34
Data Analysis	36
Conclusion	41
CHAPTER V: Examination of the Results	42
Introduction	42
Descriptive Statistics	42
A Comparison of Non-Victims to Crime Victims	49
Demographic Status	49

Anomia	50
Attitudes Towards the Judicial System	51
Attitudes Towards the Police	51
A Comparison of Non-Victims to Low Objective	
Severity Victims	54
Demographic Status	54
Anomia	54
Attitudes Towards the Judicial System	55
Attitudes Towards the Police	57
A Comparison of Non-Victims to Medium Objective	
Severity Victims	57
Demographic Status	57
Anomia	57
Attitudes Towards the Judicial System	59
Attitudes Towards the Police	60
A Comparison of Non-Victims to High Objective	
Severity Victims	60
Demographic Status	60
Anomia	61
Attitudes Towards People	61
Attitudes Towards the Judicial System	61
Attitudes Towards the Police	67
A Comparison of Non-Victims to Low Subjective	
Severity Victims	67
Demographic Status	67
Anomia	70
Attitudes Towards People	70
A Comparison of Non-Victims to Medium Subjective	
Severity Victims	71
Demographic Status	71
Anomia	71
Attitudes Towards People	71
Attitudes Towards the Judicial System	75
A Comparison of Non-Victims to High Subjective	
Severity Victims	75
Demographic Status	75
Anomia	75
Attitudes Towards the Police	77
A Comparison of Objective Severity Victims	79
Types of Crimes Suffered	79
Incidents of Victimization	79
Emotional Reactions	87
Assistance	93
Precautions	100
Anomia	103
Attitudes Towards the Police	104
A Comparison of Subjective Severity Victims	108
Types of Crimes Suffered	108
Incidents of Victimization	114
Emotional Reactions	116
Assistance	121
Precautions	129
Anomia	137

Attitudes Towards People	137
Summary of Findings	139
Demographic Status	139
Anomia	139
Attitudes Towards People	139
Attitudes Towards the Judicial System	140
Attitudes Towards the Police	140
Types of Crimes	141
Incidents of Victimization	141
Emotional Reactions	141
Assistance	142
Precautions	143
CHAPTER VI: Discussion	144
Introduction	144
Demographic and Socio-Economic Status	145
Victimization and Severity	146
Emotional Reactions of Crime Victims	148
Assistance Requested By Crime Victims	151
Victimization, Attitudes Towards People, and Anomia	153
Victimization and Attitudes Towards the Criminal Justice System	155
Precautions Taken By Crime Victims	158
Summary	159
CHAPTER VII: Conclusions	161
Implications	161
Recommendations	164
Final Remarks	165
APPENDIX A	167
Pilot Study	167
Questionnaire	168
The Concepts Defined	175
REFERENCES	183
VITA AUCTORIS	189

LIST OF TABLES

1.	PILOT STUDY	33
2.	OBJECTIVE SEVERITY INDEX	37
3.	SEX	43
4.	MARITAL STATUS	43
5.	AGE	44
6.	RELIGION	44
7.	YEAR IN UNIVERSITY	45
8.	MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY	45
9.	LIVING ARRANGEMENT	46
10.	OCCUPATION	46
11.	ANNUAL INCOME	47
12.	VICTIMIZATION	48
13.	FREQUENCIES OF CRIMES	49
14.	VICTIMIZATION BY SEX	50
15.	VICTIMIZATION BY ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM	52
16.	VICTIMIZATION BY ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE POLICE	53
17.	LOW OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMIZATION BY SEX	55
18.	LOW OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF THE COURTS	56
19.	LOW OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF THE POLICE	58
20.	MEDIUM OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMIZATION BY SEX	59
21.	MEDIUM OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF THE COURTS	62
22.	MEDIUM OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF THE POLICE	63
23.	HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMIZATION BY SEX	64

24.	HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF PEOPLE	65
25.	HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF THE COURTS	66
26.	HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF THE POLICE	68
27.	LOW SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMIZATION BY SEX	69
28.	LOW SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF PEOPLE	72
29.	MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMIZATION BY SEX	73
30.	MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF PEOPLE	74
31.	MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF THE COURTS	76
32.	HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMIZATION BY SEX	77
33.	HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF THE POLICE	78
34.	TOTAL OBJECTIVE SEVERITY INDEX BY ROBBERY	80
35.	TOTAL OBJECTIVE SEVERITY INDEX BY BURGLARY	81
36.	TOTAL OBJECTIVE SEVERITY INDEX BY PHYSICAL ASSAULT	82
37.	TOTAL OBJECTIVE SEVERITY INDEX BY ASSAULT WITH A GUN	83
38.	TOTAL OBJECTIVE SEVERITY INDEX BY THEFT	84
39.	TOTAL OBJECTIVE SEVERITY INDEX BY VANDALISM	85
40.	TOTAL OBJECTIVE SEVERITY INDEX BY THE INCIDENTS	86
41.	FEAR OF BEING ALONE AMONG MEDIUM OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	88
42.	FEAR OF RESIDENCE AMONG MEDIUM OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	88
43.	FEAR OF WALKING ALONE AMONG MEDIUM OBJECTIVE VICTIMS	89
44.	SLEEPLESSNESS AMONG MEDIUM OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	89

45.	FEAR OF BEING ALONE AMONG HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	90
46.	FEAR OF RESIDENCE AMONG HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	90
47.	FEAR OF WALKING ALONE AMONG HIGH OBJECTIVE VICTIMS	91
48.	SLEEPLESSNESS AMONG HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	91
49.	OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS STILL BOTHERED BY CRIME	92
50.	OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO ASKED FOR ASSISTANCE	94
51.	ASSISTANCE FROM FAMILY REQUESTED BY LOW OBJECTIVE VICTIMS	95
52.	ASSISTANCE FROM FRIEND REQUESTED BY LOW OBJECTIVE VICTIMS	95
53.	ASSISTANCE FROM POLICE REQUESTED BY LOW OBJECTIVE VICTIMS	96
54.	ASSISTANCE FROM FAMILY REQUESTED BY MEDIUM OBJECTIVE VICTIMS	96
55.	ASSISTANCE FROM FRIEND REQUESTED BY MEDIUM OBJECTIVE VICTIMS	97
56.	ASSISTANCE FROM POLICE REQUESTED BY MEDIUM OBJECTIVE VICTIMS	98
57.	ASSISTANCE FROM FAMILY REQUESTED BY HIGH OBJECTIVE VICTIMS	98
58.	ASSISTANCE FROM FRIEND REQUESTED BY HIGH OBJECTIVE VICTIMS	99
59.	ASSISTANCE FROM POLICE REQUESTED BY HIGH OBJECTIVE VICTIMS	99
60.	LOW OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO LOCKED DOORS AND WINDOWS	101
61.	MEDIUM OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO INSTALLED NEW LOCKS	101
62.	MEDIUM OBJECTIVE VICTIMS WHO LOCKED DOORS AND WINDOWS	102

63.	HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO INSTALLED NEW LOCKS	102
64.	HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO LOCKED DOORS AND WINDOWS	103
65.	OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO MOVED	105
66.	OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO STAYED HOME MORE OFTEN	106
67.	ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE POLICE AMONG OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	107
68.	TOTAL SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY SCORE BY ROBBERY	109
69.	TOTAL SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY SCORE BY BURGLARY	110
70.	TOTAL SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY SCORE BY PHYSICAL ASSAULT	111
71.	TOTAL SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY SCORE BY ASSAULT WITH A GUN	112
72.	TOTAL SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY SCORE BY THEFT	113
73.	TOTAL SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY SCORE BY VANDALISM	114
74.	TOTAL SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY SCORE BY THE INCIDENTS	115
75.	FEAR OF RESIDENCE AMONG MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	117
76.	FEAR OF WALKING ALONE AMONG MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS	118
77.	SLEEPLESSNESS AMONG MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	118
78.	NERVOUSNESS AMONG MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	119
79.	FEAR OF BEING ALONE AMONG HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	119
80.	FEAR OF RESIDENCE AMONG HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	120
81.	FEAR OF WALKING ALONE AMONG HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	120
82.	SLEEPLESSNESS AMONG HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	121

83.	SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS STILL BOTHERED BY CRIME	122
84.	SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO ASKED SOMEONE FOR ASSISTANCE	123
85.	ASSISTANCE FROM FAMILY REQUESTED BY LOW SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS	124
86.	ASSISTANCE FROM FRIEND REQUESTED BY LOW SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS	124
87.	ASSISTANCE FROM POLICE REQUESTED BY LOW SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS	125
88.	ASSISTANCE FROM FAMILY REQUESTED BY MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS	125
89.	ASSISTANCE FROM FRIEND REQUESTED BY MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS	126
90.	ASSISTANCE FROM POLICE REQUESTED BY MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS	126
91.	ASSISTANCE FROM FAMILY REQUESTED BY HIGH SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS	127
92.	ASSISTANCE FROM FRIEND REQUESTED BY HIGH SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS	128
93.	ASSISTANCE FROM POLICE REQUESTED BY HIGH SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS	128
94.	LOW SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO LOCKED DOORS AND WINDOWS	130
95.	MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO INSTALLED NEW LOCKS	131
96.	MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS WHO LOCKED DOORS AND WINDOWS	131
97.	HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO BOUGHT INSURANCE	132
98.	HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO INSTALLED NEW LOCKS	132
99.	HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO LOCKED DOORS AND WINDOWS	133
100.	HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO AVOIDED GOING OUT	133

101.	SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO MOVED	135.
102.	SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO STAYED HOME MORE OFTEN	136
103.	ATTITUDES TOWARDS PEOPLE AMONG SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	138

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Victimology, according to Vahakn N. Ladrian (in Viano, 1976: 40), is concerned with two fundamental areas: "the social context in which victimization occurs, and the social consequences of such victimization." With respect to the former, the pioneers of victimology, Hans von Hentig and Benjamin Mendelsohn, examined the criminal-victim relationship; that is, they focused their attention on victim culpability. Hentig, for example, "hypothesized that, in a sense, the victim shapes and molds the criminal and his crime..." (in Stephen Schafer in Galaway and Hudson, 1981: 16). Of course, the extent to which a victim contributes to his/her victimization varies from case to case. Therefore, in order to classify the degree of victim culpability, Hentig and Mendelsohn as well as many others, developed victim typologies. But, as Stephen Schafer contends, these typologies are "only speculative guesswork...supported by more or less superficial experiences" (in Galaway and Hudson, 1981: 21). In terms of the social consequences of victimization, the emphasis is on "the disruptive impacts upon a given individual, an individual's immediate group, the totality of a given

society, (and) humanity at large" (Dadrian in Viano, 1976: 40).

The purpose of this research is to investigate the disruptive impact of crime on victims. A possible consequence of criminal victimization, from a structural functionalist perspective, is that crime exacerbates feelings of anomia among victims. Anomia was first developed by Lee Srole (1956) who extended Durkheim's (1951) concept of anomie to refer to a condition of the individual. Srole (1956: 712) defined anomia as one's perception of being unattached to society.

Although the central focus of this research is to compare the anomia scores of crime victims to non-victims of crime, other factors are compared as well. These include demographic variables, attitudes towards people and the criminal justice system, and socio-economic status. A further investigation into the differences separating various severity groups of victims involves additional factors. These are: the emotional reactions to victimization; the assistance received by the victims; the behavioural changes undergone by the victims in terms of the precautions that they have taken since their victimization(s); the type(s) of crime(s) that they have suffered; and the severity of the crime(s).

Methodologically, the data collection involved a victimization survey covering a 12 month reference period. In conducting the survey, a questionnaire was administered to a convenience sample of university students. Through SPSSx, t tests and chi-square were used to detect the factors that exhibit statistically significant differences between the crime victims and the non-victims of crime with a special emphasis on anemia. The differences separating the various severity groups of crime victims were also analyzed. This revealed some of the variables associated with these different groups.

It is the thesis of this research that crime victims exhibit higher levels of anemia than non-victims of crime. In other words, crime victims feel more estranged from society than non-victims.

CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

Theoretically, crime can be discussed in terms of its socially integrative/disintegrative qualities. This chapter begins by discussing the role played by crime in maintaining social solidarity as explained by Emile Durkheim (1938) and Kai T. Erikson (in Davis and Stivers, 1975). The emphasis of this chapter, however, is the disintegrative aspects of crime on the victims marked by anomia. Since Srole (1956) derived the concept of anomia from Durkheim's (1951) theory of anomie, a discussion of anomie as well as anomia is warranted. This structural functionalist perspective provides the theoretical foundation for examining the relationship between criminal victimization and anomia.

2.2 Crime and Social Solidarity

With regard to crime's contribution to social integration, reference must be made to Emile Durkheim (1938) and Kai T. Erikson (in Davis and Stivers, 1975). Crime, according to Durkheim (1938: 67), is "an integral part of all healthy societies." He explains that although crime is

an attack on the entire community, it is the community as a whole which opposes the attack.

"Crime brings together upright consciences and concentrates them. We have only to notice what happens, particularly in a small town, when some moral scandal has just been committed. They stop each other on the street, they visit each other, they seek to come together to talk of the event and to wax indignant in common. From all the similar impressions which are exchanged, from all the temper that gets itself expressed, there emerges a unique temper, more or less determinate according to the circumstances, which is everybody's without being anybody's in particular. That is the public temper" (Durkheim, 1933: 102).

From Durkheim's (1933) point of view, crime must be immediately met by society's disapproval of the act and the punishment of the offender (p. 108). By taking common action against the offender, the collective conscience is reestablished. It reminds the members of a community of their common beliefs, and it reaffirms the behaviour acceptable to society. Thus, it is the punishment of crime that avenges the attack on society, and also promotes social integration (pp. 102 & 103).

A community that does not take collective action against a transgressor will suffer a breakdown in social cohesion. Durkheim (1933: 103) writes:

"If, then, when (a crime) is committed, the consciences which it offends do not unite themselves to give mutual evidence of their

communions, and recognize that the case is anomalous, they would be permanently unsettled. They must re-enforce themselves by mutual assurances that they are always agreed. The only means for this is action in common. In short, since it is the common conscience which is attacked, it must be that which resists, and accordingly the resistance must be collective."

Hence, the functional aspects of crime, Durkheim (1933: 109) contends, rests on its punishment by the collective conscience.

Interest in Durkheim's argument led Kai T. Erikson (in Davis and Stivers, 1975: 12) to also consider the beneficial aspects of deviance. In so doing, Erikson (in Davis and Stivers, 1975: 15) mentions that a community of people share common norms, values, and beliefs. These aspects of a community set the range of activities considered to be within the purview of normality. Deviation from the norm, however, is regarded with contempt and deemed punishable by the community's policing agents. Thus, in agreement with Durkheim, Erikson (in Davis and Stivers, 1975: 16) asserts that the punishment of deviance and crime upholds the normative order of a community. In his words:

"...members of a community inform one another about the placement of their boundaries by participating in the confrontations which occur when persons who venture out to the edges of the group are met by policing agents whose special business it is to guard the cultural integrity of the community. Whether these confrontations take the form of criminal trials, excommunication hearings, courts-martial, or even psychiatric case

conferences, they act as boundary-maintaining devices in the sense that they demonstrate to whatever audience is concerned where the line is drawn between behavior that belongs in the special universe of the group and behavior that does not" (Erikson in Davis and Stivers, 1975: 16).

Through the mass media, Erikson (in Davis and Stivers, 1975: 16) suggests, the public is made aware of crime and its punishment. In this way, the members of a community are reminded of the norms, values, and beliefs that they share in common. The result is the maintenance of social solidarity.

2.3 The Theory of Anomie

Although the punishment of crime may help to promote and preserve social integration, crime has its consequences. George Herbert Mead and John Barron Mays (in Cerklín, 1975: 53) contend that crime has nothing positive to contribute to society. Instead, Mead suggests that crime may unify a group but in a negative way. He maintains that crime unites the public in terms of expressing hostility towards the offender. In turn, this hostility evokes other negative attitudes, such as retribution, repression, and exclusion. In addition, Mays states that crime instills fear and suspicion into the minds of people. More significantly, Merton (in Smith et al., 1978: 37) proposes that "Victims (of crime) may withdraw from previous interaction patterns

as a result of increased distrust and refrain from establishing new ties." Such a reaction to crime by the victims can be explained by the concept of anomia. But before anomia can be discussed, it is necessary to first introduce Durkheim's (1951) theory of anomie from which anomia was derived.

In his discussion of anomie, Durkheim (1951) explains that people are unable to regulate their behaviour and aspirations. Instead, they require an external entity to perform this regulative task for them (p. 248). It must be something that dominates individuals, and yet has their utmost respect (p. 252). In which case, it is society that undertakes this obligation. As Durkheim (1951: 249) states:

"Either directly and as a whole, or through the agency of one of its organs, society alone can play this moderating role; for it is the only moral power superior to the individual, the authority of which he accepts. It alone has the power necessary to stipulate law and to set the point beyond which the passions must not go."

When society is disturbed to the point of being incapable of fulfilling its regulative function, then society is said to be in a state of de-regulation or anomie (p. 253).

The anomic state of society is "due to a sudden growth or to an unexpected catastrophe" which creates "serious

readjustments...in the social order" (Durkheim, 1951: 246). In the former instance, society is unable to restrain individual aspirations (p. 252). As a result, people's desires increase to the point of insatiability at the expense of their happiness (p. 248). In the latter case, society's incapacity to adjust immediately to the new situation precludes its ability to instantaneously teach individuals how to cope with their unceremonious crisis. Consequently, the people affected find themselves in a state of emotional distress. Therefore, these disturbances attenuate society's constraints on individual behaviour and aspirations (p. 252).

"The scale is upset; but a new scale cannot be immediately improvised. Time is required for the public conscience to reclassify men and things. So long as the social forces thus freed have not regained equilibrium, their respective values are unknown and so all regulation is lacking for a time. The limits are unknown between the possible and the impossible, what is just and what is unjust, legitimate claims and hopes and those which are immoderate. Consequently, there is no restraint upon aspirations" (Durkheim, 1951: 253).

Until society regains equilibrium, it remains in a state of anomie.

A somewhat different definition of anomie is presented by Robert K. Merton (1968: 216). He posits that anomie is a "breakdown in the cultural structure." Such an occurrence is characterized by "an acute disjunction between the

cultural norms and goals and the socially structured capacities of members of the group to act in accord with them." In other words, society specifies both the cultural goals (for example, American culture emphasizes success goals) and the institutional means for attaining these goals (for example, American culture advocates hard work, honesty, and education). If, however, certain members of society cannot achieve the cultural goals through the institutional means, then they are said to be in a state of normlessness or anomie. As a consequence, Merton (1968: 230) asserts, this anomic state leads individuals to varying adaptations which often include deviant behaviour.

These various forms of adaptation, according to Merton (1968), include: conformity, innovation, ritualism, rebellion, and retreatism. The first, conformity, means that both the cultural goals and the institutionalized means are accepted (p. 195). The second, innovation, refers to the use of illegitimate means to attain culturally prescribed goals. This category consists of criminals and delinquents (p. 230). Ritualism involves the abandonment of cultural goals but the adherence to institutional norms. An example of this form is the bureaucrat who "over-conforms" to the rules and practices of the organization (pp. 238-239ff). Another form of adaptation is rebellion. As the most extreme form, it pertains to the rejection of

existing cultural goals and institutionalized means while attempting to establish a new normative structure (Merton, 1968: 245). Finally, the retreatist is someone who withdraws from the pursuit of cultural goals, and is unconcerned with the institutionalized practices (p. 241). Merton (1968) proposes that retreatism is a result of:

"...an abrupt break in the familiar and accepted normative framework and in established social relations, particularly when it appears to individuals subjected to it that the condition will continue indefinitely" (p. 242).

Furthermore, retreatism is characterized by "a sense of isolation" and a reluctance to establish new social relationships (p. 243). Victims of crime would appear to fit in this category. That is, the victimization undermines previously held assumptions about life and society. The victims come to the realization that they do not have total control over their lives; they are not invulnerable (Lejeune and Alex, 1973: 273; Janoff-Bulman and Frieze, 1983: 4; Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 15); the world is not safe and just (Janoff-Bulman and Frieze, 1983: 6); and not everyone can be trusted (Lejeune and Alex, 1973: 284; Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 14). This can produce feelings of isolation among crime victims (Barkas, 1978: 150) as well as "inhibiting the formation of new relationships" (DeFronzo, 1979: 32).

2-4 Srole's Conception of Anomia

Although Durkheim (1951) and Merton (1968) originally applied the concept of anomie at the macroscopic level, it has been adapted by Leo Srole (1956) at the microscopic level. The formulation of anomia

"...afforded a 'hitch hike' opportunity to test hypotheses centering on Durkheim's concept of anomie. These hypotheses center on a pair of antinomic Greek terms, 'eunomia' and 'anomia.' The former originally denoted a well ordered condition in a society or state, the latter its opposite. The two terms can be adapted with some license to refer to the continuum of variations in the 'integratedness' of different social systems or sub-systems, viewed as molar wholes. They can also be applied to the parallel continuum of variations seen from the 'microscopic' or molecular view of individuals as they are integrated in the total action fields of their interpersonal relationships and reference groups" (Srole, 1956: 710).

More precisely, the eunomia-anomia continuum, as defined by Srole (1956), applies at both the micro-objective and the micro-subjective levels. At the micro-objective level, the concern is with patterns of interaction whereas the micro-subjective level deals with one's "social construction of reality" (Ritzer, 1991: 26). Ostensibly, then, Srole's (1956: 710) continuum measures both the degree that one is integrated into society and/or the degree that one feels socially integrated. The former applies to the micro-objective level while the latter pertains to the micro-subjective level.

Srole (1956: 711), however, used the eunomia-anomia continuum to refer specifically to the micro-subjective level; that is, the individual's sense of "self-to-others belongingness." He explains:

"The convergence most closely approximating the definition proposed here is to be seen in (1) MacIver's (1950: 84-92) definition of anomie as 'the breakdown of the individual's sense of attachment to society' and (2) Lasswell's (1952) reading of the concept as referring to the 'lack of identification on the part of the primary ego of the individual with a 'self' that includes others. In a word, modern man appeared to be suffering from psychic isolation. He felt alone, cut off, unwanted, unloved, unvalued'" (in Srole, 1956: 712).

Thus, according to Srole (1956), anomia means that an individual does not feel socially integrated whereas eunomia denotes the opposite.

One reason for using Srole's (1956) anomia scale is that Merton (in Clinard, 1964: 228) contends that "no more exacting measure of anomie has since been developed and systematically employed." Other attempts to measure anomie or normlessness have concentrated on the extent to which there is a breakdown of social constraints on the individual. Seeman (1959) and Middleton (1963), for example, were concerned with individual tendencies to resort to deviant behaviour in achieving certain goals. In contrast, Srole's (1956) anomia scale focuses on people's

perceptions of being integrated in society which is directly related to the intent of this research.

2-5 Anomie and Anomia: A Contrast

The difference between anomie and anomia is extremely significant. As stated by Merton (in Clinard, 1964: 227), "though the two are variously connected, they are nevertheless distinct." The distinction that he (Merton in Clinard, 1964: 234-235) makes between the two concepts is summarized in the following passage:

"...anomie is a condition of the social environment, not of the isolated self. - It is not one's private estrangement from the goals and rules laid down by society that constitutes anomie--that, as we have seen, is the individual attribute of anomia--but the visible estrangement from these goals and rules among the others one confronts."

Thus, anomie is a condition of society while anomia is a condition of the individual (Merton in Clinard, 1964: 228). The former deals with society's inability to regulate people's behavior and aspirations. The latter pertains to one's subjective feelings of estrangement from society (Merton in Clinard, 1964: 235). It is marked by "feelings of loneliness, hopelessness, and distrust....anomia refers to individual attitudes toward life and interpersonal 'expectations' (Smith et al., 1978: 396-397). Furthermore,

according to the arguments presented by Durkheim (1951) and Merton (1968), anomie may lead to crime whereas feelings of anomia among victims may be exacerbated by crime.

2-6 Conclusion

Despite crime's contribution to social solidarity, the victims of crime certainly suffer the consequences. One of the adverse effects of crime that the victims may experience is anomia.

CHAPTER III.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

3.1 Introduction

Recent documentation concerning the impact of criminal victimization concentrates on both micro-objective and micro-subjective levels of social reality. On the one hand, research focusing on the micro-objective level deals with crime's affect on social interaction. On the other hand, studies at the micro-subjective level relate to the victims' socio-psychological reactions to crime. These include the crime victims' feelings of anomia, emotional reactions, attitudes, and security behaviour.

3.2 Victimization and Anomia

Those who have conducted research at the micro-objective level assume that the disruption of one's existing relationships is characteristic of anomia. In this area, Smith (in Viano, 1976: 216) found that crime does have an impact on the victims but not enough to disrupt social interaction. In a later study of burglary victims, Smith et al. (1973) conclude that burglary has little impact on anomia. Their rationale is that in most cases burglary is a

one-time experience. Although it may lead to some behavioural adjustments, it does not disturb one's interpersonal relationships. Instead, they argue, burglary victims maintain their social relationships which are sometimes strengthened as a result of the crime. Therefore, Smith et al. (1978: 400) posit that "Unless events occur which drastically alter a person's interaction pattern (that is a significant alteration of structure or person's perception of structure), shifts in anomia scores are not likely."

Concurring with Smith et al. (1978), DeFronzo (1979: 32) also obtained little evidence to suggest that victimization disrupts social interaction. Nevertheless, he did find significantly higher levels of anomia among crime victims and those fearing victimization in comparison to those not fearing crime (p. 30). His explanation is that crime may not affect existing patterns of social interaction, but it may prevent the establishment of new relationships. In DeFronzo's (1979: 32) words, crime may "act more subtly against social solidarity by inhibiting the formation of new relationships and increasing hostility towards and the social isolation of strangers."

Contrary to these assertions, Conklin (1975: 53) claims that social solidarity is definitely weakened by crime. In

his case study of the impact of a mass murder on a small and homogeneous community, Conklin (1975: 57) states:

"Still there is no real evidence in Capote's account that the people of Holcomb united as a community or had their values reinforced in any way by the murders. Most people reacted by trying to provide greater security for themselves, their families, and their homes; there were few collective efforts to protect the community."

Conklin (1975: 68) goes on to say that social interaction may increase as a result of crime, but it is usually for self-protection and to make sense of the event. Consequently, crime creates distrust and suspicion which often sets people apart.

With this in mind, attention will be directed toward the crime victims' reactions to being victimized which may provide some clues to the factors associated with anomia and crime victims per se.

3.3 Emotional Reactions to Victimization

Social psychological reactions to criminal victimization have received much consideration from researchers. Janoff-Bulman and Frieze (1983: 2) argue that "Even relatively 'minor' victimizations such as burglary or robbery can result in a great deal of suffering and disruption." They explain that the severe psychological reactions due to victimization include:

"1) re-experiencing the trauma via memories, intrusive thoughts, or dreams; 2) numbing of responsiveness demonstrable by feelings of detachment from others, constricted affect or diminished interest in significant activities; 3) other symptoms including exaggerated startle response, sleep disturbance, guilt, memory impairment or trouble concentrating, and phobias about the activities triggering recollection of the event" (American Psychiatric Association's DSM III, 1980).

Other researchers who have studied crime victims have discovered their reactions to victimization to be denial, confusion and shock, anger, nervousness, fear, guilt, physical upset and nausea, memory loss, isolation, and depression (Earkas, 1978: 150; Taylor et al., 1983: 21; Bourque in Waller, 1982: 12). Hence, the first null hypothesis:

Null H1: Crime victims do not experience any emotional reactions as a result of their victimization(s).

With respect to the type of crime suffered, Earkas (1978: 149-150) states that property crime victims exhibit similar reactions as victims of personal violence. The only difference in feelings are in terms of intensity and duration whereby violent crimes have a greater impact on the victim than property crimes. In accordance to this argument, Bard and Sangrey (1979: 32-33) add that the extent

of the trauma also depends upon the degree of the violation(s) as experienced by the crime victims. Correspondingly, these result in the following two null hypotheses:

Null H2: Anomia, among victims of crime, is not directly related to the type(s) of crime(s) that they experience.

Null H3: Anomia, among victims of crime, is not directly related to the perceived severity of the crime(s).

Interestingly, victims' reactions to burglary, robbery, and physical violence have been found to vary in terms of sex, age, education, and city size. Unfortunately, religious attendance produced inconsistent results in relation to burglary and physical violence (Smith in Viano, 1976: 210 & 213). However, it did increase the association of robbery with fear (Smith in Viano, 1976: 213). With respect to sex, women are more likely to experience fear due to victimization while men report anger (Waller and Okihiro, 1978: 38-39; Maguire, 1980: 262; Smith in Viano, 1976: 211). This may be due to cultural patterning that encourages males to be aggressive and females to be regressive or resigned (Ball, 1976: 393). Secondly, young victims (18-29 years of age) do not report fear whereas victims in the middle age group (30-59 years of age) are both fearful and distrustful. The elderly (60+ years of age) are also fearful but maintain

a higher level of trust than the younger age groups. The reason for this is that the elderly are dependent on others; therefore, they emphasize trust. As far as education is concerned, the less educated victim is more fearful and less trusting (Smith in Viano, 1976: 211-212 & 213). A plausible explanation for the preceding results is that the elderly and the less educated occupy lower status positions in terms of power within society. Thus, they are more likely to assume the victim role than those people who occupy higher status positions (Berg and Johnson in Parsonage, 1979: 65). Finally, the size of a city is directly related to fear and distrust among crime victims (Smith in Viano, 1976: 212).

Bard and Sangrey (1979: 34) suggest that the social psychological trauma suffered by crime victims is characterized by a definite process. They refer to this process as the "crisis reaction" which consists of three stages:

1. The impact stage.
2. The recoil stage.
3. The reorganization stage.

The impact stage refers to the period during and immediately after the victimization. The recoil stage concerns itself with the victims' attempt to deal with their crisis. Finally, the stage of reorganization is the period where the victims have recovered from their tragic experience.

During the impact stage, Bard and Sangrey (1979: 34-39ff) indicate that crime victims fall apart and become numb and disoriented. Their defense systems crumble. They become unconscious of their actions and feel physically immobilized. Their inability to sleep or eat at this stage is not uncommon among victims of crime. Furthermore, their behaviour becomes quite childlike and dependent. They feel vulnerable, lonely, lost, and very helpless. Everything becomes a problem, and they need the help and direction of other people. More prevalent is their disbelief that they have been victimized. However, these reactions do not necessarily appear immediately after the victimization. They may be expressed several hours or days after the crime. Undoubtedly, the emotions experienced by crime victims are irrational but quite normal.

The recoil stage marks the beginning of the crime victims' psychological recovery. This recovery could proceed in two forms. One, the crime victims may insulate themselves from their feelings by indulging in some kind of activity. In doing so, it makes them feel emotionally detached from their victimization and it restores their sense of invulnerability. Second, the victims of crime may deal with their emotions by talking to others about their victimization. In either case, the victims start to deal

with such emotions as fear, anger, sadness, self-pity, and guilt. Unfortunately, the crime victims do go through occasional periods of denial and depression (Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 40-46ff).

Once the victims reach the final phase, the reorganization stage, feelings of fear and rage diminish. The crime victims usually assimilate and accept the victimization. However, it is normal for victims of crime to undergo a delayed recovery. Moreover, certain aspects of the crime victims' attitudes and behaviour become permanently changed. In the end, one of two things can happen:

1. The victims can recover entirely from the violation and become stronger individuals.
2. The victims can experience long-term negative consequences as a result of their painful episode (Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 46-47ff).

3.4 Changes in Attitude

Even if the adverse effects of victimization eventually diminish, the victim does experience a permanent transformation in self-perception and view of the world

(Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 47). The basic assumptions that people have of themselves and the world include a sense of personal invulnerability, competence, and autonomy (Lejeune and Alex, 1973: 263; Janoff-Bulman and Frieze, 1983: 3; Wortman, 1983: 199 & 209; Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 15); a view of the world as being meaningful, comprehensible, safe, and just (Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 4; Janoff-Bulman and Frieze, 1983: 3; Wortman, 1983: 199 & 209; Taylor et al., 1983: 23); and that others can be trusted (Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 14; Lejeune and Alex, 1973: 263-264; Wortman, 1983: 199 & 209). Once an individual is victimized, however, these perceptions are undermined. The victim recognizes his/her vulnerability and feels a loss of autonomy (Lejeune and Alex, 1973: 273; Janoff-Bulman and Frieze, 1983: 4; Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 15). This awareness of powerlessness and helplessness leads to a negative self-image. As a result, the victim sees him/herself as weak, unworthy, and out of control. The world is no longer meaningful and comprehensible nor is it safe and just (Janoff-Bulman and Frieze, 1983: 6). Furthermore, the victim realizes that not everyone is trustworthy (Lejeune and Alex, 1973: 284; Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 14). Consequently, the victim formulates new "assumptions about himself, about others, and about his surroundings" (Lejeune and Alex, 1973: 261). This leads to the next two null hypotheses:

Null H4: Crime victims do not have a more negative attitude towards people than non-victims of crime.

Null H5: Crime victims do not have a more negative attitude towards the criminal justice system than non-victims of crime.

3.5 Security Behaviour

Other reactions experienced by crime victims are changes in "security behaviour." Maguire (1980: 266) notes that burglary victims usually buy insurance or increase their coverage; install new locks or bolts or an alarm in their homes; and/or they become more "security conscious" by locking doors or shutting windows, putting furniture against doors, the possession of a makeshift weapon or firearm, fortifying one's home, moving to a new location, and/or finding a new job (Maguire, 1980: 266; Waller and Okihiro, 1978: 80; Janoff-Bulman and Frieze, 1983: 10). Other behavioural responses to victimization include the decreasing use of parks, decreasing downtown trips, and the avoidance of strangers (Rosenthal in Waller and Okihiro, 1978: 79-80).

One of the major reasons attributed to these responses is the victim's attempt to regain control (Maguire, 1980: 266).

Such behaviour, Janoff-Bulman and Frieze (1983: 10) propose, "can provide the victim with a sense of environmental control and can thereby minimize their newfound perception of vulnerability."

Contrary to the above contentions, Miransky and Langer (1978: 400) found "no difference between burglarized and nonburglarized subjects on measures of lock use, crime prevention attitude or feelings of helplessness." They propose the "distancing hypothesis" as accounting for this lack of difference. In other words, burglary victims do not become more security-conscious because they want to forget the event. The precautions that can be taken only remind them of their victimization(s) (p. 404). In view of this fact, the final null hypothesis is proposed:

Null H6: Crime victims do not undergo any behavioural changes as a result of their victimization(s).

3.6 Secondary Victimization

Further victimization by family, friends, and/or the criminal justice system can add to the crime victim's trauma. For example, family and friends may blame and derogate the victim. They may regard the victim as a loser (Taylor et al., 1983: 23; Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 6). The police can be unsympathetic, callous, and unhelpful, as well

as showing little concern for the victim (Barkas, 1978: 161; Reiff, 1979: 93). Within the judicial system the victim can be treated "as a piece of evidence with no rights or considerations as a wronged person" (Reiff, 1979: 92). Flea-bargaining, for instance, excludes the victim from the process, and it denies him/her justice. Postponements and delays in the proceedings augment transportation costs, child care expenses, and lost wages. Court procedure is not usually explained to the victim which only adds to the intimidating character of the judicial system (Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 125-127ff; Reiff, 1979: 96 & 99ff). Louise Gilbert summarizes her experience with the criminal justice system in the following statement: "I was victimized by the murder of my children. Then the system victimized me again" (Newsweek, May 28, 1984: 13). Subsequently, these factors influence the amount of anxiety and stress suffered by the victim which, in turn, affect the individual's capacity to recuperate (Gray in Ball, 1976: 393).

3.7 Conclusion

Upon review of the literature, it is apparent that there are two areas of concern: (1) crime's influence on social interaction, and (2) the socio-psychological reactions experienced by victims of crime. This particular research concentrates on the latter, especially on the crime victims'

sense of attachment to society. Included are the emotional reactions to victimization, and the attitudinal and behavioural characteristics of crime victims.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

4.1 Finding A Sample

The study of crime victims is not an easy topic to research. James Garofalo (in Galaway and Hudson, 1981: 99) identifies two problems in obtaining a representative sample of crime victims:

"(1) information about victims is not routinely collected by the criminal justice system, and (2) the information that does exist in agency files pertains only to those criminal events that come to the attention of and are recorded by agency personnel."

Other sources of hindrance include: (1) the lack of co-operation by law enforcement agencies to disclose the names and/or telephone numbers of crime victims to researchers, and (2) the haphazard reporting of crime victims' names and/or addresses by the newspapers. As a viable solution to these problems, Garofalo (in Galaway and Hudson, 1981: 99) suggests the use of the victimization survey.

The sampling alternatives available to this researcher in studying the impact of crime on victims were: (1) obtaining

the names and/or addresses of crime victims from the judicial court files or newspaper files, (2) procuring the names, addresses, and/or telephone numbers of crime victims from the police or the National Victims Resource Centre in Ottawa, and (3) a victimization survey using a sample of university students.

As Garofalo (in Galaway and Hudson, 1981: 99) states, all judicial court files available to the public contain information regarding the offenders and not the victims. The newspaper files of The Windsor Star, however, report the names and/or addresses of some crime victims. For example, the "Break-in Blotter" in The Windsor Star contained 45 names and/or addresses of burglary victims from the column's initial date of publication in July 1984 to the end of December 1984. Other occurrences of burglary were reported but either the names and addresses of the victims were withheld, or the addresses that were listed were those of schools, businesses, and apartment buildings with no identifiable victims. Information concerning other types of crime victims were published less frequently. According to one of the crime reporters for The Windsor Star, the names and addresses of crime victims are made public with the consent of the victims, and the news articles are selected on the basis of public interest and the amount of time and space available. Consequently, newspaper files, and

especially court files, are not the ideal sources for collecting a sample of crime victims necessary for quantitative research.

The police department denied a request made for the names and addresses of both property crime victims such as burglary, theft, and vandalism and victims of personal violence such as robbery, physical assault, and assault with a gun. The reason is that these files are confidential and only available to other recognized police agencies, the crown attorney, the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board, and other official bodies. It was then suggested to the police that they select a random sample of both property crime victims and victims of personal violence from 1984. In so doing, rather than disclosing the names and addresses of these victims, only their telephone numbers would be required. Before contacting the respondents, a letter of introduction would be sent to each of them by the police. It would explain the intent of the study and ensure its anonymity and confidentiality. By telephone, each of the respondents would then be contacted and asked for their consent in participating in the study. Again, the police denied the request on the basis that it would still constitute a breach of confidentiality.

As another alternative in attaining a sample of crime victims, the National Victims Resource Centre in Ottawa was contacted. Unfortunately, they do not have files on individual cases of victimization. They only have information regarding victimological literature.

Subsequently, the most practical solution to obtaining a sample of crime victims was the victimization survey. This technique did not only enable the researcher to examine the impact of crime on victims, but it also allowed for a comparative study of crime victims to non-victims of crime. Although a city-wide survey would have been ideal, it was too large of a task for one researcher in terms of being very expensive and time consuming. Instead, the survey involved a sample of university students.

Before conducting the actual research, a pilot study was carried out to test the possibility that there are a significant number of crime victims among university students. A one-page questionnaire (see APPENDIX A: Pilot Study) concerning the incidents of victimizations between January 1, 1984 and December 31, 1984 was randomly administered to 60 students (30 males and 30 females) at the university library. The respondents were carefully selected making sure that they were not enrolled in introductory sociology. This precautionary measure was taken so as to

avoid the contamination of the actual research sample that would later be used.

The results of the pilot study indicated that 33 students (or 55%) were victims of crime in 1984. Of the 33 victims, 19 were male and 14 were female. The number of victimizations are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: PIICT STUDY

The Incidents of Victirizations

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Robbery	0	1
Burglary	2	2
Assault*	2	3
Theft	13	9
Vandalism	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>
Totals	25	22
Overall Total	<u>47</u>	

*Note: Assault includes both physical assault and assault with a gun.

Based on the outcome of the pilot study, it was safe to assume that a significant number of crime victims could be obtained from a sample of university students.

Prior to the collection of data, a questionnaire was constructed (see APPENDIX A: Questionnaire & The Concepts Defined) and pre-tested with 15 respondents none of which

were enrolled in introductory sociology. The pre-test revealed that 7 (or 46.7%) of the respondents were victims of crime between January 1, 1984 and December 31, 1984. As far as the questionnaire was concerned, the respondents had no apparent difficulties with it. As a result, the questionnaire was unchanged.

4.2 Data Collection

The actual research involved a convenience sample of introductory sociology students at the University of Windsor. The reasons for using this convenience sample were two-fold: (1) introductory sociology classes comprised of students of various ages, from different faculties, and in different year levels; and (2) significant differences in attitude among students from other faculties were not suspected. There were 7 introductory sociology classes--1 evening class and 6 day classes--totalling 970 students. With the permission of the instructing professors, the victimization survey covering a 12-month reference period from January 1, 1984 to December 31, 1984 was administered to all of the classes. The students were asked to complete the questionnaire as instructed, and return it to the researcher immediately after it's completion. The final number in the sample was 414 respondents. Thus, there was a 42.7% response rate. A definite sampling bias which accounted for such a low response rate was absenteeism.

Some of the problems encountered during the data collection were minor but nevertheless worth mentioning. First, the data was collected from March 27, 1985 to April 3, 1985. This extended the reference period to approximately 16 months. But because the researcher felt that people tend to remember events in terms of the year that they occur, the original reference period remained unchanged. According to this argument, a reference period from April 1984 to March 1985 would have increased the respondents' tendency to "inaccurately place (the victimization) in time" (Garofalo in Galaway and Hudson, 1981: 101). For example, a victimization that occurred February or March of 1984 could have been incorrectly placed within the reference period by the respondent. Conversely, a victimization that occurred within the appropriate time frame could have been placed outside of the reference period by the respondent. Thus, for the sake of more accurate recall by the respondents, the reference period included January 1, 1984 to December 31, 1984. Finally, the questionnaire that was administered to the evening class did not contain the socio-economic questions comprising of annual income and occupation nor were these items pre-tested. As a consequence, a minimum of 44 cases in the sample are missing from the socio-economic variables.

4.3 Data Analysis

The data base of this research consists of 10 categories embracing 68 items all of which are applicable to the victims of crime. There are 5 categories and 24 items that apply to both the crime victims and non-victims of crime. The remaining 5 categories and 44 items pertain only to the crime victims which include two severity scales that were created.

The reason for devising two severity scales is based on previous research which suggested that the primary variable related to the impact of crime on victims is the severity of the crime(s). To reiterate, Barkas (1978: 149-150) and Bard and Sangrey (1979: 32-33) agree that the impact of crime is contingent upon two factors: the type(s) of crime(s) suffered and the degree of the violation(s) as experienced by the victim. The former condition implies an objective approach to severity while the latter proposes a subjective measure of severity.

The subjective severity scale involves the total sum of the individual severity scores given by the victims for each crime that they suffered. The total possible score is 30.

The objective severity scale rests upon the ranking of the six crimes--robbery, burglary, physical assault, assault

with a gun, theft and vandalism--by a panel of six student judges. As an effort to establish a level of consistency, the judges were given the definitions of each crime in accordance to how they were defined and operationalized in this study. The judges then ranked the crimes in terms of severity from the most severe to the least severe. The rankings are indicated in Table 2.

<u>CRIMES</u>	<u>JUDGES</u>					
	J1	J2	J3	J4	J5	J6
Robbery	3	3	3	3	3	3
Burglary	4	4	4	4	4	4
Physical Assault	2	1	2	2	2	1
Assault with a Gun	1	2	1	1	1	2
Theft	6	5	5	5	6	5
Vandalism	5	6	6	6	5	6

The Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (Norusis, 1983: 130-131) concerning the judges' rankings of the six crimes was .94. This means that the judges had a similar ranking for the crimes.

Subsequently, each crime was assigned a numerical value according to its ranking. The more severe the crime, the larger the value. In this case:

Assault with a gun=6
Physical assault=5
Robbery=4
Burglary=3
Theft=2
Vandalism=1

By using this ranking scheme, the victims were given a total objective severity index score according to the crime(s) that they suffered. For example, a respondent who was a victim of physical assault, theft, and vandalism would receive a total objective severity index score of 8. The total possible score is 21.

Since the subjective and the objective severity scales are different, they were converted into Z score variables. In doing so, the two different scales were transformed into the same scale. The Pearson correlation between the two Z score severity scales was .7 (Norusis, 1983: 205 & 99). Thus, the judges ranked the severity of crimes similar to those indicated by the crime victims.

In order to analyze the data, the crime victims were equally divided into three severity groups: low, medium, and high. These divisions were done in relation to their total objective severity index scores and total subjective severity scores. Within each severity group of crime

victims, the items and their frequency distributions were analyzed and compared. This provided some information about the characteristics associated with each group of victims, and revealed some apparent differences among them. In effect, severity is the independent variable.

The actual analysis of the data consisted of crosstabulations using the chi-square statistic for nominal and ordinal variables, and t tests were used for interval variables. In both cases, the level of significance was set at .05.

Chi-square was used to test "(t)he hypothesis that two variables of a crosstabulation (were) independent of each other" (Norusis, 1983: 52). A small probability, less than .05, rejected this hypothesis of independence.

The t test was used to check the equality of means hypothesis. There are two t values that can be used: the separate-variance t test and the pooled-variance t test. The t test that is used depends on the value of F. The F value is used to test the equality of variances hypothesis (Norusis, 1983: 79-80). As a general rule, Norusis (1983: 80) specifies that "If the observed significance level for the F test is small, the hypothesis that the population variances are equal is rejected, and the separate-variance t

test for means should be used." In the instance of a large observed significance level for the F test, it is safe to assume that the variances are equal, and the pooled-variance t test is used. In either case, a small significance level for the t test indicates that the means are unequal, and that the two groups exhibit statistically significant differences on the particular item being tested.

The first stage of analysis involved a comparative study of crime victims to non-victims of crime. More specifically, the non-victims of crime were also compared to each severity group of crime victims. Therefore, the following groups were tested on all of the items that apply to both of them.

1. Non-Victims of Crime vs Crime Victims
2. Non-Victims vs Low Objective Severity Victims
3. Non-Victims vs Medium Objective Severity Victims
4. Non-Victims vs High Objective Severity Victims
5. Non-Victims vs Low Subjective Severity Victims
6. Non-Victims vs Medium Subjective Severity Victims
7. Non-Victims vs High Subjective Severity Victims

The final stage of analysis concerned only the victims of crime. Hence, the low, the medium, and the high severity

groups were compared to each other on all of the items. Listed below are the groups of crime victims that were tested.

- TOTAL OBJECTIVE SEVERITY INDEX SCORES:

- Low vs Medium
- Low vs High
- Medium vs High

- TOTAL SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY SCORES:

- Low vs Medium
- Low vs High
- Medium vs High

4.4 Conclusion

Hence, the use of a total objective severity index scale and a total subjective severity scale as the independent variables allowed for more substantial results than simply comparing the crime victims to the non-victims of crime in relation to anomia. It permitted for a more sophisticated comparison between the non-victims of crime and the various severity groups of crime victims. This provided an indication of some of the additional variables that distinguish the crime victims from the non-victims. Finally, this method of analysis revealed some of the factors that are associated with different severity groups of crime victims.

CHAPTER V

EXAMINATION OF THE RESULTS

5.1 Introduction

Presented in this chapter are the significant findings. It begins with an analysis of the descriptive statistics followed by an investigation of the relationships specified in the previous chapter. Finally, a summary of the most relevant results is provided.

5.2 Descriptive Statistics

The frequency distributions indicate that the overwhelming majority of respondents were female (66.2%), single (87.4%), 18 to 24 years of age (87.2%), Roman Catholic (51.1%), first year university students (71.2%) who majored in social science (56.4%), and lived with their parents (50.6%). In terms of socio-economic status, the preponderance of people in the sample came from families whose fathers were either managers/owners (23.5%) or operatives (22.6%), such as factory workers, and whose parents had a combined annual income of \$20,000 to \$39,999 (44.6%). These findings are displayed in Tables 3 through 11, respectively.

Table 3: SEX

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
MALE	1	140	33.8
FEMALE	2	274	66.2
TOTAL		414	100.0
MEAN	1.662	STD ERR	.023
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	.474
SKEWNESS	-.697	MEDIAN	2.000
VARIANCE	.224	MISSING CASES	0

Table 4: MARITAL STATUS

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
SINGLE	1	360	87.4
MARRIED	2	33	8.0
WIDOWED	3	1	.2
SEPARATED	4	5	1.2
DIVORCED	5	8	1.9
LIVING TOGETHER	6	5	1.2
TOTAL		412	100.0
MEAN	1.260	STD ERR	.043
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	.865
SKEWNESS	4.035	MEDIAN	1.000
VARIANCE	.747	MISSING CASES	2

Table 5: AGE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
18-24	2	360	87.2
25-34	3	37	9.0
35-44	4	12	2.9
45-54	5	2	.5
55 AND OVER	6	2	.5
TOTAL		413	100.0
MEAN	2.182	STD ERR	.027
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	.543
SKWNESS	3.758	MEDIAN	2.000
VARIANCE	.295	MISSING CASES	1

Table 6: RELIGION

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NONE	0	39	9.4
ROMAN CATHOLIC	1	211	51.1
EASTERN RITE	2	2	.5
GREEK ORTHODOX	3	17	4.1
JEWISH	4	5	1.2
PROTESTANT	5	114	27.6
OTHER	6	25	6.1
TOTAL		413	100.0
MEAN	2.436	STD ERR	.101
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	2.062
SKWNESS	.525	MEDIAN	1.000
VARIANCE	4.251	MISSING	1

Table 7: YEAR IN UNIVERSITY

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
PRELIMINARY	0	19	4.6
FIRST	1	294	71.2
SECOND	2	56	13.6
THIRD	3	27	6.5
FOURTH	4	9	2.2
CTHER	5	8	1.9
	TOTAL	413	100.0
MEAN	1.363	STD ERR	.045
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	.905
SKEWNESS	2.041	MEDIAN	1.000
VARIANCE	.819	MISSING CASES	1

Table 8: MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
UNDECIDED	0	62	15.2
SOCIAL SCIENCE	1	230	56.4
SCIENCE	2	53	13.0
ARTS	3	20	4.9
BUSINESS	4	37	9.1
HUMAN KINETICS	5	3	.7
ENGINEERING	6	1	.2
EDUCATION	7	2	.5
	TOTAL	408	100.0
MEAN	1.419	STD ERR	.060
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	1.216
SKEWNESS	1.530	MEDIAN	1.000
VARIANCE	1.47	MISSING CASES	6

Table 9: LIVING ARRANGEMENT

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
RENT	1	122	29.8
CWN	2	29	7.1
ROOM AND BOARD	3	24	5.9
LIVE WITH PARENTS	4	207	50.6
RESIDENCE	5	25	6.1
CTHER	6	2	.5
	TOTAL	409	100.0
MEAN	2.976	STD ERR	.071
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.436
SKEWNESS	-.401	MEDIAN	4.000
VARIANCE	2.063	MISSING CASES	5

Table 10: OCCUPATION

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
PROFESSIONAL	1	41	12.2
MANAGER OR OWNER	2	79	23.5
SFMI-PROFESSIONAL	3	42	12.5
CLERICAL OR SALES	4	8	2.4
CRAFTSMAN, FOREMAN	5	62	18.5
OPERATIVE	6	76	22.6
SERVICE WORKER	7	15	4.5
UNSKILLED	8	13	3.9
	TOTAL	336	100.0
MEAN	3.964	STD ERR	.113
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	2.070
SKEWNESS	.095	MEDIAN	4.000
VARIANCE	4.285	MISSING CASES	78

Table 11: ANNUAL INCOME

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
UNDER \$10,000	1	35	11.1
\$10,000-19,999	2	32	10.2
\$20,000-29,999	3	63	20.1
\$30,000-39,999	4	77	24.5
\$40,000-49,999	5	53	16.9
\$50,000 CF MORE	6	54	17.2
	TOTAL	314	100.0
MEAN	3.774	STD ERR	.086
MODE	4.000	STD DEV	1.557
SKEWNESS	-.222	MEDIAN	4.000
VARIANCE	2.425	MISSING CASES	100

The number of respondents that rated themselves as crime victims for 1984 totalled 177 (43.5%) while 230 (56.5%) ranked themselves as non-victims of crime. This is illustrated in Table 12.

As shown in Table 13, those who rated themselves as crime victims reported a total of 325 incidents of victimization for 1984. This included 6 (1.9%) individuals who believed that they were robbery victims, 42 (12.9%) who indicated that they had been burglarized, 57 (17.5%) who admitted to

Table 12: VICTIMIZATION

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
CRIME VICTIMS	1.00	177	43.5
NCN-VICTIMS OF CRIME	2.00	230	56.5
	TOTAL	407	100.0
MEAN	1.565	STD ERR	.025
MODE	2.000	STD DEV	.496
SKWNESS	-.264	MEDIAN	2.000
VARIANCE	.246	MISSING CASES	7

being physically assaulted, 16 (4.9%) people who specified that they had been assaulted with a gun, 136 (41.9%) who felt that they suffered a theft, and 68 (20.9%) respondents who classified themselves as victims of vandalism.

Table 13: FREQUENCIES OF CRIMES

	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
ROBBERY	6	1.9
BURGLARY	42	12.9
PHYSICAL ASSAULT	57	17.5
ASSAULT WITH A GUN	16	4.9
THEFT	136	41.9
VANDALISM	68	20.9
TOTAL	325	100.0

Note: Each victim could have experienced more than one crime.

5.3 A Comparison of Non-Victims to Crime Victims

5.3.1 Demographic Status

A significant difference between the non-victims of crime and the crime victims was found in terms of sex. Although the females dominated both the crime victims (54.2%) and the non-victims of crime (75.5%) categories, this was due to the fact that two-thirds of the sample consisted of females. However, Table 14 indicates that the majority of males (59.1%) considered themselves as crime victims while only 35.6% of the females placed themselves in this group.

Table 14: VICTIMIZATION BY SEX

A Comparison of Non-Victims to Crime Victims in Terms of Sex.

	CCUNT	I				
	ROW PCT	MALE		FEMALE		ROW
	CCL PCT					TOTAL
	TOT PCT		I		I	
			+		+	+
CRIME VICTIMS		I 81	I	I 96	I	I 177
		I 45.8	I	I 54.2	I	I 43.5
		I 59.1	I	I 35.6	I	
		I 19.9	I	I 23.6	I	
		+	+	+	+	+
NON-VICTIMS OF CRIME		I 56	I	I 174	I	I 230
		I 24.3	I	I 75.7	I	I 56.5
		I 40.9	I	I 64.4	I	
		I 13.8	I	I 42.8	I	
		+	+	+	+	+
	COLUMN	137		270		407
	TOTAL	33.7		66.3		100.0
CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE				
19.59419	1	0.0000				

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 7

5.3.2 Anomia

The crime victims and the non-victims of crime revealed no significant differences on anomia. The t test showed the following: Crime Victims, N=173, Mean=1.89, SD=1.31; Non-Victims of Crime, N=223, Mean=1.77, SD=1.38; t=0.82, p=0.41. Hence, on the average, the respondents experienced low levels of anomia.

5.3.3 Attitudes Towards the Judicial System

The non-victims of crime had a larger percentage of its members (61%) than did the crime victims (58.3%) who believed that the courts do not deal harshly enough with criminals. Between the two groups, 17.7% of the crime victims and 11.2% of the non-victims of crime thought that the courts deal justly with the criminals.

5.3.4 Attitudes Towards the Police

Approval of the use of physical force by the police in certain situations was greater among the non-victims of crime (76.8%) than among the crime victims (69.9%). Moreover, a greater percentage of crime victims (19.7%) than non-victims of crime (9.4%) were opposed to its use.

Table 15: VICTIMIZATION BY ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM

A Comparison of Non-Victims to Crime Victims in Terms of Their Perceptions of the Courts' Treatment of Criminals.

	CCOUNT	I	NON-VICT	ROW
	ECW PCT	I	IMS OF	TOTAL
	CCL PCT	ICRIME	IMS OF	TOTAL
	TOT PCT	IVICTIMS	I CRIME	I
TOO HARSHLY	I	6	I	I
	I	100.0	I	I
	I	3.4	I	I
	I	1.5	I	I
ABOUT RIGHT	I	31	I	25
	I	55.4	I	44.6
	I	17.7	I	11.2
	I	7.8	I	6.3
DON'T KNOW	I	36	I	62
	I	36.7	I	63.3
	I	20.6	I	27.8
	I	9.0	I	15.6
NOT HARSHLY ENOUGH	I	102	I	136
	I	42.9	I	57.1
	I	58.3	I	61.0
	I	25.6	I	34.2
	CCLUMN	175	223	398
	TOTAL	44.0	56.0	100.0

CHI-SQUARE D.F. SIGNIFICANCE

12.79512 3 0.0051

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 16

Table 16: VICTIMIZATION BY ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE POLICE

A. Comparison of Non-Victims to Crime Victims in terms of Their Approval of the Use of Physical Force by the Police.

	CCUNT	I		NON-VICT	ROW
	FCW PCT	I		IMS OF	TOTAL
	COL PCT	ICRIME		ICRIME	
	TOT PCT	ICRIME		ICRIME	
YES		I 121	I 172	I	293
		I 41.3	I 58.7	I	73.8
		I 69.9	I 76.8	I	
		I 30.5	I 43.3	I	
NO		I 34	I 21	I	55
		I 61.8	I 38.2	I	13.9
		I 19.7	I 9.4	I	
		I 8.6	I 5.3	I	
NOT SURE		I 18	I 31	I	49
		I 36.7	I 63.3	I	12.3
		I 10.4	I 13.8	I	
		I 4.5	I 7.8	I	
	COLUMN	173	224		397
	TOTAL	43.6	56.4		100.0

CHI-SQUARE

D.F.

SIGNIFICANCE

8.99567

2

0.0111

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 17

5.4 A Comparison of Non-Victims to Low Objective Severity Victims

5.4.1 Demographic Status

Sex produced significant differences between the non-victims of crime and the low objective severity group of crime victims. A larger percentage of the males (31.7%) in comparison to 17.1% of the females were ranked as low objective severity crime victims.

5.4.2 Anomia

There were no significant differences in the mean scores of anomia between the low objective severity victims and the non-victims of crime. The t test exhibited these results: Low Objective Severity Victims, N=61, Mean=1.67, SD=1.27; Non-Victims of Crime, N=223, Mean=1.77, SD=1.38; $t=-0.48$, $p=0.63$. The mean scores suggest that, on the average, both groups in the sample suffered low levels of anomia.

Table 17: LOW OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMIZATION BY SEX

A Comparison of Non-Victims to Low Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Sex.

	CCUNT	I				
	ROW	PCT	MALE		FEMALE	ROW
	COL	PCT	I		I	TOTAL
	TOT	PCT	I		I	I
LOW	I		26	I	36	I 62
OBJECTIVE	I	41.9		I	58.1	I 21.2
SEVERITY	I	31.7		I	17.1	I
VICTIMS	I	8.9		I	12.3	I
NON-VICTIMS	I		56	I	174	I 230
	I	24.3		I	75.7	I 78.8
	I	68.3		I	82.9	I
	I	19.2		I	59.6	I
COLUMN			82		210	292
TOTAL			28.1		71.9	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
6.63422	1	0.0100

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 122

5.4.3 Attitudes Towards the Judicial System

Fewer respondents of the low objective severity classification (50.8%) than of those grouped as non-victims of crime (61%) stated that the courts do not deal harshly enough with criminals. Eighteen percent (18%) of the low objective severity victims indicated that the courts treat the criminals about right in comparison to 11.2% of the non-victims of crime who felt this way.

Table 18: LOW OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF THE COURTS

A Comparison of Non-Victims to Low Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Their Perceptions of the Courts' Treatment of Criminals.

	COUNT	ILCV	I	NON-	ROW
	ROW PCT	IOEJ.	I	VICTIMS	TOTAL
	CCL PCT	ISEV.	I	VICTIMS	
	TOT PCT	IVICTIMS	I	VICTIMS	
TOO HARSHLY	I	2	I		2
	I	100.0	I		.7
	I	3.3	I		
	I	.7	I		
ABOUT RIGHT	I	11	I	25	36
	I	30.6	I	69.4	12.7
	I	18.0	I	11.2	
	I	3.9	I	8.8	
DON'T KNOW	I	17	I	62	79
	I	21.5	I	78.5	27.8
	I	27.9	I	27.8	
	I	6.0	I	21.8	
NOT HARSHLY ENCUGH	I	31	I	136	167
	I	18.6	I	81.4	58.8
	I	50.8	I	61.0	
	I	10.9	I	47.9	
	COLUMN	61	223	284	
	TOTAL	21.5	78.5	100.0	

CHI-SQUARE D.F. SIGNIFICANCE

9.91207 3 0.0193

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 130

5.4.4 Attitudes Towards the Police

Almost an equal percentage of the low objective severity victims (71.7%) as of the non-victims of crime (76.8%) agreed that some situations warrant the use of physical force by the police. However, a greater percentage of the low objective severity victims (20%) in relation to 9.4% of the non-victims of crime were against its use by the police.

5.5 A Comparison of Non-Victims to Medium Objective Severity Victims

5.5.1 Demographic Status

Approximately 29% of the males constituted the medium objective severity group of crime victims as opposed to 14.7% of the females. This relationship was significant at the .01 level.

5.5.2 Anomia

Medium objective severity crime victims and non-victims of crime revealed similar means. On the average, low levels of anomia were associated with the two groups. This is supported by the subsequent findings: Medium Objective Severity Victims, $N=52$, $Mean=1.87$, $SD=1.37$; Non-Victims of Crime, $N=223$, $Mean=1.77$, $SD=1.38$; $t=0.46$, $p=0.64$.

Table 19: LOW OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF THE POLICE

A Comparison of Non-Victims to Low Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Their Approval of the Use of Physical Force by the Police.

	CCOUNT FOR CCL TOT	PCT PCT PCT	LOW IOEJ. ISEV. IVICTIMS	NON- IVICTIMS	ROW TOTAL
YES	I		43	I 172	I 215
	I		20.0	I 80.0	I 75.7
	I		71.7	I 76.8	I
	I		15.1	I 60.6	I
NO	I		12	I 21	I 33
	I		36.4	I 63.6	I 11.6
	I		20.0	I 9.4	I
	I		4.2	I 7.4	I
NOT SURE	I		5	I 31	I 36
	I		13.9	I 86.1	I 12.7
	I		8.3	I 13.8	I
	I		1.8	I 10.9	I
	COLUMN TOTAL		60 21.1	224 78.9	284 100.0
<u>CHI-SQUARE</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE</u>			
5.89331	2	0.0525			

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 130

Table 20: MEDIUM OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMIZATION BY SEX

A Comparison of Non-Victims to Medium Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Sex.

	CCUNT	I				
	ROW PCT	IMALE		FEMALE		ROW
	COL PCT	I				TOTAL
	TCT PCT	I		I		I
MEDIUM OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	I	23	I	30	I	53
	I	43.4	I	56.6	I	18.7
	I	29.1	I	14.7	I	
	I	8.1	I	10.6	I	
NCN-VICTIMS	I	56	I	174	I	230
	I	24.3	I	75.7	I	81.3
	I	70.9	I	85.3	I	
	I	19.8	I	61.5	I	
COLUMN TOTAL		79		204		283
		27.9		72.1		100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
------------	------	--------------

6.84917	1	0.0089
---------	---	--------

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 131

5.5.3 Attitudes Towards the Judicial System

The majority of medium objective severity victims (64.2%) and non-victims of crime (61%) agreed that the courts are too lenient. With 18.9% of the medium objective severity victims, only 11.2% of the non-victims of crime felt that the courts treated the criminals about right. A larger

percentage of the non-victims of crime (27.8%) as opposed to the percentage of medium objective severity victims (13.2%) were uncertain.

5.5.4 Attitudes Towards the Police

Of those who were placed in the medium objective severity group, 88.5% approved of the use of physical force by the police in certain situations, and 76.8% of the non-victims of crime were in favour of its use.

5.6 A Comparison of Non-Victims to High Objective Severity Victims

5.6.1 Demographic Status

The crosstabulation of high objective severity victims and non-victims of crime by sex was highly significant. First, 36.4% of the males were rated as high objective severity victims as compared to 14.7% of the females. Finally, the high objective severity victim category was dominated by the males (51.6%).

5.6.2 Anomia

The t test between the high objective severity victims and the non-victims of crime on anomia was not significant. In comparison to the previous results, there was a slight increase in the difference of means, but on the average, the two groups still had low scores of anomia. The outcome was as follows: High Objective Severity Victims, N=60, Mean=2.1, SD=1.27; Non-Victims of Crime, N=223, Mean=1.77, SD=1.38; $t=1.69$, $p=0.09$.

5.6.3 Attitudes Towards People

Significant differences between the high objective severity victims and the non-victims of crime were detected with regard to their views on the degree to which people are helpful. Exactly 21% of those classified as high objective severity victims and 34.1% of those who recognized themselves as non-victims of crime believed that people are helpful. However, 25.8% of the high objective severity victims in contrast to 13.5% of the non-victims of crime were of the opinion that people are out for themselves.

5.6.4 Attitudes Towards the Judicial System

More of the high objective severity victims (16.4%) than of the non-victims of crime (11.2%) were inclined to agree with the courts' treatment of criminals.

Table 21: MEDIUM OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF THE COURTS

A Comparison of Non-Victims to Medium Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Their Perceptions of the Courts' Treatment of Criminals.

	COUNT FOR CCT	PERCENT PCT TCT	MEDIUM OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	NON- VICTIMS	ROW TOTAL
TOO HARSHLY	I	2	I	I	2
	I	100.0	I	I	.7
	I	3.8	I	I	
	I	.7	I	I	
ABOUT RIGHT	I	10	I	25	35
	I	29.6	I	71.4	12.7
	I	18.9	I	11.2	
	I	3.6	I	9.1	
DON'T KNOW	I	7	I	62	69
	I	10.1	I	89.9	25.0
	I	13.2	I	27.8	
	I	2.5	I	22.5	
NOT HARSHLY ENOUGH	I	34	I	136	170
	I	20.0	I	80.0	61.6
	I	64.2	I	61.0	
	I	12.3	I	49.3	
	COLUMN TOTAL	53 19.2	223 80.8	276 100.0	

CHI-SQUARE D.F. SIGNIFICANCE

14.11342 3 0.0028

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 138

Table 22: MEDIUM OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF THE POLICE

A Comparison of Non-Victims to Medium Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Their Approval of the Use of Physical Force by the Police.

	COUNT	MEDIUM			ROW		
	ROW	PCT	IOEJ.		TOTAL		
	COL	PCT	ISEV.	NON-			
	TOT	PCT	IVICTIMS	IVICTIMS			
YES	I		46	I	172	I	218
	I	21.1		I	78.9	I	79.0
	I	88.5		I	76.8	I	
	I	16.7		I	62.3	I	
NO	I		4	I	21	I	25
	I	16.0		I	84.0	I	9.1
	I	7.7		I	9.4	I	
	I	1.4		I	7.6	I	
NOT SURE	I		2	I	31	I	33
	I	6.1		I	93.9	I	12.0
	I	3.8		I	13.8	I	
	I	.7		I	11.2	I	
	COLUMN		52		224		276
	TOTAL		18.8		81.2		100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
4.38517	2	0.1116

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 138

Table 23: HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMIZATION BY SEX

A Comparison of Non-Victims to High Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Sex.

	CCOUNT	I				
	ROW	PCT	MALE		FEMALE	ROW
	CCL	PCT	I		I	TOTAL
	TOT	PCT	I		I	I
HIGH	I		32	I	30	I 62
OBJECTIVE	I	51.6		I	48.4	I 21.2
SEVERITY	I	36.4		I	14.7	I
VICTIMS	I	11.0		I	10.3	I
NON-VICTIMS	I		56	I	174	I 230
	I	24.3		I	75.7	I 78.8
	I	63.6		I	95.3	I
	I	19.2		I	59.6	I
COLUMN			88		204	292
TOTAL			30.1		69.9	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
15.97195	1	0.0001

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 122

Table 24: HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF PEOPLE

A Comparison of Non-Victims to High Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Their Perceptions of People's Tendency to be Helpful.

	COUNT FOR COL TOT	HIGH PCT PCT	ICEJ. ISEV. IVICTIMS	NON- VICTIMS	ROW TOTAL
HELPFUL	I	13	I	76	I 89
	I	14.6	I	85.4	I 31.2
	I	21.0	I	34.1	I
	I	4.6	I	26.7	I
DEPENDS	I	28	I	108	I 136
	I	20.6	I	79.4	I 47.7
	I	45.2	I	48.4	I
	I	9.8	I	37.9	I
DON'T KNOW	I	5	I	9	I 14
	I	35.7	I	64.3	I 4.9
	I	8.1	I	4.0	I
	I	1.8	I	3.2	I
OUT FOR THEMSELVES	I	16	I	30	I 46
	I	34.8	I	65.2	I 16.1
	I	25.8	I	13.5	I
	I	5.6	I	10.5	I
	COLUMN TOTAL	62 21.8	223 78.2	285 100.0	

CHI-SQUARE D.F. SIGNIFICANCE

8.96960 3 0.0297

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 129

Table 25: HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF THE COURTS

A Comparison of Non-Victims to High Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Their Perceptions of the Courts' Treatment of Criminals.

	COUNT ROW COL TCT	HIGH PCT PCT PCT	IOEJ. ISEV. VICTIMS	NON- VICTIMS	ROW TOTAL
TOO HARSHLY	I		2	I	I
	I	100.0		I	I
	I	3.3		I	I
	I	.7		I	I
ABOUT RIGHT	I		10	I	I
	I	28.6		I	I
	I	16.4		I	I
	I	3.5		I	I
DON'T KNOW	I		12	I	I
	I	16.2		I	I
	I	19.7		I	I
	I	4.2		I	I
NOT HARSHLY ENCUGH	I		37	I	I
	I	21.4		I	I
	I	60.7		I	I
	I	13.0		I	I
	COLUMN TOTAL		61 21.5	223 78.5	284 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
9.57146	3	0.0226

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 130

5.6.5 Attitudes Towards the Police

Within the high objective severity victims ranking, 52.5% approved of a policeman striking an adult male citizen in certain situations while 29.5% of these respondents disapproved of such actions. However, 76.8% of the non-victims of crime favoured the use of physical force by the police in some instances, and only 9.4% of this group were against it.

5.7 A Comparison of Non-Victims to Low Subjective Severity Victims

5.7.1 Demographic Status

On the basis of sex, significant differences were found between low subjective severity victims and non-victims of crime. A larger percentage of the males (26.3%) than of the females (15.1%) specified that they were crime victims.

Table 26: HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF THE POLICE

A Comparison of Non-Victims to High Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Their Approval of the Use of Physical Force by the Police.

	CCOUNT ROW PCT CCL PCT TOT PCT	HIGH IOBJ. ISEV. IVICTIMS	NON- VICTIMS	ROW TOTAL
YES	I	32	I 172	I 204
	I	15.7	I 84.3	I 71.6
	I	52.5	I 76.8	I
	I	11.2	I 60.4	I
NO	I	18	I 21	I 39
	I	46.2	I 53.8	I 13.7
	I	29.5	I 9.4	I
	I	6.3	I 7.4	I
NOT SURE	I	11	I 31	I 42
	I	26.2	I 73.8	I 14.7
	I	18.0	I 13.8	I
	I	3.9	I 10.9	I
	COLUMN TOTAL	61 21.4	224 78.6	285 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
18.73757	2	0.0001

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 129

Table 27: LOW SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMIZATION BY SEX

A Comparison of Non-Victims to Low Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Sex.

	CCUNT I				
	ROW PCT I	MALE	FEMALE	ROW	TOTAL
	CCL PCT I				
	TOT PCT I				
LOW SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	I	20	I 31	I	51
	I	39.2	I 60.8	I	18.1
	I	26.3	I 15.1	I	
	I	7.1	I 11.0	I	
NON-VICTIMS	I	56	I 174	I	230
	I	24.3	I 75.7	I	81.9
	I	73.7	I 84.9	I	
	I	19.9	I 61.9	I	
COLUMN TOTAL		76	205		281
		27.0	73.0		100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
3.95347	1	0.0468

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 133

5.7.2 Anomia

Similar to the preceding results, there were no significant differences between the low subjective severity victims and the non-victims of crime. Both groups had means that indicated low levels of anomia. These were the findings: Low Subjective Severity Victims, $N=51$, $Mean=1.63$, $SD=1.34$; Non-Victims of Crime, $N=223$, $Mean=1.77$, $SD=1.38$; $t=-0.65$, $p=0.51$.

5.7.3 Attitudes Towards People

The non-victims of crime (11.2%) had a larger proportion of respondents than the low subjective severity victims (4%) who thought that most people would try to take advantage of them if they got the chance. Furthermore, there was a larger percentage of the non-victims of crime (21.9%) in relation to the proportion of low subjective severity victims (12%) who felt that most people try to be fair. It seems that a larger percentage of the low subjective severity victims (Depends + Don't Know=84%) than of the non-victims of crime (Depends + Don't Know=66.9%) were uncertain about people's tendency to be fair.

5.8 A Comparison of Non-Victims to Medium Subjective
Severity Victims

5.8.1 Demographic Status

A greater portion of the males (36.4%) than of the females (14.7%) were found in the medium subjective severity victims category. In addition, more males (51.6%) than females (48.4%) indicated that they were medium subjective severity victims.

5.8.2 Anomia

On the average, both the medium subjective severity victims and the non-victims of crime reported low anomia scores. This finding was substantiated by the subsequent t test: Medium Subjective Severity Victims, $N=60$, Mean=1.83, $SD=1.32$; Non-Victims of Crime, $N=223$, Mean=1.77, $SD=1.38$; $t=0.33$, $p=0.74$.

5.8.3 Attitudes Towards People

Skepticism about people's aptness to be fair was greater among the medium subjective severity victims (20%) than among the non-victims of crime (11.2%).

Table 28: LOW SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF PEOPLE

A Comparison of Non-Victims to Low Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Their Perceptions of People's Tendency to be Fair

	CCOUNT	ILCW		NCN-	ROW
	ROW PCT	ISUBJ.		IVICTIMS	TOTAL
	COL PCT	ISEV.		IVICTIMS	
	TOT PCT	IVICTIMS		IVICTIMS	
TAKE ADVANTAGE	I	2	I	25	I 27
	I	7.4	I	92.6	I 9.9
	I	4.0	I	11.2	I
	I	.7	I	9.1	I
DEPENDS	I	33	I	132	I 165
	I	20.0	I	80.0	I 60.2
	I	66.0	I	58.9	I
	I	12.0	I	48.2	I
DON'T KNOW	I	9	I	18	I 27
	I	33.3	I	66.7	I 9.9
	I	18.0	I	8.0	I
	I	3.3	I	6.6	I
TRY TO BE FAIR	I	6	I	49	I 55
	I	10.9	I	39.1	I 20.1
	I	12.0	I	21.9	I
	I	2.2	I	17.9	I
	COLUMN	50	224	274	
	TOTAL	18.2	81.8	100.0	
CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE			
8.57077	3	0.0356			

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 140

Table 29: MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMIZATION BY SEX

A Comparison of Non-Victims to Medium Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Sex.

CCUNT I	ROW PCT I	MALE I	FEMALE I	ROW TOTAL I
CCL PCT I				
TOT PCT I				
MEDIUM I	32 I	30 I	62 I	
SUBJECTIVE I	51.6 I	48.4 I	21.2 I	
SEVERITY I	36.4 I	14.7 I		
VICTIMS I	11.0 I	10.3 I		
NCN-VICTIMS I	56 I	174 I	230 I	
I	24.3 I	75.7 I	78.8 I	
I	63.6 I	85.3 I		
I	19.2 I	59.6 I		
COLUMN TOTAL	88	204	292	
	30.1	69.9	100.0	

<u>CHI-SQUARE</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE</u>
15.97195	1	0.0001

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 122

Table 30: MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF PEOPLE

A Comparison of Non-Victims to Medium Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Their Perceptions of People's Tendency to be Fair.

	CCOUNT ROW COL TOT	PCT PCT PCT	MEDIUM ISUBJ. ISEV. IVICTIMS	NON- VICTIMS	ROW TOTAL
TAKE ADVANTAGE	I		12	I 25	I 37
	I		32.4	I 67.6	I 13.0
	I		20.0	I 11.2	I
	I		4.2	I 8.8	I
DEPENDS	I		40	I 132	I 172
	I		23.3	I 76.7	I 60.6
	I		66.7	I 58.9	I
	I		14.1	I 46.5	I
DON'T KNOW	I		2	I 18	I 20
	I		10.0	I 90.0	I 7.0
	I		3.3	I 8.0	I
	I		.7	I 6.3	I
TRY TO BE FAIR	I		6	I 49	I 55
	I		10.9	I 89.1	I 19.4
	I		10.0	I 21.9	I
	I		2.1	I 17.3	I
	COLUMN TOTAL		60 21.1	224 78.9	284 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
8.23787	3	0.0413

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 130

5.8.4 Attitudes Towards the Judicial System

Although a similar percentage of people within both groups agreed that the courts lack in severity, a greater percentage of the medium subjective severity victims (18%) than of the non-victims of crime (11.2%) believed that criminals are justly punished. A larger proportion of the non-victims (27.8%) compared to 18% of the medium subjective severity victims had no opinion on this subject.

5.9 A Comparison of Non-Victims to High Subjective Severity Victims

5.9.1 Demographic Status

Consistent with the prior cases is the fact that the males had a larger percentage of its gender (30.9%) in the high subjective severity category than did the females (15.1%).

5.9.2 Anomia

As shown by the t test below, the mean anomia scores for both the high subjective severity victims and the non-victims of crime were low. T test: High Subjective Severity Victims, N=54, Mean=2.09, SD=1.26; Non-Victims of Crime, N=223, Mean=1.77, SD=1.38; $t=1.58$, $p=0.12$.

Table 31: MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF THE COURTS

A Comparison of Non-Victims to Medium Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Their Perceptions of the Courts' Treatment of Criminals.

	COUNT FOR TOTAL	PCT PCT	MEDIUM ISSUEJ. SEV. VICTIMS	NON- VICTIMS	ROW TOTAL
TOO HARSHLY	I		3	I	I
	I	100.0		I	I
	I	4.9		I	I
	I	1.1		I	I
ABOUT RIGHT	I		11	I	25
	I	30.6		I	69.4
	I	18.0		I	11.2
	I	3.9		I	8.8
DON'T KNOW	I		11	I	62
	I	15.1		I	84.9
	I	18.0		I	27.8
	I	3.9		I	21.8
NOT HARSHLY ENOUGH	I		36	I	136
	I	20.9		I	79.1
	I	59.0		I	61.0
	I	12.7		I	47.9
	COLUMN TOTAL		61 21.5	223 78.5	284 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
------------	------	--------------

14.53513

3

0.0023

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 130

Table 32: HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMIZATION BY SEX

A Comparison of Non-Victims to High Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Sex.

	CCOUNT	I			
ROW	PCT	IMALE	FEMALE	ROW	TOTAL
COL	PCT	I	I	I	I
TOT	PCT	I	I	I	I
HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	I	25	I 31	I	56
	I	44.6	I 55.4	I	19.6
	I	30.9	I 15.1	I	
	I	8.7	I 10.8	I	
NCN-VICTIMS	I	56	I 174	I	230
	I	24.3	I 75.7	I	80.4
	I	69.1	I 84.9	I	
	I	19.6	I 60.8	I	
COLUMN TOTAL		81	205		286
		28.3	71.7		100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
9.16501	1	0.0043

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 128

5.9.3 Attitudes Towards the Police

A smaller percentage of the high subjective severity victims (54.5%) than of the non-victims of crime (76.9%) approved of the use of physical force by the police in certain situations. In fact, compared to 9.4% of the non-victims of crime, 29.1% of the high subjective severity victims disapproved of it in all situations.

Table 33: HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS' OPINION OF THE POLICE

A Comparison of Non-Victims to High Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Their Approval of the Use of Physical Force by the Police.

	CCOUNT FCW CCL TOT	PCT PCT	IGH ISUBJ. ISEV. VICTIMS	NON- VICTIMS	ROW TOTAL
YES	I		30	I 172	I 202
	I		14.9	I 85.1	I 72.4
	I		54.5	I 76.8	
	I		10.8	I 61.6	
NO	I		16	I 21	I 37
	I		43.2	I 56.8	I 13.3
	I		29.1	I 9.4	
	I		5.7	I 7.5	
NOT SURE	I		9	I 31	I 40
	I		22.5	I 77.5	I 14.3
	I		16.4	I 13.8	
	I		3.2	I 11.1	
	COLUMN TOTAL		55 19.7	224 80.3	279 100.0

<u>CHI-SQUARE</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE</u>
-------------------	-------------	---------------------

16.15624	2	0.0003
----------	---	--------

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 135

5.10 A Comparison of Objective Severity Victims

5.10.1 Types of Crimes Suffered

Although the chi-square for Table 34 was not statistically significant, the frequency of robbery was the highest among the high objective severity victims (83.3%). This was also true for the frequencies of burglary (54.8%), physical assault (75.4%), assault with a gun (100%), theft (39.7%), and vandalism (52.9%). However, the frequencies of burglary and physical assault were also high among the medium objective severity victims with 45.2% and 24.6%, respectively. In addition, the frequencies of theft and vandalism were prevalent among low, medium, and high objective severity victims.

5.10.2 Incidents of Victimization

The incidents of victimization were directly related to the objective severity rankings of the victims. For example, as the incidents increased so did the objective severity rating of victims.

Table 34: TOTAL OBJECTIVE SEVERITY INDEX BY ROBBERY

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Being a Victim of Robbery.

	OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS				ROW TOTAL
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH		
YES	1	5	3.4	6	
	16.7	83.3	3.4	100.0	
	1.9	8.2	3.4	100.0	
	.6	2.9	3.4	100.0	
NO	61	52	55	168	
	36.3	31.0	32.7	96.0	
	100.0	98.1	90.2	100.0	
	34.9	29.7	31.4	100.0	
NOT SURE			1	1	
			100.0	100.0	
			1.6	1.6	
			.6	.6	
COLUMN TOTAL	61	53	61	175	
	34.9	30.3	34.9	100.0	
CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE			
8.71546	4	0.0686			

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 239

Table 35: TOTAL OBJECTIVE SEVERITY INDEX BY BURGLARY

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Being a Victim of Burglary.

	CCOUNT	I	ECW PCT	IOEJECTIVE	SEVERITY	VICTIMS	ROW-	
	COL	PCT	I	I	MEDIUM	I	TOTAL	
	TCT	PCT	I	ICW	I	HIGH	I	
YES				I	I	19	I	
				I	I	45.2	I	
				I	I	36.5	I	
				I	I	10.9	I	
NO				I	I	60	I	
				I	I	46.2	I	
				I	I	100.0	I	
				I	I	34.5	I	
NOT SURE				I	I		I	
				I	I		I	
				I	I		I	
				I	I		I	
	CCOLUMN				60	52	62	174
	TOTAL				34.5	29.9	35.6	100.0

CHI-SQUARE D.F. SIGNIFICANCE

33.61408 4 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 240

Table 36: TOTAL OBJECTIVE SEVERITY INDEX BY PHYSICAL ASSAULT

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Being a Victim of Physical Assault.

	CCOUNT	I	ROW PCT	OBJECTIVE SEVERITY	VICTIMS	RCW		
	CCI	PCT	I	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	TOTAL	
	TOT	PCT	I					
YES	I		I	14	I	43	I	57
	I		I	24.6	I	75.4	I	32.9
	I		I	27.5	I	69.4	I	
	I		I	8.1	I	24.9	I	
NO	I	60	I	37	I	19	I	115
	I	52.2	I	32.2	I	15.7	I	66.5
	I	100.0	I	72.5	I	29.0	I	
	I	34.7	I	21.4	I	10.4	I	
NOT SURE	I		I		I	1	I	1
	I		I		I	100.0	I	.6
	I		I		I	1.6	I	
	I		I		I	.6	I	
	COLUMN	60		51		62		173
	TOTAL	34.7		29.5		35.8		100.0

<u>CHI-SQUARE</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE</u>
70.47246	4	0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 241

Table 37: TOTAL OBJECTIVE SEVERITY INDEX BY ASSAULT WITH A GUN

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Being a Victim of Assault with a Gun.

	CCUNT I	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	ROW TOTAL
ROW	PCT	OBJECTIVE	SEVERITY	VICTIMS	
CCL	PCT				
TCT	PCT				
YES					
				16	16
				100.0	9.0
				25.8	
				9.0	
NO					
		62	52	46	160
		38.8	32.5	28.8	90.4
		100.0	98.1	74.2	
		35.0	29.4	26.0	
NOT SURE					
			1		1
			100.0		.6
			1.9		
			.6		
COLUMN TOTAL		62	53	62	177
		35.0	29.9	35.0	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
34.79940	4	0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 237

Table 38: TOTAL OBJECTIVE SEVERITY INDEX BY THEFT

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Being a Victim of Theft.

	CCOUNT	ROW PCT	OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS			ROW TOTAL
			LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	
YES	I		50	32	54	136
	I		36.8	23.5	39.7	77.7
	I		80.6	60.4	90.0	
	I		28.6	18.3	30.9	
NO	I		12	21	3	36
	I		33.3	58.3	8.3	20.6
	I		19.4	39.6	5.0	
	I		6.9	12.0	1.7	
NOT SURE	I				3	3
	I				100.0	1.7
	I				5.0	
	I				1.7	
	COLUMN TOTAL		62 35.4	53 30.3	60 34.3	175 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
.25.50130	4	0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 239

Table 39: TOTAL OBJECTIVE SEVERITY INDEX BY VANDALISM

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Being a Victim of Vandalism.

	COUNT			OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS			ROW TOTAL
	ROW	PCT	COL	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	
YES	I	12	I	20	I	36	I 68
	I	17.6	I	29.4	I	52.9	I 38.9
	I	19.7	I	37.7	I	59.0	I
	I	6.9	I	11.4	I	20.6	I
NO	I	45	I	33	I	20	I 98
	I	45.9	I	33.7	I	20.4	I 56.0
	I	73.8	I	62.3	I	32.8	I
	I	25.7	I	18.9	I	11.4	I
NOT SURE	I	4	I		I	5	I 9
	I	44.4	I		I	55.6	I 5.1
	I	6.6	I		I	8.2	I
	I	2.3	I		I	2.9	I
	COLUMN TOTAL	61	53	61	175		
		34.9	30.3	34.9	100.0		

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
25.92509	4	0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 239

Table 40: TOTAL OBJECTIVE SEVERITY INDEX BY THE INCIDENTS

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Objective Severity Victims in Terms of the Number of Different Crimes that They have Suffered.

INCIDENTS	CCUNT I	OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS			ROW TOTAL
	ROW PCT I	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	
	CCL PCT I				
	TCT PCT I				
1	I	62	20	1	83
	I	74.7	24.1	1.2	46.9
	I	100.0	37.7	1.6	
	I	35.0	11.3	.6	
2	I		33	20	53
	I		62.3	37.7	29.9
	I		62.3	32.3	
	I		18.6	11.3	
3	I			31	31
	I			100.0	17.5
	I			50.0	
	I			17.5	
4	I			7	7
	I			100.0	4.0
	I			11.3	
	I			4.0	
5	I			3	3
	I			100.0	1.7
	I			4.8	
	I			1.7	
	COLUMN TOTAL	62 35.0	53 29.9	62 35.0	177 100.0

CHI-SQUARE D.F. SIGNIFICANCE

178.55986

8

0.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 237

5.10.3 Emotional Reactions

The differences in the mean number of emotional reactions suffered by the three objective severity groups of crime victims were significant between low and medium objective severity victims (Low Objective Severity Victims, N=60, Mean=0.22, SD=0.59; Medium Objective Severity Victims, N=50, Mean=1.26, SD=1.56; $t=-4.47$, $p=0.000$) and low and high objective severity victims (Low Objective Severity Victims, N=60, Mean=0.22, SD=0.56; High Objective Severity Victims, N=57, Mean=1.09, SD=1.12; $t=-5.22$, $p=0.000$). On the average, victims ranked in the low objective severity group experienced almost no emotional reactions while those ranked in the medium and the high objective severity categories indicated approximately one reaction.

Some of the more prominent emotional reactions suffered by the medium objective severity victims included a fear of being alone (18%), a fear of entering their residence (21.6%), a fear of walking alone at night (21.6%), and sleeplessness (21.6%). The high objective severity victims experienced similar reactions. Respectively, the percentages for the high group were 17.5%, 13.3%, 20%, and 13.3%.¹

¹ Each respondent could have indicated more than one emotional reaction.

Table 41: FEAR OF BEING ALONE AMONG MEDIUM OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS

The Frequency of Medium Objective Severity Victims who had a Fear of Being Alone.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	41	82.0
YES	1	9	18.0
TOTAL		50	100.0
MEAN	.180	STD ERR	.055
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.388
SKEWNESS	1.718	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.151	MISSING CASES	3

Table 42: FEAR OF RESIDENCE AMONG MEDIUM OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS

The Frequency of Medium Objective Severity Victims who had a Fear of Entering Their Residence.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	40	78.4
YES	1	11	21.6
TOTAL		51	100.0
MEAN	.216	STD ERR	.058
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.415
SKEWNESS	1.425	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.173	MISSING CASES	2

Table 43: FEAR OF WALKING ALONE AMONG MEDIUM OBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of Medium Objective Severity Victims who had a Fear of Walking Alone at Night.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	40	78.4
YES	1	11	21.6
TOTAL		51	100.0
MEAN	.216	STD ERR	.058
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.415
SKEWNESS	1.425	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.173	MISSING CASES	2

Table 44: SLEEPLESSNESS AMONG MEDIUM OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS

The Frequency of Medium Objective Severity Victims who Suffered from Sleeplessness.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	40	78.4
YES	1	11	21.6
TOTAL		51	100.0
MEAN	.216	STD ERR	.058
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.415
SKEWNESS	1.425	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.173	MISSING CASES	2

Table 45: FEAR OF BEING ALONE AMONG HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS

The Frequency of High Objective Severity Victims who had a Fear of Being Alone.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NC	0	47	82.5
YFS	1	10	17.5
TOTAL		57	100.0
MEAN	.175	STD ERR	.051
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.384
SKEWNESS	1.753	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.147	MISSING CASES	5

Table 46: FEAR OF RESIDENCE AMONG HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS

The Frequency of High Objective Severity Victims who had a Fear of Entering Their Residence.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NC	0	52	86.7
YFS	1	8	13.3
TOTAL		60	100.0
MEAN	.133	STD ERR	.044
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.343
SKEWNESS	2.213	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.119	MISSING CASES	2

Table 47: FEAR OF WALKING ALONE AMONG HIGH OBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of High Objective Severity Victims who had a Fear of Walking Alone at Night.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NC	0	48	80.0
YES	1	12	20.0
TOTAL		60	100.0
MEAN	.200	STD ERR	.052
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.403
SKEWNESS	1.539	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.163	MISSING CASES	2

Table 48: SLEEPLESSNESS AMONG HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS

The Frequency of High Objective Severity Victims who Suffered Sleeplessness.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NC	0	52	86.7
YFS	1	8	13.3
TOTAL		60	100.0
MEAN	.133	STD ERR	.044
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.343
SKEWNESS	2.213	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.119	MISSING CASES	2

Table 49: OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS STILL BOTHERED BY CRIME

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Still Being Bothered by Their Victimization(s).

	CCUNT	I	ROW PCT	OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	ROW			
	CCL PCT	I	TOT PCT	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	TOTAL	
YES	I	10	I	17	I	22	I	49
	I	20.4	I	34.7	I	44.9	I	29.5
	I	16.7	I	35.4	I	37.9	I	
	I	6.0	I	10.2	I	13.3	I	
NO	I	47	I	28	I	29	I	103
	I	45.6	I	27.2	I	27.2	I	62.0
	I	78.3	I	58.3	I	48.3	I	
	I	28.3	I	16.8	I	16.9	I	
NOT SURE	I	3	I	3	I	8	I	14
	I	21.4	I	21.4	I	57.1	I	8.4
	I	5.0	I	6.3	I	13.8	I	
	I	1.8	I	1.8	I	4.8	I	
	COLUMN	60		48		58		166
	TOTAL	36.1		28.9		34.9		100.0

CHI-SQUARE D.F. SIGNIFICANCE

12.94342 4 0.0121

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 248

Of those victims still bothered by their victimization(s), 44.9% were placed in the high severity group, 34.7% were ranked as medium severity victims, and 20.4% were classified in the low severity category.

5.10.4 Assistance

Statistically there were no significant differences among the objective severity victims in terms of asking someone for assistance after the victimization(s). Nevertheless, the majority of those who asked for assistance were high objective severity victims (38.6%). Furthermore, 55.7% of the high objective severity victims, 51% of the medium group, and 49.2% of the low group asked someone for assistance. This resulted in 88 crime victims (or $88/169=52.1\%$) who turned to someone for assistance immediately after their victimization(s).

The low objective severity victims who requested assistance had 40% who turned to a family member or other relatives for help, 53.3% desired the assistance of a neighbour or friend, and 53.3% informed the police.²

² The reason why these percentages do not total 100% is because each respondent may have turned to more than one person or group of people for assistance.

Table 50: OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO ASKED FOR ASSISTANCE

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Asking Someone for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

ROW	OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS			ROW TOTAL
	CCOUNT	PCT	PCT	
TOT	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	
YES	I 29	I 25	I 34	I 89
	I 33.0	I 28.4	I 38.6	I 52.1
	I 49.2	I 51.0	I 55.7	I
	I 17.2	I 14.8	I 20.1	I
NO	I 30	I 24	I 25	I 79
	I 38.0	I 30.4	I 31.6	I 46.7
	I 50.8	I 49.0	I 41.0	I
	I 17.8	I 14.2	I 14.8	I
NOT SURE	I	I	I 2	I 2
	I	I	I 100.0	I 1.2
	I	I	I 3.3	I
	I	I	I 1.2	I
COLUMN TOTAL	59 34.9	49 29.0	61 36.1	169 100.0

CHI-SQUARE D.F. SIGNIFICANCE

4.50330 4 0.3422

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 245

Among those in the medium objective severity group who sought assistance, 51.9% requested help from a family member or other relatives, 25.9% asked a neighbour or friend, and 59.3% talked to the police.³

³ The reason why these percentages do not total 100% is because each respondent may have turned to more than one person or group of people for assistance.

Table 51: ASSISTANCE FROM FAMILY REQUESTED BY LOW OBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of Low Objective Severity Victims who Asked Family or Other Relatives for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	18	60.0
YES	1	12	40.0
	TOTAL	30	100.0
MEAN	.400	STD ERR	.091
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.498
SKEWNESS	-.430	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.248	MISSING CASES	32

Table 52: ASSISTANCE FROM FRIEND REQUESTED BY LOW OBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of Low Objective Severity Victims who Asked a Neighbour or Friend for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	14	46.7
YES	1	16	53.3
	TOTAL	30	100.0
MEAN	.533	STD ERR	.093
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	.507
SKEWNESS	-.141	MEDIAN	1.000
VARIANCE	.257	MISSING CASES	32

Table 53: ASSISTANCE FROM POLICE REQUESTED BY LOW OBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of Low Objective Severity Victims who Asked the Police for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	14	46.7
YES	1	16	53.3
TOTAL		30	100.0
MEAN	.533	STD ERR	.093
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	.507
SKEWNESS	-.141	MEDIAN	1.000
VARIANCE	.257	MISSING CASES	32

Table 54: ASSISTANCE FROM FAMILY REQUESTED BY MEDIUM OBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of Medium Objective Severity Victims who asked Family or Other Relatives for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	13	48.1
YES	1	14	51.9
TOTAL		27	100.0
MEAN	.519	STD ERR	.098
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	.509
SKEWNESS	-.079	MEDIAN	1.000
VARIANCE	.259	MISSING CASES	26

Table 55: ASSISTANCE FROM FRIEND REQUESTED BY MEDIUM OBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of Medium Objective Severity Victims who Asked a Neighbour or Friend for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	20	74.1
YES	1	7	25.9
	TOTAL	27	100.0
MEAN	.259	STD ERR	.086
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.447
SKEWNESS	1.164	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.199	MISSING CASES	26

Those who asked someone for assistance within the high objective severity category, 51.4% approached a family member or other relatives, 35.1% went to a neighbour or friend, and 43.2% called the police.*

* The reason why these percentages do not total 100% is because each respondent may have turned to more than one person or group of people for assistance.

Table 56: ASSISTANCE FROM POLICE REQUESTED BY MEDIUM OBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of Medium Objective Severity Victims who Asked the Police for Assistance Immediately After the Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	11	40.7
YES	1	16	59.3
TOTAL		27	100.0
MEAN	.593	STD ERR	.096
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	.501
SKWNESS	-.399	MEDIAN	1.000
VARIANCE	.251	MISSING CASES	26

Table 57: ASSISTANCE FROM FAMILY REQUESTED BY HIGH OBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of High Objective Severity Victims who asked Their Family or Other Relatives for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	18	48.6
YES	1	19	51.4
TOTAL		37	100.0
MEAN	.514	STD ERR	.083
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	.507
SKWNESS	-.056	MEDIAN	1.000
VARIANCE	.257	MISSING CASES	25

Table 58: ASSISTANCE FROM FRIEND REQUESTED BY HIGH OBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of High Objective Severity Victims who Asked a Neighbour or Friend for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	24	64.9
YES	1	13	35.1
TOTAL		37	100.0
MEAN	.351	STD ERR	.083
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.484
SKEWNESS	-.649	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.234	MISSING CASES	25

Table 59: ASSISTANCE FROM POLICE REQUESTED BY HIGH OBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of High Objective Severity Victims who Asked the Police for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	21	56.8
YES	1	16	43.2
TOTAL		37	100.0
MEAN	.432	STD ERR	.083
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.502
SKEWNESS	-.284	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.252	MISSING CASES	25

5.10-5 Precautions

High objective severity victims, on the average, had taken slightly more precautions than low objective severity victims. However, the difference in mean scores was marginal as the t test denotes: Low Objective Severity Victims, N=55, Mean=0.76, SD=0.77; High Objective Severity Victims, N=59, Mean=1.39, SD=1.16; $t=-3.42$, $p=0.001$. No significant differences in means were found between low and medium, and medium and high objective severity victims.

For the most part, the precautions taken by the objective severity victims were to install new locks (Medium Objective Severity Victims=16.7%; High Objective Severity Victims=26.7%), and make sure that all their doors and windows were locked (Low Objective Severity Victims=14.3%; Medium Objective Severity Victims=43.8%; High Objective Severity Victims=40%).⁵

⁵ Each respondent could have taken more than one precaution.

Table 60: LOW OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO LOCKED DOORS AND WINDOWS

The Frequency of Low Objective Severity Victims who Made Sure all Their Doors and Windows were Locked As a Result of Being Victimized

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	48	85.7
YES	1	8	14.3
TOTAL		56	100.0
MEAN	.143	STD ERR	.047
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.353
SKEWNESS	2.098	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.125	MISSING CASES	6

Table 61: MEDIUM OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO INSTALLED NEW LOCKS

The Frequency of Medium Objective Severity Victims who Installed New Locks as a Result of Being Victimized.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	40	83.3
YES	1	8	16.7
TOTAL		48	100.0
MEAN	.167	STD ERR	.054
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.377
SKEWNESS	1.847	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.142	MISSING CASES	5

Table 62: MEDIUM OBJECTIVE VICTIMS WHO LOCKED DOORS AND WINDOWS

The Frequency of Medium Objective Severity Victims who Made Sure all Their Doors and Windows were Locked as a Result of Being Victimized.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	27	56.3
YES	1	21	43.8
TOTAL		48	100.0
MEAN	.438	STD ERR	.072
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.501
SKEWNESS	-.260	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.251	MISSING CASES	5

Table 63: HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO INSTALLED NEW LOCKS

The Frequency of High Objective Severity Victims who Installed New Locks as a Result of Being Victimized.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	44	73.3
YES	1	16	26.7
TOTAL		60	100.0
MEAN	.267	STD ERR	.058
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.446
SKEWNESS	1.083	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.199	MISSING CASES	2

Table 64: HIGH OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO LOCKED DOORS AND WINDOWS

The Frequency of High Objective Severity Victims who Made Sure all Their Doors and Windows were Locked as a Result of Being Victimized.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FRQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	36	60.0
YES	1	24	40.0
	TOTAL	60	100.0
MEAN	.400	STD ERR	.064
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.494
SKEWNESS	-.419	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.244	MISSING CASES	2

Despite the lack of statistical significance, 6 out of a total of 7 victims who had moved, and 5 out of 7 victims who stayed home more often, both as a result of being victimized, were classified as high objective severity victims.

5.10.6 Anemia

The mean levels of anemia among low, medium, and high objective severity victims were not significantly different. All three groups, on the average, expressed low levels of anemia. This was exemplified by the t tests listed below:

1. Low Objective Severity Victims, $N=61$, Mean=1.67, SD=1.27; Medium Objective Severity Victims, $N=52$, Mean=1.87, SD=1.37; $t=-0.78$, $p=0.44$.

2. Low Objective Severity Victims, N=61, Mean=1.67, SD=1.27; High Objective Severity Victims, N=60, Mean=2.1, SD=1.27; $t=-1.85$, $p=0.07$.
3. Medium Objective Severity Victims, N=52, Mean=1.97, SD=1.37; High Objective Severity Victims, N=60, Mean=2.1, SD=1.27; $t=-0.94$, $p=0.35$.

5.10.7 Attitudes Towards the Police

The majority of victims within each objective severity group approved of the use of physical force by the police in certain situations. However, of those who approved, 35.5% belonged to the low category, 38% were ranked in the medium group, and only 26.4% were classified as high objective severity victims.

Table 65: OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO MOVED

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Moving Because of Their Victimization(s).

	CCOUNT	OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS			ROW
	PCT	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	TOTAL
YES-HAVE MOVED	1	1	6	7	
	14.3	85.7	4.3		
	2.0	10.5			
	.6	3.7			
YES-PLAN TO MOVE	1	1	2	4	
	25.0	25.0	50.0	2.4	
	1.7	2.0	3.7		
	.6	.6	1.2		
NO	57	46	47	150	
	38.0	30.7	31.3	91.5	
	98.3	93.9	82.5		
	34.8	28.0	28.7		
DON'T KNOW	1	1	2	3	
	33.3	66.7	1.8		
	2.0	3.5			
	.6	1.2			
COLUMN TOTAL	58	49	57	164	
	35.4	29.9	34.8	100.0	

CHI-SQUARE D.F. SIGNIFICANCE

11.47898

6

0.0747

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 250

Table 66: OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO STAYED HOME MORE OFTEN

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Staying Home More Often Because of Their Victimization(s).

	COUNT			PERCENT			TOTAL
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	
YES	2	5	7	28.6	71.4	4.1	
	4.1	8.3	3.0				
NO	59	41	51	39.1	27.2	33.8	151
	98.3	83.7	85.0	34.9	24.3	30.2	89.3
NOT SURE	1	6	4	9.1	54.5	36.4	11
	1.7	12.2	6.7	.6	3.6	2.4	6.5
	60	49	60	35.5	29.0	35.5	169
							100.0
CHI-SQUARE	D.F.		SIGNIFICANCE				
10.51667	4		0.0326				
NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 245							

Table 67: ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE POLICE AMONG OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Objective Severity Victims in Terms of Their Approval of the Use of Physical Force by the Police.

	COUNT		OBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS			ROW TOTAL
	ROW	PCT	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	
YES	I	43	I 46	I 32	I 121	
	I	35.5	I 39.0	I 26.4	I 69.9	
	I	71.7	I 88.5	I 52.5	I	
	I	24.9	I 26.6	I 18.5	I	
NO	I	12	I 4	I 18	I 34	
	I	35.3	I 11.8	I 52.9	I 19.7	
	I	20.0	I 7.7	I 29.5	I	
	I	6.9	I 2.3	I 10.4	I	
NOT SURE	I	5	I 2	I 11	I 18	
	I	27.8	I 11.1	I 61.1	I 10.4	
	I	8.3	I 3.8	I 18.0	I	
	I	2.9	I 1.2	I 6.4	I	
	COLUMN TOTAL	60 34.7	52 30.1	61 35.3	173 100.0	

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
17.85321	4	0.0013

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 241

5.11 A Comparison of Subjective Severity Victims

5.11.1 Types of Crimes Suffered

In comparison to the low and the medium groups, the high subjective severity victims had the largest frequencies of robbery (83.3%) and assault with a gun (80%). The frequencies of burglary were 31.7% and 68.3% for the medium and the high subjective severity victims, respectively. The frequency of physical assault among the subjective severity victims was not statistically significant. Nevertheless, 44.6% of those who were physically assaulted were high subjective severity victims. Finally, positive relationships were revealed concerning the frequencies of theft and vandalism in relation to the subjective severity rankings. In other words, as the frequencies of these two crimes increased, the degree of subjective severity increased as well. As a result, the high subjective severity victims had the greatest percentages of theft (39.5%) and vandalism (57.4%).

Table 68: TOTAL SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY SCORE BY ROBBERY

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Being a Victim of Robbery.

	COUNT		SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS			ROW TOTAL
	ROW	PCT	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	
	COL	PCT	I			
YES				1	5	6
			16.7		83.3	3.6
			1.6		9.1	
			.6		3.0	
NO			51	60	49	160
			31.9	37.5	30.6	95.8
			100.0	98.4	89.1	
			30.5	35.9	29.3	
NOT SURE					1	1
					100.0	.6
					1.9	
					.6	
	COLUMN TOTAL	51 30.5	61 36.5	55 32.9	167 100.0	
CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE				
9.53820	4	0.0490				

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 247

Table 69: TOTAL SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY SCORE BY BURGLARY

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Being a Victim of Burglary.

	COUNT	SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS			ROW TOTAL
		LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	
YES	I	I 13	I 28	I 41	
	I	I 31.7	I 68.3	I 24.7	
	I	I 21.7	I 50.9	I	
	I	I 7.8	I 16.9	I	
NO	I	I 51	I 46	I 26	I 123
	I	I 41.5	I 37.4	I 21.1	I 74.1
	I	I 100.0	I 76.7	I 47.3	I
	I	I 30.7	I 27.7	I 15.7	I
NOT SURE	I	I 1	I 1	I 2	
	I	I 50.0	I 50.0	I 1.2	
	I	I 1.7	I 1.6	I	
	I	I .6	I .6	I	
	COLUMN TOTAL	51 30.7	60 36.1	55 33.1	166 100.0

<u>CHI-SQUARE</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANCE</u>
39.02267	4	0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 248

Table 70: TOTAL SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY SCORE BY PHYSICAL ASSAULT

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Being a Victim of Physical Assault.

	CCOUNT	SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS			ROW
	PCT	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	TOTAL
YES	I 12	I 19	I 25	I 56	
	I 21.4	I 33.9	I 44.6	I 33.9	
	I 24.0	I 31.7	I 45.5	I	
	I 7.3	I 11.5	I 15.2	I	
NO	I 38	I 41	I 29	I 108	
	I 35.2	I 38.0	I 26.9	I 65.5	
	I 76.0	I 68.3	I 52.7	I	
	I 23.0	I 24.8	I 17.6	I	
NOT SURE	I	I	I 1	I 1	
	I	I	I 100.0	I .6	
	I	I	I 1.8	I	
	I	I	I .6	I	
	COLUMN TOTAL	50 30.3	60 36.4	55 33.3	165 100.0

CHI-SQUARE D.F. SIGNIFICANCE

7.98212 4 0.0922

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 249

Table 71: TOTAL SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY SCORE BY ASSAULT WITH A GUN

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Being a Victim of Assault with a Gun.

	COUNT			SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS	ROW TOTAL
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH		
YES	15	12	3	30	8.9
	33.3	40.0	10.0	83.3	
	50.0	60.0	15.0	125.0	
	16.7	20.0	5.0	41.7	
NO	51	58	44	153	90.5
	33.3	37.9	28.8	100.0	
	100.0	93.5	78.6	272.1	
	30.2	34.3	26.0	90.5	
NOT SURE	1	1	1	3	.6
	100.0	100.0	100.0	300.0	
	1.6	1.6	1.6	4.8	
	.6	.6	.6	1.8	
	COLUMN TOTAL	51	62	56	169
		30.2	36.7	33.1	100.0

CHI-SQUARE D.F. SIGNIFICANCE

19.78490 4 0.0009

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 245

Table 72: TOTAL SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY SCORE BY THEFT

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Being a Victim of Theft.

	COUNT	I		I		I	ROW
	FOR PCT	ISUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS					TOTAL
	COL PCT	I					
	TOT PCT	I LOW	I MEDIUM	I HIGH			
YES		I 37	I 43	I 50	I	130	
		I 28.5	I 33.1	I 38.5	I	77.8	
		I 72.5	I 69.4	I 92.6	I		
		I 22.2	I 25.7	I 29.9	I		
NO		I 14	I 18	I 2	I	34	
		I 41.2	I 52.9	I 5.9	I	20.4	
		I 27.5	I 29.0	I 3.7	I		
		I 8.4	I 10.8	I 1.2	I		
NOT SURE		I	I 1	I 2	I	3	
		I	I 33.3	I 66.7	I	1.8	
		I	I 1.6	I 3.7	I		
		I	I .6	I 1.2	I		
	COLUMN	51	62	54		167	
	TOTAL	30.5	37.1	32.3		100.0	

CHI-SQUARE D. F. SIGNIFICANCE

15.19624 4 0.0043

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 247

Table 73: TOTAL SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY SCORE BY VANDALISM

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Being a Victim of Vandalism.

	COUNT			SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS			ROW TOTAL		
	ROW	PCT	I	I	I	I			
	TOT	PCT	I	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH			
YES	I		11	I	18	I	39	I	68
	I		16.2	I	26.5	I	57.4	I	40.7
	I		22.0	I	29.0	I	70.9	I	
	I		6.6	I	10.8	I	23.4	I	
NO	I		36	I	41	I	14	I	91
	I		39.6	I	45.1	I	15.4	I	54.5
	I		72.0	I	66.1	I	25.5	I	
	I		21.6	I	24.6	I	8.4	I	
NOT SURE	I		3	I	3	I	2	I	8
	I		37.5	I	37.5	I	25.0	I	4.8
	I		6.0	I	4.8	I	3.6	I	
	I		1.8	I	1.8	I	1.2	I	
	COLUMN		50	62	55		167		
	TOTAL		29.9	37.1	32.9		100.0		

CHI-SQUARE D.F. SIGNIFICANCE

31.86341 3 4 0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 247

5.11.2 Incidents of Victimization

Similar to the findings concerning the objective severity rankings, a direct relationship was also found between the incidents of victimization and subjective severity.

Table 74: TOTAL SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY SCORE BY THE INCIDENTS

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of the Number of Different Crimes that They have Suffered.

INCIDENTS	COUNT		SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS			ROW TOTAL
	ROW	PCT	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	
	COL	PCT				
	TOT	PCT	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	
1	I		42	34		76
	I	55.3		44.7		45.0
	I	82.4		54.8		
	I	24.9		20.1		
2	I		9	2	22	52
	I	17.3		40.4	42.3	30.8
	I	17.6		33.9	39.3	
	I	5.3		12.4	13.0	
3	I			7	24	31
	I			22.6	77.4	18.3
	I			11.3	42.9	
	I			4.1	14.2	
4	I				7	7
	I				100.0	4.1
	I				12.5	
	I				4.1	
5	I				3	3
	I				100.0	1.8
	I				5.4	
	I				1.8	
C COLUMN			51	62	56	169
TOTAL			30.2	36.7	33.1	100.0

CHI-SQUARE D.F. SIGNIFICANCE

96.30307

8

0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 245

5.11.3 Emotional Reactions

Statistically significant differences in means were found between low and medium subjective severity victims, and low and high groups on emotional reactions. The emotional reactions undergone by the low subjective severity victims were, on the average, negligible. The victims who indicated a medium or a high severity level suffered a mean score of approximately one emotional reaction. The t tests were as follows:

1. Low Subjective Severity Victims, N=49, Mean=0.29, SD=0.68; Medium Subjective Severity Victims, N=60, Mean=0.9, SD=1.47; $t=-2.88$, $p=0.005$.
2. Low Subjective Severity Victims, N=49, Mean=0.29, SD=0.68; High Subjective Severity Victims, N=52, Mean=1.31, SD=1.13; $t=-5.55$, $p=0.000$.

The largest frequencies of emotional reactions undergone by medium subjective severity victims included a fear of entering their residence (14.8%), a fear of walking alone at night (18%), sleeplessness (11.5%), and nervousness (16.4%). On the other hand, the high subjective severity victims exhibited a fear of being alone (25%), a fear of entering their residence (16.7%), a fear of walking alone at night (24.1%), and sleeplessness (18.5%).⁶

⁶ Each respondent could have indicated more than one emotional reaction.

Table 75: FEAR OF RESIDENCE AMONG MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS

The Frequency of Medium Subjective Severity Victims who had a Fear of Entering Their Residence as a Result of Being Victimized.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	52	85.2
YES	1	9	14.8
	TOTAL	61	100.0
MEAN	.148	STD ERR	.046
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.358
SKEWNESS	2.038	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.128	MISSING CASES	1

An increase in subjective severity was accompanied by an increase in the percentage of victims who were still bothered by their victimization(s). Accordingly, the high subjective severity category had the highest percentage of victims (55.3%) who were still troubled in some way.

Table 76: FEAR OF WALKING ALONE AMONG MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of Medium Subjective Severity Victims who had a Fear of Walking Alone at Night as a Result of Being Victimized.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	50	82.0
YES	1	11	18.0
TOTAL		61	100.0
MEAN	.180	STD ERR	.050
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.388
SKEWNESS	1.705	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.150	MISSING CASES	1

Table 77: SLEEPLESSNESS AMONG MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS

The Frequency of Medium Subjective Severity Victims who Suffered from Sleeplessness as a Result of Being Victimized.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	54	88.5
YES	1	7	11.5
TOTAL		61	100.0
MEAN	.115	STD ERR	.041
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.321
SKEWNESS	2.479	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.103	MISSING CASES	1

Table 78: NERVOUSNESS AMONG MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS

The Frequency of Medium Subjective Severity Victims who Suffered from Nervousness as a Result of Being Victimized.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	51	83.6
YES	1	10	16.4
TOTAL		61	100.0
MEAN	.164	STD ERR	.048
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.373
SKEWNESS	1.862	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.139	MISSING CASES	1

Table 79: FEAR OF BEING ALONE AMONG HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS

The Frequency of High Subjective Severity Victims who had a Fear of Being Alone as a Result of Being Victimized.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	39	75.0
YES	1	13	25.0
TOTAL		52	100.0
MEAN	.250	STD ERR	.061
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.437
SKEWNESS	1.189	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.191	MISSING CASES	4

Table 80: FEAR OF RESIDENCE AMONG HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS

The Frequency of High Subjective Severity Victims who had a Fear of Entering Their Residence as a Result of Being Victimized.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	45	83.3
YES	1	9	16.7
	TOTAL	54	100.0
MEAN	.167	STD ERR	.051
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.376
SKEWNESS	1.840	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.142	MISSING CASES	2

Table 81: FEAR OF WALKING ALONE AMONG HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS

The Frequency of High Subjective Severity Victims who had a Fear of Walking Alone at Night as a Result of Being Victimized.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	41	75.9
YFS	1	13	24.1
	TOTAL	54 ✓	100.0
MEAN	.241	STD ERR	.059
MODE	.000	STE DEV	.432
SKEWNESS	1.248	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.186	MISSING CASES	2

Table 32: SLEEPLESSNESS AMONG HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS

The Frequency of High Subjective Severity Victims who Suffered from Sleeplessness as a Result of Being Victimized.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	44	81.5
YES	1	10	18.5
	TOTAL	54	100.0
MEAN	.185	STD ERR	.053
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.392
SKEWNESS	1.668	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.154	MISSING CASES	2

5.11.4 Assistance

The victims' tendency to ask someone for assistance had a significantly positive association with the level of severity. As the results show, 20% of those who turned to someone for help were low severity victims while 37.6% classified themselves in the medium severity group, and 42.4% rated themselves as high severity victims. A total of 95 crime victims (or $95/162=52.5\%$) requested assistance immediately after their victimization(s).

Table 93: SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS STILL BOTHERED BY CRIME

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Still Being Bothered by Their Victimization(s).

	COUNT			PERCENTAGE			ROW TOTAL
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	
YES	I	5	16	26			47
	I	10.6	34.0	55.3			29.6
	I	10.4	26.7	51.0			
	I	3.1	10.1	16.4			
NO	I	41	40	17			98
	I	41.8	40.8	17.3			61.6
	I	85.4	66.7	33.3			
	I	25.8	25.2	10.7			
NOT SURE	I	2	4	8			14
	I	14.3	28.6	57.1			8.8
	I	4.2	6.7	15.7			
	I	1.3	2.5	5.0			
	COLUMN TOTAL	48	60	51			159
		30.2	37.7	32.1			100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
29.54286	4	0.0000

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 255

In most cases, the low subjective severity victims who asked for help turned to a family member or other relatives (50%), neighbour or friend (44.4%), and/or the police

⁷ The reason why these percentages do not total 100% is because each respondent may have turned to more than one person or group of people for assistance.

Table 84: SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO ASKED SOMEONE FOR ASSISTANCE

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Asking Someone for Assistance Immediately After the Victimization(s).

	COUNT	SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS			ROW TOTAL
		LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	
YES	I 17	I 32	I 36	I 85	
	I 20.0	I 37.6	I 42.4	I 52.5	
	I 36.2	I 52.5	I 66.7		
	I 10.5	I 19.8	I 22.2		
NO	I 30	I 29	I 16	I 75	
	I 40.0	I 38.7	I 21.3	I 46.3	
	I 63.8	I 47.5	I 29.6		
	I 18.5	I 17.9	I 9.9		
NOT SURE	I	I	I 2	I 2	
	I	I	I 100.0	I 1.2	
	I	I	I 3.7		
	I	I	I 1.2		
	COLUMN TOTAL	47 29.0	61 37.7	54 33.3	162 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
14.83554	4	0.0051

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 252

(50%).⁷

Family or relatives (47.1%), neighbour or friend (32.4%), and the police (52.9%) were asked for help the most by the medium subjective severity victims who desired it.⁷

Table 85: ASSISTANCE FROM FAMILY REQUESTED BY LOW SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of Low Subjective Severity Victims who Asked Family or Other Relatives for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	9	50.0
YES	1	9	50.0
TOTAL		18	100.0
MEAN	.500	STD ERR	.121
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.514
SKEWNESS	.000	MEDIAN	.500
VARIANCE	.265	MISSING CASES	33

Table 86: ASSISTANCE FROM FRIEND REQUESTED BY LOW SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of Low Subjective Severity Victims who Asked a Neighbour or Friend for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	10	55.6
YES	1	8	44.4
TOTAL		18	100.0
MEAN	.444	STD ERR	.121
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.514
SKEWNESS	.244	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.261	MISSING CASES	33

Table 87: ASSISTANCE FROM POLICE REQUESTED BY LOW SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of Low Subjective Severity Victims who Asked the Police for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	9	50.0
YES	1	9	50.0
TOTAL		18	100.0
MEAN	-.500	STD ERR	.121
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.514
SKEWNESS	-.000	MEDIAN	-.500
VARIANCE	-.265	MISSING CASES	33

Table 88: ASSISTANCE FROM FAMILY REQUESTED BY MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of Medium Subjective Severity Victims who Asked Family or Other Relatives for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	19	52.9
YES	1	16	47.1
TOTAL		34	100.0
MEAN	-.471	STD ERR	.087
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.507
SKEWNESS	-.123	MEDIAN	-.000
VARIANCE	-.257	MISSING CASES	28

Table 89: ASSISTANCE FROM FRIEND REQUESTED BY MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of Medium Subjective Severity Victims who Asked a Neighbour or Friend for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	23	67.6
YES	1	11	32.4
TOTAL		34	100.0
MEAN	.324	STD ERR	.081
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.475
SKEWNESS	-.790	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.225	MISSING CASES	28

Table 90: ASSISTANCE FROM POLICE REQUESTED BY MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of Medium Subjective Severity Victims who Asked the Police for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	16	47.1
YES	1	18	52.9
TOTAL		34	100.0
MEAN	.529	STD ERR	.087
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	.507
SKEWNESS	-.123	MEDIAN	1.000
VARIANCE	.257	MISSING CASES	28

The high subjective severity victims who needed

assistance went to their families or relatives (51.3%), neighbours or friends (38.5%), and/or the police (51.3%).^a

Table 91: ASSISTANCE FROM FAMILY REQUESTED BY HIGH SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of High Subjective Severity Victims who Asked Family or Other Relatives for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	19	48.7
YES	1	20	51.3
	TOTAL	39	100.0
MEAN	.513	STD ERR	.081
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	.506
SKEWNESS	-.053	MEDIAN	1.000
VARIANCE	.256	MISSING CASES	17

^a The reason why these percentages do not total 100% is because each respondent may have turned to more than one person or group of people for assistance.

Table 92: ASSISTANCE FROM FRIEND REQUESTED BY HIGH SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of High Subjective Severity Victims who Asked a Neighbour or Friend for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	24	61.5
YES	1	15	39.5
TOTAL		39	100.0
MEAN	.395	STD ERR	.079
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.493
SKEWNESS	-.494	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.243	MISSING CASES	17

Table 93: ASSISTANCE FROM POLICE REQUESTED BY HIGH SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS

The Frequency of High Subjective Severity Victims who Asked the Police for Assistance Immediately After Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	19	48.7
YES	1	20	51.3
TOTAL		39	100.0
MEAN	.513	STD ERR	.081
MODE	1.000	STD DEV	.506
SKEWNESS	-.053	MEDIAN	1.000
VARIANCE	.256	MISSING CASES	17

5.11.5 Precautions

There were statistically significant differences of means among low, medium, and high subjective severity victims. The low severity victims had a mean score of 0.57 as opposed to 1.05 for the medium group and 1.60 for those in the high severity category. These were out of a possible total of eight (8) precautions that the victims could have taken since their victimization(s). Hence, the differences in the mean number of precautions taken by each severity group of victims were small. The results were expressed by the subsequent t tests:

1. Low Subjective Severity Victims, N=46, Mean=0.57, SD=0.81; Medium Subjective Severity Victims, N=57, Mean=1.05, SD=0.88; $t=-2.91$, $p=0.004$.
2. Low Subjective Severity Victims, N=46, Mean=0.57, SD=0.81; High Subjective Severity Victims, N=53, Mean=1.60, SD=1.12; $t=-5.35$, $p=0.000$.
3. Medium Subjective Severity Victims, N=57, Mean=1.05, SD=0.88; High Subjective Severity Victims, N=53, Mean=1.60, SD=1.12; $t=-2.89$, $p=0.005$.

The most frequent precautions taken by the subjective severity victims are summarized below:

1. Low Subjective Severity Victims: Made sure all their doors and windows were locked (14.9%).

2. Medium Subjective Severity Victims: Installed new locks (14%); and made sure all their doors and windows were locked (33.3%).
3. High Subjective Severity Victims: Bought insurance or increased their insurance coverage (15.1%); installed new locks (30.2%); made sure all their doors and windows were locked (49.1%); and avoided going out a night (15.1%).⁹

Table 94: LOW SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO LOCKED DOORS AND WINDOWS

The Frequency of Low Subjective Severity Victims who Made Sure all Their Doors and Windows were Locked Since Their Victimization(s) -

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	40	85.1
YES	1	7	14.9
	TOTAL	47	100.0
MEAN	.149	STD ERR	.052
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.360
SKEWNESS	2.038	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.130	MISSING CASES	4

⁹ Each respondent could have taken more than one precaution.

Table 95: MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO
INSTALLED NEW LOCKS

The Frequency of Medium Subjective Severity Victims
who Installed New Locks Since Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	49	86.0
YES	1	8	14.0
TOTAL		57	100.0
MEAN	.140	STD ERR	.046
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.350
SKEWNESS	2.127	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.123	MISSING CASES	5

Table 96: MEDIUM SUBJECTIVE VICTIMS WHO LOCKED DOORS
AND WINDOWS

The Frequency of Medium Subjective Severity Victims
who Made Sure all Their Doors and Windows were Locked
Since Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	38	66.7
YES	1	19	33.3
TOTAL		57	100.0
MEAN	.333	STD ERR	.063
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.476
SKEWNESS	.726	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.226	MISSING CASES	5

Table 97: HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO BOUGHT INSURANCE

The Frequency of High Subjective Severity Victims who Bought or Increased Their Insurance Coverage Since Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	45	84.9
YES	1	8	15.1
TOTAL		53	100.0
MEAN	.151	STD ERR	.050
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.361
SKEWNESS	2.007	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.131	MISSING CASES	3

Table 98: HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO INSTALLED NEW LOCKS

The Frequency of High Subjective Severity Victims who Installed New Locks Since Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	37	69.8
YES	1	16	30.2
TOTAL		53	100.0
MEAN	.302	STD ERR	.064
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.463
SKEWNESS	.888	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.215	MISSING CASES	3

Table 99: HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO LOCKED DOORS AND WINDOWS

The Frequency of High Subjective Severity Victims who Made Sure all Their Doors and Windows were Locked Since Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	27	50.9
YES	1	26	49.1
	TOTAL	53	100.0
MEAN	.491	STD ERR	.069
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.505
SKEWNESS	-.039	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.255	MISSING CASES	3

Table 100: HIGH SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO AVOIDED GOING OUT

The Frequency of High Subjective Severity Victims who Avoided Going Out at Night Since Their Victimization(s).

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	VALID PERCENT
NO	0	45	84.9
YES	1	8	15.1
	TOTAL	53	100.0
MEAN	.151	STD ERR	.050
MODE	.000	STD DEV	.361
SKEWNESS	2.007	MEDIAN	.000
VARIANCE	.131	MISSING CASES	3

The relationship between subjective severity and the tendency to move because of victimization was not statistically significant. However, 5 out of 6 respondents who did move because of their victimization(s) were high subjective severity victims.

Similarly, the chi-square associated with subjective severity and the propensity to stay home more often due to victimization was not significant at the .05 level. Regardless, the few who did stay home more often as a consequence of being victimized were all high subjective severity victims.

Table 101: SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO MOVED

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Moving as a Result of Being Victimized.

	COUNT			SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS			ROW TOTAL
	ROW	PCT	I	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	
YES-HAVE MOVED							
YES-PLAN TO MOVE							
NO							
DON'T KNOW							
	COLUMN TOTAL		48	58	51	157	100.0
			30.6	36.9	32.5		

CHI-SQUARE D.F. SIGNIFICANCE

11.64977

6

0.0703

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 257

Table 102: SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS WHO STAYED HOME MORE OFTEN

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Staying Home more Often as a Result of Their Victimization(s).

	COUNT			ROW TOTAL
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	
YES	7	13.2	4.3	24.5
	33.1	37.9	29.0	100.0
NO	98.0	91.7	79.2	268.9
	29.6	34.0	25.9	89.5
NOT SURE	1	5	4	10
	10.0	50.0	40.0	100.0
	2.0	8.3	7.5	17.8
	.6	3.1	2.5	6.2
COLUMN TOTAL	49	60	53	162
	30.2	37.0	32.7	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
17.41330	4	0.0016

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 252

5.11.6 Anomia

No significant differences in means were found among the subjective severity victims on anomia scores. The mean anomia scores for these groups of victims were low. The t tests revealed the following:

1. Low Subjective Severity Victims, N=51, Mean=1.63, SD=1.34; Medium Subjective Severity Victims, N=60, Mean=1.83, SD=1.32; $t=-0.81$, $p=0.42$.
2. Low Subjective Severity Victims, N=51, Mean=1.63, SD=1.34; High Subjective Severity Victims, N=54, Mean=2.09, SD=1.26; $t=-1.83$, $p=0.07$.
3. Medium Subjective Severity Victims, N=60, Mean=1.83, SD=1.32; High Subjective Severity Victims, N=54, Mean=2.09, SD=1.26; $t=-1.07$, $p=0.29$.

5.11.7 Attitudes Towards People

The high (33.3%), and especially the medium (57.1%) categories, had the largest percentages of subjective severity victims who felt that most people would try to take advantage of them.

Table 103: ATTITUDES TOWARDS PEOPLE AMONG SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS

A Comparison of Low, Medium, and High Subjective Severity Victims in Terms of Their Perceptions of People's Tendency to be Fair.

	CCDNT	I								
	ROW	PCT	SUBJECTIVE SEVERITY VICTIMS			ROW				
	CCL	PCT	I				TOTAL			
	TOT	PCT	I	LOW	I	MEDIUM	I	HIGH		
			I	2	I	12	I	7	I	21
TAKE ADVANTAGE			I	9.5	I	57.1	I	33.3	I	12.7
			I	4.0	I	20.0	I	12.7	I	
			I	1.2	I	7.3	I	4.2	I	
			I	33	I	40	I	38	I	111
DEPENDS			I	29.7	I	36.0	I	34.2	I	67.3
			I	66.0	I	66.7	I	69.1	I	
			I	20.0	I	24.2	I	23.0	I	
			I	9	I	2	I	2	I	13
DON'T KNOW			I	69.2	I	15.4	I	15.4	I	7.9
			I	18.0	I	3.3	I	3.6	I	
			I	5.5	I	1.2	I	1.2	I	
			I	6	I	6	I	8	I	20
TRY TO BE FAIR			I	30.0	I	30.0	I	40.0	I	12.1
			I	12.0	I	10.0	I	14.5	I	
			I	3.6	I	3.6	I	4.8	I	
	COLUMN			50		60		55		165
	TOTAL			30.3		36.4		33.3		100.0

CHI-SQUARE D.F. SIGNIFICANCE

15.34882

6

0.0177

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 249

5.12 Summary of Findings

5.12.1 Demographic Status

The comparison of non-victims of crime to the various groups of crime victims revealed significant differences in terms of sex. In all cases, a larger percentage of the males than of the females were in the crime victims category. The greater portion of females were non-victims of crime. Differences in sex, however, were not found within the objective and the subjective severity groups.

5.12.2 Anomia

The t tests in each relationship did not exhibit any differences in the mean levels of anomia. On the average, the non-victims of crime as well as the crime victims indicated low anomia scores.

5.12.3 Attitudes Towards People

Overall, the results regarding attitudes towards people were inconsistent with each other. For example, a larger percentage of the low subjective severity victims than of the non-victims of crime were uncertain about people's tendency to be fair. However, more of the medium subjective severity victims than of the non-victims of crime felt that most people try to be fair. Furthermore, a larger percentage of the high objective severity victims than of

the non-victims of crime indicated that most of the time people are looking out for themselves. When the subjective severity victims were compared to each other, the medium category had the greatest portion of respondents who believed that most people would try to take advantage of them. A comparison of the objective severity groups to each other revealed no significant differences.

5.12.4 Attitudes Towards the Judicial System

The non-victims of crime in comparison to the crime victims as a whole, the individual groups of objective severity victims, and the medium subjective severity victims had a larger proportion of its members who regarded the courts' treatment of criminals as too lenient. In this respect, differences did not appear within the objective and the subjective severity categories of crime victims.

5.12.5 Attitudes Towards the Police

With exception of the medium objective severity victims, the non-victims of crime had a higher percentage of its members than the crime victims who approved of the use of physical force by the police in certain situations. Within the objective severity category a larger portion of the less severe victims than the high group also approved of its use.

However, attitudes towards the use of physical force by the police produced no differences among the subjective severity victims.

5-12.6 Types of Crimes

The frequencies of all six crimes (robbery, burglary, physical assault, assault with a gun, theft, and vandalism) were highest among the high severity victims.

5-12.7 Incidents of Victimization

The incidents of victimization were directly related to the severity rankings.

5-12.8 Emotional Reactions

On the average, the low severity victims indicated almost no emotional reactions while the medium and the high severity victims experienced approximately one emotional reaction. The emotional reactions most commonly reported by both medium and high severity victims were:

1. Fear of being alone.
2. Fear of entering their residence or rooms within their residence.
3. Fear of walking alone at night.
4. Sleeplessness.

5. Nervousness. (Most frequent among medium subjective severity victims.)

Qualitative data exposed additional emotions experienced by the crime victims. A relatively small number of the victims (14/177=7.9%) said that they felt a great deal of anger and revenge toward the perpetrator. Fewer crime victims (8/177=4.5%) were afraid of being victimized again, and some of the burglary victims (4/42=9.5%) reported an invasion of privacy.

Finally, severity had a positive relationship with still being bothered by the victimization(s).

5.12.9 Assistance

The majority of crime victims, particularly the high severity victims, asked someone for assistance immediately after their victimization(s). The people most frequently requested for help by the crime victims were:

1. Family or other relatives.
2. Neighbour or friend.
3. Police.

5.12.10 Precautions

The crime victims took an average of approximately one precaution since their victimization(s). The most frequent precautions that they took included:

1. Made sure all their doors and windows were locked.
2. Installed new locks. (Most frequent among medium and high severity victims.)
3. Bought insurance or increased their insurance coverage. (Most frequent among high subjective severity victims.)
4. Avoided going out at night. (Most frequent among high subjective severity victims.)

Aside from the lack of statistical significance, the high severity victims were the most likely to stay at home more often and/or move to a new location as a result of being victimized.

Other precautions mentioned by the crime victims involved a greater sense of caution in general (25/177=14.1%). This included placing goods in a safe place, carrying small sums of money, and/or keeping the house lights on at night.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

6.1 Introduction

Anomia was the central focus of this thesis. Unfortunately, the comparative analysis of this variable did not produce significant differences between the crime victims and the non-victims of crime nor among the crime victims themselves. However, given the results, a discussion is warranted in the following areas: (1) the differences in terms of demographic and socio-economic status, (2) the role played by severity, (3) the emotional reactions of crime victims, (4) the assistance requested by victims of crime, (5) the attitudes towards people in general, (6) the attitudes towards the criminal justice system, and (7) the precautions taken by crime victims. The purpose of such a discussion is not to establish irrefutable axioms, but rather to generally expound on the facts and stimulate new questions.

6.2 Demographic and Socio-Economic Status .

Higher rates of victimization among males than females are common in all victimization surveys, as was the case in this study (Hindelang et al., 1978: 4 & 9). As a matter of fact, Hindelang et al. note that marital status, age, and family income are also strongly related to victimization (pp. 5-8ff). The common denominator for these variables is lifestyle. It is the intervening factor that links demographic and socio-economic status to the rates of victimization (p. 241).

To illustrate this point, Hindelang et al. (1978) state that females are socialized-to stay home more than males. As a result, the greater mobility and more outside activities afforded to males make them more susceptible to victimization than females (p. 248). However, this proposition is not entirely correct. Contemporary socialization enables both males and females to participate in activities outside the home. Thus, a more plausible explanation is that the boisterous and aggressive behaviour typical of males may account for their greater propensity towards crime and vulnerability to victimization.

Of course lifestyle seems to account for the differences in victimization rates in terms of age and marital status. For instance, adolescents between the ages of 16 and 19, and

individuals who are either single, divorced, or separated are highly mobile and conduct a large proportion of their daily activities outside of the home which increase the likelihood of victimization (Hindelang et al., 1978: 6-8ff & 247-249ff).

Income has a similar affect on the rates of victimization. Because the more affluent can afford segregation in housing, transportation and leisure activities, they spend a small proportion of their time in public places reducing their chances of being victimized (p. 249).

Consequently, a more diverse sample of respondents in terms of demographic and socic-economic status, in this thesis, might have exposed other differences besides those based on sex.

6.3 Victimization and Severity

Severity, in this study, was measured in two ways. The first was the total objective severity index score. The size of this score depended on the number and type(s) of crime(s) suffered. Thus, the direct relationship found between the total objective severity index score and the incidents of victimization was due to the manner in which

objective severity was calculated; that is, an increase in the number of different crimes experienced produced an increase in the total objective severity index score. The second measure was the total subjective severity score. The magnitude of this score was contingent upon the victim's severity rating of the victimization(s). Either a positive or negative association between the incidents of victimization and the total subjective severity score were possible. The result was a positive relationship denoting that an increase in the total subjective severity score corresponded to an increase in the number of different crimes suffered. This demonstrates that when victims experience a number of different crimes, they tend to rate the events as highly severe. In view of this fact, the domination of each crime by the high subjective severity victims reveals that the majority of victims in each crime category suffered other victimizations, and considered them to be severe.

Additional evidence showed a high Pearson correlation ($r=.7$) between the total objective severity index scores and the total subjective severity scores. This substantiates the fact that the severity of victimization can be measured both objectively and subjectively. Hence, the arguments presented by Barkas (1978: 149-150) and Bard and Sangrey (1979: 32-33) are both correct. The impact of crime on a

victim can be determined by either the type(s) of crime(s), or the degree of the violation(s) as perceived by the victim.

Finally, the objective ranking of crimes from the most severe to the least severe was assault with a gun, physical assault, robbery, burglary, theft, and vandalism. This, along with the high Pearson correlation between the objective and the subjective severity scales, support Barkas' (1978: 149-150) premise that crimes of violence (such as assault with a gun, physical assault, and robbery) have a greater impact on the victim than property crimes (such as burglary, theft, and vandalism).

Succinctly, the severity of criminal victimization is a function of the number of different crimes experienced, the victim's perception of the incident(s), and the type(s) of crime(s) suffered.

6.4 Emotional Reactions of Crime Victims

In spite of the significant number of crime victims who were still bothered by their victimization(s), the overwhelming majority did not perceive the episode(s) as the worst experience(s) in their lives. In this study, the medium and the high severity victims mentioned, on the

average, one emotional reaction. But what were the most frequent reactions?

Researchers, in the area of victimology, have found the emotional reactions of crime victims to include denial, confusion and shock, anger, nervousness, fear, guilt, physical upset and nausea, memory loss, isolation, suspicion, sleeplessness, depression, and a host of others (Barkas, 1978: 150; Taylor et al., 1983: 21; Bourque in Waller, 1982: 12; Smith in Viano, 1976: 203-217; American Psychiatric Association's DSM III (1980) in Bulman and Frieze, 1983: 2). In this thesis, fear, anger and revenge, sleeplessness, and nervousness all manifested themselves. In addition, a few of the victims were fearful of being victimized again, and a small percentage of burglary victims regarded their victimization as an invasion of privacy.

The most frequent emotional reaction reported by the crime victims was fear. Of course, four types of phobic reactions were operationalized in this study's questionnaire which could have accounted for this result. However, Waller and Ckihiro (1978) also found that fear was one of the most frequently mentioned reactions by burglary victims, aside from anger and the initial surprise of the occurrence (p. 37). In their research, the specific fears of burglary victims were the fear of being alone and fear of entering

their residence or rooms. within their residence (pp.38-39). This coincides with some of the findings of this thesis. The crime victims, in this case, also specified the fear of being alone and fear of entering their residence or rooms within their residence as common reactions. In addition to these phobias, they indicated a fear of walking alone at night.

Feelings of fear, according to Bard and Sangrey (1979), are common and often the most difficult emotion that face victims of crime. They sometimes develop phobic reactions to particular places or situations associated with the victimization(s) (p. 42ff). Naturally, some burglary victims would have a fear of entering their residence or rooms within their residence because this is where the violation(s) occurred and, as some burglary victims believe, this is where it could happen again (Maguire, 1980: 265). Similarly, victims who are afraid of being alone or to walk alone at night may have been victimized while in one of these situations or they may feel vulnerable being alone or, as a few victims in this sample documented, they may also fear a reoccurrence of their victimization(s).

The small number of burglary victims who regarded their victimization(s) as an invasion of privacy can be explained in the following manner:

"Most people feel their homes to be places of refuge and safety, shelters from the dangerous outside. We breathe easier behind our own familiar doors. And our homes are our nests, filled with the people and the things we love. The burglar intrudes on this security and privacy. Burglars quite literally threaten us where we live" (Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 18).

Hence, burglary upsets the victim's sense of security within the home (Maguire, 1980: 270).

Other prominent reactions expressed by crime victims are intense anger toward the criminal and the wish for revenge (Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 44-45; Waller and Okibiro, 1978: 37). Although these feelings were reported in this study, the accuracy of their frequency was hindered by the fact that these categories were not included in the questionnaire. In view of the results obtained by previous research, the inclusion of anger and revenge within the design of the questionnaire would have resulted in a larger number of victims who experienced these emotions.

6.5 Assistance Requested By Crime Victims

Three groups of people were most frequently requested for help by the crime victims immediately after their victimization(s). These groups included the family or other relatives, neighbours or friends, and the police. Apart from the police, the overwhelming majority of crime victims

did not seek professional help, but rather they asked the people closest to them for assistance.

While some victims of crime entangle themselves in their work as a way of distracting themselves from the emotional trauma of being victimized, other victims prefer to talk about it (Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 41). As Bard and Sangrey assert, "Family and friends can be most helpful...by being nurturing and comforting, allowing the victim to find his or her own recuperative rhythm, and thus supporting the struggle" (p. 40). Thus, the best assistance that a person can offer a crime victim is to listen. It may be very painful for the listener, but the victim should never be discouraged from talking about the event; repression of these emotions can be extremely damaging. By expressing one's feelings about the victimization(s) to supportive people, the intensity of these emotions will eventually diminish (Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 42-44ff).

Crime victims call the police for any number of reasons. The major ones are: (1) out of a personal obligation, (2) apprehension of the offender, (3) required for insurance claims, and (4) with the hope of increased neighbourhood protection by the police (Smith and Maness in McDonald, 1976: 94). Whatever the reason(s), the police are usually the first people that the victim talks to after the crime.

At this stage, the victim is often in a state of shock and extremely vulnerable. Therefore, it is very important that the police treat the situation with utmost delicacy (Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 117). Along with the routine investigation, the police should be sympathetic, understanding, willing to listen to the victim, and respond to the call as quickly as possible. These considerations can attenuate the initial impact of the victimization(s), and provide the victim with a greater sense of security and comfort. However, the police who are indifferent to the victim's needs, discourteous, impatient, and delay in responding to the call can further violate the victim and exacerbate the emotional impact of the victimization(s) (Maguire, 1980: 272; Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 117; Barkas, 1978: 161).

6.6 Victimization, Attitudes Towards People, and Anomia

Contrary to the arguments presented by Emile Durkheim (1938) and Kai T. Erikson (in Davis and Stivers, 1975), researchers, such as John Conklin (1975: 58), have claimed that crime weakens social solidarity. They add that the unification of a community due to crime rests upon a negative climate of distrust, suspicion, hostility, retribution, repression, and exclusion (Conklin, 1975: 68; Head and Mays in Conklin, 1975: 53). It is also argued that

crime is accompanied by a permanent change in the victims' perception of others (Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 47); from one of trust to distrust (Lejeune and Alex, 1973: 284; Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 14).

The findings in this study, neither prove nor refute the socially integrative or disintegrative aspects of crime. Instead, they suggest that, in most cases, victims' attitudes towards other people in terms of fairness, helpfulness, and trust were not significantly different from the non-victims of crime. This means that victimization does not undermine the victims' previously held assumptions about people.

Another possibility is that young people, such as those in this sample, adjust better to adversity than older groups. Besides, these respondents were all university students constituting the top percentile of educated youth. Therefore, their favorable chances for success may have bolstered their sense of optimism and opinion of people more than, for example, the poor, the sick, the elderly, and the unemployed.

More importantly, victimization had no effect on feelings of anomia. In other words, it did not exacerbate the crime victims' feelings of estrangement from society. On the

average, both the crime victims and the non-victims of crime felt socially integrated with a strong sense of "self-to-others belongingness."

These results were similar to those obtained by Smith et al. (1978). They found that burglary and robbery do not affect anomia. Their explanation is that "...for most people, burglary and robbery are one-time experiences that may lead to some immediate adjustments in behavior but do not result in significant shifts in attitudes" (p. 399). According to Smith et al. (1978: 400) as well as DeFronzo (1979: 32), a disruption of one's interaction patterns or one's perception of it increases anomia. Subsequently, higher rates of victimization would be required to induce such a condition or perception (Smith in Viano, 1976: 217).

6.7 Victimization and Attitudes Towards the Criminal Justice System

The majority of crime victims and non-victims of crime were in favour of the use of physical force by the police in certain situations. They also thought that the courts are not harsh enough with criminals. These observations correspond to those attained by Hindelang and Gottfredson (in McDonald, 1976: 61). Their findings revealed that 7 out of 10 respondents approved of tougher law enforcement, and

seventy-five percent rated the courts' treatment of criminals as too lenient.

A more interesting fact is that a larger proportion of the non-victims than of the crime victims supported the police use of physical force, and believed that the courts' should punish criminals more severely. DeFronzo (1979: 30) found similar results between those fearing victimization and crime victims. Those who feared being victimized approved of tougher law enforcement and harsher sentences for criminals. Victimization, on the other hand, had no significant effects on these items. DeFronzo offers no explanation for these differences in attitude. Nevertheless, he documents an important observation that may account for them.

In DeFronzo's (1979: 30) study, fear of victimization produced a negative relationship to voluntary organization memberships. However, the people in this category endorsed the spending of money to solve urban problems, but were less in favour of appropriating funds for welfare and improving the condition of blacks. Although the crime victims were not significantly interested in changing the situation of blacks, they did support voluntary organizations, urban improvement, and increased spending for welfare.

The more liberal attitude expressed by crime victims in comparison to those fearing victimization suggest two approaches to decreasing crime. Theoretically, it appears that victims are more concerned with changing the social conditions that are conducive to crime as opposed to persons fearing victimization who are more interested in its deterrence through the strict application of the law. Thus, non-victims of crime are more in favour of punishment after the commission of an offense while crime victims are more likely to advocate preventive measures before victimization can occur. Lending credence to this hypothesis, Waller and Okihiro (1978: 90) contend that, "Fear of victimization is more closely linked to retribution than is anger at actual victimization."

An alternative interpretation is that, for most people, the reality and the experience of being victimized is not as bad as the anticipatory fear of victimization. It appears that the known lessens the anxiety of the unknown. As stated by West (1984: 175), "...the incident has concretized a vague anxiety about crime into the specific (usually minor) incident they themselves experienced."

6.8 Precautions Taken By Crime Victims

In opposition to the distancing hypothesis proposed by Miransky and Langer (1978: 400), the crime victims did not try to distance themselves from the event(s) by not becoming more security conscious. Instead, the crime victims took, on the average, one precaution since their victimization(s). Specifically, there was a frequent use of locks among all groups of crime victims, as described in other studies (Waller and Okihiro, 1978: 48; Maguire, 1980: 266). In addition, the installation of new locks was most frequent among medium and high severity victims while the high subjective severity victims were the most likely to buy insurance or increase their coverage and avoid going out at night. Therefore, the number of possible precautions that were taken by the crime victims increased with severity. Janoff-Bulman and Frieze (1983: 10) support this observation by the fact that, in their research, the serious crime of robbery motivated the victims to take additional precautions, such as refraining from nocturnal activities outside the home. In this study, the overall precautions were minor but practical.

Except for a very small number of crime victims, serious preventive measures, such as moving to a new neighbourhood and/or staying at home more often, were not detected.

Hindelang et al. (1978: 224-225) best explain this behaviour in the subsequent passage:

"...for most people, the behavioral effects of crime...appear more as subtle adjustments in behavior than as major shifts in what can be called 'behavioral policies.' That is, rather than making substantial changes in what they do, people tend to change the ways in which they do things. For example, an individual might continue to go out in the evening for entertainment..., but the same individual might modify his or her behavior by taking a taxi rather than walking, by going out with others rather than alone, or by avoiding places that have 'bad reputations.' Likewise, the same individual, when at home, may begin to take extra precautions such as installing dead-bolt locks or leaving lights on."

According to some authors, the modifications in security behaviour restore the crime victim's sense of control, autonomy, and competence (Janoff-Bulman and Frieze, 1983: 10; Maguire, 1980: 266).

6.9 Summary

Generally speaking, there were higher rates of victimization among males than females. The severity of the victimization(s) was contingent upon the type(s) of crime(s), the extent of the violation(s) as experienced by the victim, and the number of different crimes that the individual suffered. On the average, while the low severity victims were not affected emotionally, the medium and the high severity groups did report at least one emotional

reaction. The more common responses included a variety of phobias, sleeplessness, and nervousness; and less frequently, anger and revenge, and the invasion of privacy felt by burglary victims. Although the vast majority did not feel that being a victim of crime was the worst thing in their lives, some were still bothered by their victimization(s).

In their adversity, the majority of crime victims turned to their families or other relatives, neighbours or friends, and/or the police for assistance. Criminal victimization did not change the victims' attitudes towards people nor did it increase their levels of anomia. It did, however, alter their view of the criminal justice system. Crime victims were less in favour of strict law enforcement and retribution than non-victims of crime. Finally, the crime victims took an average of one preventive measure. These were subtle precautions, depending on the severity of the victimization(s), but enough to renew their sense of security and control.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

7.1 Implications

Initially, the thesis proposed in this study was that crime victims exhibit higher levels of anomia than non-victims of crime. The research findings, however, contradict this presupposition. In this sample, most of the respondents were young, highly educated, and occupied functional positions in society. These factors may have accounted for the observed low levels of anomia. If a sample of less "fortunate" individuals had been interviewed, higher levels of anomia would probably have been observed. As a result, a conditional thesis is proffered:

Criminal victimization does not exacerbate feelings of anomia among socially functional individuals!

By the same token, the second and the third null hypotheses are accepted with some modification.

- Among victims of crime who are socially functional, anomia is not related to the type(s) of crime(s) that they experience.

- Among victims of crime who are socially functional, anomia is not related to the perceived severity of the crime(s).

Further analysis of the data supports the fourth and the fifth null hypotheses.

- Crime victims do not have a more negative attitude towards people than non-victims of crime.
- Crime victims do not have a more negative attitude towards the criminal justice system than non-victims of crime.

However, based on the results, the first and the last null hypotheses are rejected. Instead, the subsequent hypotheses are presented:

- Crime victims experience some emotional reactions as a result of their victimization(s).
- The more common emotional reactions suffered by crime victims are fear, sleeplessness, nervousness, and anger and revenge.
- Crime victims undergo minor changes in security behaviour as a result of their victimization(s).

- The most frequent precaution taken by crime victims is to make sure that all their doors and windows are locked.

- The possible precautions taken by the more severely affected crime victims include the installation of new locks, buying insurance or increasing their coverage, and/or avoid going out at night.

Finally, additional research hypotheses are proposed:

- Males suffer higher rates of victimization than females.
- The severity of the victimization(s) is contingent upon three factors: (i) the type(s) of crime(s), (ii) the extent of the trauma as perceived by the victim, and (iii) the number of different crimes suffered.
- Crime victims are less in favour of strict law enforcement and retribution than non-victims of crime.
- Subjective severity is directly associated with the crime victims' request for assistance.
- Immediately after the victimization(s), crime victims request assistance from family or other relatives, neighbours or friends, and/or the police.

7-2 Recommendations

Future research concerning the impact of crime on victims could adopt the following recommendations:

1. As previously suggested, the sample should be more demographically and socio-economically diverse so as to test for possible differences in these areas.
2. Rather than dividing the sample into two categories, it could be divided into three groups: crime victims, those fearing victimization, and those who have neither been victimized nor fear victimization. This would reveal the role played by the anticipatory fear of victimization that might otherwise be suppressed within a general non-victim category.
3. Each statement concerning the eunomia-anomia continuum should be examined separately instead of grouping them into one variable.
4. With regard to the anomia scale, the possible responses should be extended from a dichotomized variable to a five-point scale. Such a change would increase the accuracy of the scale by measuring the extent to which the respondents feel anomic.
5. The validity of DeFronzo's (1979: 32) assertion that victimization hinders the establishment of new relationships and increases the hostility towards and the isolation of strangers should be investigated.

6. The number of emotional items should be more exhaustive. For instance, guilt, self-blame, the blaming of others, denial, confusion, shock, physical upset, nausea, memory loss, a sense of isolation, and depression are categories that could all be added.
7. A very interesting topic of research would be to examine the differences between crime victims who recover from their victimization(s) and those who do not.

7.3 Final Remarks

The results of this thesis have depicted criminal victimization as a comparatively benign event with few negative repercussions. In many cases, victimization is a minor episode accompanied by subtle, short-lived consequences. Yet, this should not overshadow and underestimate the potential gravity of criminal victimization. At the other end of the spectrum, there are a smaller number of victims who experience heinous crimes that result in both physical and emotional scars which are often permanent. Should we, then, neglect the needs of crime victims because the more severe cases fail to be statistically significant when pooled together with their more numerous, but less severely victimized, counterparts? Each crime victim should be regarded as a wronged person and

deserves the utmost consideration from researchers, society, and especially the criminal justice system.

Relatively few studies have concentrated on the impact of criminal victimization. The main thrust of previous victimological research has been on "the victim's participation in and responsibility for the crime" (Bard and Sangrey, 1979: 97). Although this research is not the definitive study in victimology, it has given us a better understanding of the crime victim's plight in relation to the structural functionalist perspective.

In retrospect, structural functionalism did not prove to be the ideal approach to understanding the impact of crime on victims. Since there were no differences in terms of anomia between crime victims and non-victims of crime, it would appear that criminal victimization is not a dysfunctional relationship between victim and society, but rather a personal conflict between victim and criminal. It is, therefore, a question of the victim's definition of the situation, and "the patterns of behaviour, action, and interaction" that result from the victimization(s) (Ritzer, 1981: 26).

APPENDIX A

A-1 Pilot Study

The following questions pertain specifically to the last year only; that is, between January 1, 1984 and December 31, 1984.

1. Did anyone take something directly from you by using force--such as stickup, mugging, or threat?
1 ___ yes 2 ___ no 3 ___ not sure
2. Did anyone break into or somehow illegally get into your home/apartment?
1 ___ yes 2 ___ no 3 ___ not sure
3. Have you been punched, beaten, or assaulted by another person?
1 ___ yes 2 ___ no 3 ___ not sure
4. Have you been threatened with a gun or shot at?
1 ___ yes 2 ___ no 3 ___ not sure
5. Did anyone steal something from you without you being aware of it until after the incident?
1 ___ yes 2 ___ no 3 ___ not sure
6. Did anyone intentionally damage something that you own?
1 ___ yes 2 ___ no 3 ___ not sure

A-2 Questionnaire

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of Windsor is conducting a study concerning the impact of crime on society. Your co-operation in this study will help to improve our understanding of the social and the psychological effects of crime. Any information that you give in this questionnaire will be kept strictly confidential.

Thank you for your co-operation.

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE!

1. Sex: 1 male 2 female
2. What is your marital status?

1 <input type="checkbox"/> single	4 <input type="checkbox"/> separated
2 <input type="checkbox"/> married	5 <input type="checkbox"/> divorced
3 <input type="checkbox"/> widowed	6 <input type="checkbox"/> living together
3. Would you indicate to what age category you belong?

1 <input type="checkbox"/> younger than 18
2 <input type="checkbox"/> 19-24
3 <input type="checkbox"/> 25-34
4 <input type="checkbox"/> 35-44
5 <input type="checkbox"/> 45-54
6 <input type="checkbox"/> 55 and over
4. To what religious group do you belong?

0 <input type="checkbox"/> none
1 <input type="checkbox"/> Roman Catholic
2 <input type="checkbox"/> Eastern Rite Catholic
3 <input type="checkbox"/> Greek (or Russian) Orthodox
4 <input type="checkbox"/> Jewish
5 <input type="checkbox"/> Protestant (What denomination is that?)
(Specify) _____
6 <input type="checkbox"/> other (Specify) _____
5. (If a member of a religious group) About how often do you usually attend religious services?

1 <input type="checkbox"/> about once a week or more
2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 or 3 times a month
3 <input type="checkbox"/> about once a month

- 4 ___ several times a year
 5 ___ about once a year
 6 ___ less than once a year
 7 ___ never

6. What year are you in university?

- 0 ___ preliminary- 3 ___ third
 1 ___ first 4 ___ fourth
 2 ___ second 5 ___ other
 (Specify)

7. What is your major field of study
 in university?

(Specify) _____

If undecided, check here _____

8. Do you own or rent the residence you
 live in?

- 1 ___ rent
 2 ___ own
 3 ___ room and board
 4 ___ live with parents
 5 ___ other (Specify)

9. Questions 9(a) to 9(f) pertain
 specifically to the last year only:
 that is, between January 1, 1984 and
 December 31, 1984.

(a) Did anyone take something directly from
 you by using force--such as a stickup,
 mugging, or threat?

- 1 ___ yes 2 ___ no 3 ___ not sure

(If yes)

On the following scale from 1 to 5, how
 severe would you say this incident was
 to you? (Circle one number.)

Not severe _____ Extremely
 at all 1 2 3 4 5 severe

(b) Did anyone break into or somehow illegally
 get into your home/apartment?

- 1 ___ yes 2 ___ no 3 ___ not sure

(If yes)

On the following scale from 1 to 5, how
 severe would you say this incident was
 to you? (Circle one number.)

Not severe _____ Extremely
 at all 1 2 3 4 5 severe

(c) Have you been punched, beaten, or assaulted

by another person?

1 yes 2 no 3 not sure

(If yes)

On the following scale from 1 to 5, how severe would you say this incident was to you? (Circle one number.)

Not severe _____ Extremely
at all 1 2 3 4 5 severe

(d) Have you been threatened with a gun or shot at?

1 yes 2 no 3 not sure

(If yes)

On the following scale from 1 to 5, how severe would you say this incident was to you? (Circle one number.)

Not severe _____ Extremely
at all 1 2 3 4 5 severe

(e) Did anyone steal something from you without you being aware of it until after the incident?

1 yes 2 no 3 not sure

(If yes)

On the following scale from 1 to 5, how severe would you say this incident was to you? (Circle one number.)

Not severe _____ Extremely
at all 1 2 3 4 5 severe

(f) Did anyone intentionally damage something that you own?

1 yes 2 no 3 not sure

(If yes)

On the following scale from 1 to 5, how severe would you say this incident was to you? (Circle one number.)

Not severe _____ Extremely
at all 1 2 3 4 5 severe

If you responded "yes" to any one of the questions from 9(a) to 9(f), please answer all of the remaining questions.

If you responded "no" to all of the questions from 9(a) to 9(f), please

skip to questions 18 to 24.

10. Do you recall exactly in which month the latest crime against you occurred?

1 yes 2 no

(If yes)

In which month(s) did it/they occur?

(Specify) _____

(If no)

Do you recall the season(s)?

- 1 Spring (Apr., May)
 2 Summer (June, July, Aug., Sept.)
 3 Fall (Oct., Nov.)
 4 Winter (Dec., Jan., Feb., Mar.)
 5 no

11. Have you suffered from any of the following as a result of being a victim of crime(s)? (Check all relevant answers)

- 1 fear of being alone
 2 fear of entering your residence or rocks within your residence
 3 fear of strangers
 4 fear of walking outside alone at night
 5 sleeplessness
 6 headaches
 7 nervousness
 8 anything else? Explain.

9 no/none

12. Does/Do the crime(s) against you in the past year--that is, between January 1, 1984 and December 31, 1984--still bother you today in anyway?

1 yes 2 no 3 not sure

(If yes)

In what way(s) does it bother you? Explain.

13. Is being a victim of crime(s) the worst thing that has happened to you in your life?

1 yes 2 no 3 not sure

14. Did you turn to anyone for assistance

immediately after the crime(s)?

1 ___ yes 2 ___ no 3 ___ not sure

(If yes)

Who were they? (Check all relevant answers)

- 1 ___ spouse
 2 ___ family member or other relatives
 3 ___ neighbour or friend
 4 ___ lawyer
 5 ___ police
 6 ___ medical doctor
 7 ___ psychiatrist or psychologist
 8 ___ other (Specify) _____

What help did you get? Explain.

15. What precautions have you taken since you have been a victim of crime(s)?

(Check all relevant answers)

- 1 ___ bought a handgun or revolver
 2 ___ bought insurance or increased insurance coverage
 3 ___ installed a burglar alarm in the home (house/garage)
 4 ___ installed new locks on doors and windows
 5 ___ make sure all doors and windows are locked
 6 ___ avoid going out at night
 7 ___ avoid strangers
 8 ___ other precautions (Specify) _____

0 ___ none

16. Have you moved or do you plan to move because of fear of crime resulting from your personal victimization(s)?

- 1 ___ yes - have moved
 2 ___ yes - plan to move
 3 ___ no
 4 ___ don't know

(If yes)

Why? _____

17. Since you've been a victim of crime,

do you stay home more often?

1 ___ yes 2 ___ no 3 ___ not sure

18. Although you may not agree or disagree completely with any of the following statements, please indicate whether you tend more to agree or disagree with each statement.

(a) There is little use writing to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man.

1 ___ agree 2 ___ disagree

(b) Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.

1 ___ agree 2 ___ disagree

(c) In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse, not better.

1 ___ agree 2 ___ disagree

(d) It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.

1 ___ agree 2 ___ disagree

(e) These days a person doesn't really know whom he can count on.

1 ___ agree 2 ___ disagree

19. Do you think that most people would try to take advantage of you if they get the chance, or would they try to be fair?

1 ___ would take advantage of you

2 ___ depends

3 ___ don't know

4 ___ would try to be fair

20. Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful, or that they are mostly just looking out for themselves?

1 ___ try to be helpful

2 ___ depends

3 ___ don't know

4 ___ just looking out for themselves

21. Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?
- 1 most people can be trusted
 - 2 depends
 - 3 don't know
 - 4 can't be too careful
22. In general, do you think the courts in this area deal too harshly or not harshly enough with criminals?
- 1 too harshly
 - 2 about right
 - 3 don't know
 - 4 not harshly enough
23. Are there any situations you can imagine in which you would approve of a policeman striking an adult male citizen?
- 1 yes
 - 2 no
 - 3 not sure
24. Do you favour or oppose the death penalty for persons convicted of murder?
- 1 favour
 - 2 oppose
 - 3 don't know
25. What is (was) the approximate annual income of your parents?
(Adult students please indicate your approximate annual income.)
(If you are married, please indicate you and your spouses combined annual income.)
- 1 under \$10,000
 - 2 \$10,000-19,999
 - 3 \$20,000-29,999
 - 4 \$30,000-39,999
 - 5 \$40,000-49,999
 - 6 \$50,000 or more
26. What is your father's occupation? Describe the kind of work he does in two or three words. (If deceased, what was his occupation?) (Adult students please describe the kind of work you do in two or three words.)

-
- 1 _____ professional (doctor, lawyer,
certified accountant)
- 2 _____ business manager, official,
farm owner, proprietor
- 3 _____ semi-professional (teacher,
fireman, social worker)
- 4 _____ clerical or sales worker
- 5 _____ craftsman, foreman
- 6 _____ operative or factory worker
(truck driver)
- 7 _____ service worker (waiter, laundry
worker)
- 8 _____ unskilled, domestic, or farm
worker
- 9 _____ no answer

Note: Adult students are those who attend university but are no longer supported financially by their parents. For example: they attend university part-time, work full-time, and pay for their own accommodations.

A-3 The Concepts Defined

I. Questions Applicable to Both the Victims and Non-Victims of Crime

A. Demographic Questions

- Item 1 Sex: 1. Male 2. Female
- Item 2 Marital Status: 1. Single
2. Married
3. Widowed
4. Separated
5. Divorced
6. Living Together
- Item 3 Age: 1. Younger than 18 2. 18-24
3. 25-34 4. 35-44
5. 45-54 6. 55 and over
- Item 4 Religion: 0. None 1. Roman Catholic
2. Eastern Rite Catholic
3. Greek (or Russian) Orthodox
4. Jewish
5. Protestant 6. Other

- Item 5 (If a member of a religious group)
Religiosity: 1. About once a week or more
2. 2 or 3 times a month
3. About once a month
4. Several times a year
5. About once a year
6. Less than once a year
7. Never
- Item 6 Year in University: 0. Preliminary 1. First
2. Second 3. Third
4. Fourth 5. Other
- Item 7 Major Field of Study: 0. Undecided
1. Social Science
2. Science 3. Arts
4. Business
5. Human Kiretics
6. Engineering
7. Educator
- Item 8 Living Arrangement: 1. Rent 2. Own
3. Room and Board
4. Live With Parents
5. University
Residence
6. Other

B. Crimes

- Item 9 Robbery: The taking of property in possession of its rightful owner by force or intimidation, with or without the use of a weapon. A robbery means that criminal and victim have confronted each other.
- Item 10 Burglary: The offender illegally enters a residence. The offender may or may not use force (for example, breaking down the door) to gain entry.
- Item 11 Physical Assault: The offender used physical force against the victim with or without the use of a weapon.
- Item 12 Assault With A Gun: The offender shot at or threatened to shoot the victim with a gun.
- Item 13 Theft: The taking of property without the consent of the rightful owner, and the owner had no knowledge of the crime until after its occurrence.
- Item 14 Vandalism: The intentional damaging of property without the

consent of the rightful
owner.

The possible responses to Items 9 through 14 are:
1. Yes 2. No and 3. Not Sure.

One reason for including these crimes is that they are "studied in most major victimization surveys" (Garofalo in Galaway and Hudson, 1981: 99 & 102). More importantly, since the victim must be interviewed, murder victims were excluded along with those who are unaware of being victimized, such as victims of consumer fraud. In addition, the respondents must define themselves as victims. In which case, victims who consent to crimes such as gambling, prostitution, and drug abuse do not always define themselves as victims; hence, they were excluded from the study as well. Finally, a victim has to be identified. Therefore, the victimization of large organizations, schools, and government cannot be studied in this way (Garofalo in Galaway and Hudson, 1981: 101-102).

Item 15 Types of Crime:

Violent: If the respondent answered "yes" to any one of these crimes--robbery, physical assault, and assault with a gun--and answered "no" to all the other crimes, then he/she is categorized as a violent crime victim.

Property: If the respondent answered "yes" to any one of these crimes--burglary, theft, and vandalism--and answered "no" to all the other crimes, then he/she is categorized as a property crime victim.

Both: If the respondent answered "yes" to any one of these

crimes--burglary, theft, and vandalism--and "yes" to any one of these crimes--robbery, physical assault, and assault with a gun--then the person is categorized as being both a property and violent crime victim.

Item 16 Incidents of Victimization:
It includes the number of different crimes suffered by the victim. Since there are a total of six crimes, the total possible incidents of victimization is six.

Unfortunately, it does not specify whether the crimes were the product of one incident or they occurred on separate occasions.

Finally, the number of times that a respondent was a victim to any one crime is not indicated.

Item 17 Crime Victims and Non-Victims of Crime:
Crime Victims: If the respondent answered "yes" to any one of the questions concerning the six crimes then the respondent is classified as a crime victim.
Non-Victims: If the respondent answered "no" to all of the questions concerning the six crimes then the respondent is classified as a non-victim of crime.

C. Anomia Scale

Item 18 Anomia: A condition of the individual. It pertains to the individual's sense of self-to-others belongingness. In other words, it is one's subjective feelings of estrangement from society. It is marked by feelings of loneliness, hopelessness, and distrust.

The statements comprising the scale are concerned with the following issues:

1. Community leaders are unconcerned with people's needs.
2. People's goals cannot be accomplished in a society that is unpredictable and lacking order.
3. People are receding from the goals already achieved in life.
4. Life is meaningless and the future looks bleak for one's children.
5. People cannot count on immediate personal relationships for social and psychological support.

The possible responses to each statement are:

1. Agree 2. Disagree

Possible scores range from 0 to 5. One point for each agree.

D. Questions Pertaining to Attitude

(i) Attitude about people in general.

- Item 19 Are most people fair? 1. Would take advantage of you
2. Depends
3. Don't know
4. Would try to be fair

- Item 20 Are people mostly helpful? 1. Try to be helpful
2. Depends
3. Don't know
4. Just looking out for themselves

- Item 21 Can most people be trusted?
1. Most people can be trusted
2. Depends 3. Can't know
4. Can't be too careful

(ii) Attitude about the treatment of criminals by the criminal justice system.

- Item 22 The courts' treatment of criminals
1. Too harsh
2. About right
3. Don't know
4. Not harsh enough

- Item 23 Certain situations warrant the use of force by the police?
1. Yes 2. No 3. Not Sure

- Item 24 Capital Punishment:
1. Favour 2. Oppose 3. Don't know

F. Socio-Economic Status

- Item 25 Father's Annual Income: 1. Under \$10,000
2. \$10,000-19,999
3. \$20,000-29,999
4. \$30,000-39,999
5. \$40,000-49,999

- Item 26 Father's Occupation: 6. \$50,000 or more
1. Professional (e.g. Doctor)
 2. Manager, Owner
 3. Semi-Professional (e.g. Teacher)
 4. Clerical or Sales Worker
 5. Craftsman, Foreman
 6. Operative or Factory Worker
 7. Service Worker (e.g. Waiter)
 8. Unskilled

II. Questions Applicable Only to the Victims of Crime

A. Subjective Severity of Crimes

- Item 27 Severity of Robbery
Item 28 Severity of Burglary
Item 29 Severity of Physical Assault
Item 30 Severity of Assault With A Gun
Item 31 Severity of Theft
Item 32 Severity of Vandalism

The possible responses to the above items are on a scale of 1 to 5 from not severe at all to extremely severe, respectively.

B. Time of Victimization

- Item 33 Recall the month of the latest crime:
 1. Yes 2. No

- Item 34 (If yes) Month of Occurrence:
 01. January 02. February
 03. March 04. April
 05. May 06. June 07. July
 08. August 09. September
 10. October 11. November
 12. December

- Item 35 (If no) Season of Occurrence:
 1. Spring (Apr., May)
 2. Summer (June, July, Aug., Sept.)
 3. Fall (Oct., Nov.)
 4. Winter (Dec., Jan., Feb., Mar.)
 5. No

C. Emotional Reactions to Victimization

- Item 36 Fear of being alone.
Item 37 Fear of entering one's residence.
Item 38 Fear of strangers.
Item 39 Fear of walking outside alone at night.
Item 40 Sleeplessness
Item 41 Headaches
Item 42 Nervousness
Item 43 Other

Item 44 No/None

The possible responses to items 36 through 44 are:
0. No 1. Yes

By adding together items 36 to 43, a new variable is created called Emotional Reactions. The total possible score is 8. The larger the score, the more emotional reactions the victim suffered.

Item 45 Still bothered by the victimization? 1. Yes
2. No
3. Not Sure

Item 46 The victimization is the worst thing in one's life?
1. Yes 2. No 3. Not Sure

D. Assistance Received

Item 47 Did the victim seek assistance?
1. Yes 2. No 3. Not Sure

(If yes) Who were they?

Item 48 Spouse

Item 49 Family/Relatives

Item 50 Neighbor/Friend

Item 51 Lawyer

Item 52 Police

Item 53 Medical Doctor

Item 54 Psychiatrist/Psychologist

Item 55 Other

The possible responses to items 48 through 55 are:
0. No 1. Yes

F. Behavioural Changes in Terms of the Precautions Taken

Item 56 Bought a handgun or revolver.

Item 57 Bought insurance or increased insurance.

Item 58 Installed a burglar alarm.

Item 59 Installed new locks.

Item 60 Lock all doors and windows.

Item 61 Avoid going out at night.

Item 62 Avoid strangers.

Item 63 Other precautions.

Item 64 None

The possible responses to items 56 through 64 are:
0. No 1. Yes

By adding together items 56 to 63, a new variable is created called Precautions. The total possible

score is 8. The larger the score, the more precautions the victim took.

- Item 65 Move or plan to move because of the victimization(s).
1. Yes-have moved 2. Yes-plan to move
3. No 4. Don't Know
- Item 66 Stay home more often because of the victimization(s).
1. Yes 2. No 3. Not Sure

REFERENCES

1. Ball, Richard A. "The Victimological Cycle" in Victimology. Volume 1, Number 3, Fall, 1976.
2. Bard, Morton and Dawn Sangrey. The Crime Victim's Book. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1979.
3. Barkas, J.L. Victims. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1978.
4. Berg, William E. and Robert Johnson. "Assessing the Impact of Victimization" in William H. Parsonage, editor, Perspectives on Victimology. London: Sage Publications, 1979.
5. Bourque, Blair E., G.B. Brumback, E.E. Krug, and L.O. Richardson. "Crisis Intervention: Investigating the Need for New Applications" in Irvin Waller, Crime Victims: Needs, Services and Reforms: Orphans of Social Policy. Tokyo: Paper delivered at the 4th International Symposium of Victimology. Section IV: Practical Aspects of Victimology, September 2, 1982.
6. Conklin, John E. The Impact of Crime. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1975.
7. Dadrian, Vahagn N. "An Attempt at Defining Victimology" in Eralio C. Viano, editor, Victims and Society. Washington, D.C.: Visage Press, Inc., 1976.

8. DeFronzo, James. "In Search of the Behavioral and Attitudinal Consequences of Victimization" in Sociological Symposium. Volume 25, Winter, 1979.
9. Durkheim, Emile. The Division of Labour in Society. Translated by George Simpson. New York: The Free Press, 1933.
10. Durkheim, Emile. The Rules of Sociological Method. Translated by Sarah A. Solovay and John H. Mueller and edited by George E.G. Catlin. New York: The Free Press, 1938.
11. Durkheim, Emile. Suicide. Translated by John A. Spaulding and George Simpson and edited by George Simpson. New York: The Free Press, 1951.
12. Erikson, Kai T. "On the Sociology of Deviance" in F. James Davis and Richard Stivers, editors, The Collective Definition of Deviance. New York: The Free Press, 1975.
13. Gilbert, Louise. "...And the Judge Cried, Too" in Newsweek. May 28, 1984.
14. Gray, Jeffrey. "The Psychology of Fear and Stress" in Richard A. Ball, 'The Victimological Cycle' in Victimology. Volume 1, Number 3, Fall, 1976.
15. Hindelang, Michael J. and Michael Gottfredson. "The Victim's Decision Not to Invoke the Criminal Justice Process" in William F. McDonald, editor, Criminal Justice And The Victim. London: Sage Publications, Inc., 1976.

16. Hindelang, Michael J., Michael E. Gottfredson, and James Garofalo. Victims of Personal Crime: An Empirical Foundation for a Theory of Personal Victimization. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1978.
17. Janoff-Bulman, Bernie and Irene Hanson Prieze. "A Theoretical Perspective for Understanding Reactions to Victimization" in Journal of Social Issues. Volume 39(2), Summer, 1983.
18. Lejeune, Robert and Nicholas Alex. "On Being Mugged: The Event and its Aftermath" in Urban Life and Culture. Volume 2(3), October, 1973.
19. Mack, J.A. "A Victim-Role Typology of Rational-Economic Property Crime" in International Journal of Criminology and Penology. Volume 2(2), May, 1974.
20. Maquire, Mike. "The Impact of Burglary Upon Victims" in British Journal of Criminology. Volume 20(3), 1980.
21. Mays, John Barron. "Crime and the Social Structure" in John E. Conklin, The Impact of Crime. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1975.
22. Mead, George Herbert. "The Psychology of Punitive Justice" in John E. Conklin, The Impact of Crime. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1975.
23. Merton, Robert K. "Anomie, Anomia and Social Interaction: Contexts of Deviant Behavior" in Marshall

- P. Clinard, editor, Anomie and Deviant Behavior.
London: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.
24. Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure.
New York: The Free Press, 1968.
 25. Merton, Robert K. "Social Theory and Social Structure"
(1949) in David Lewis Smith, Robert DuRant, and Timothy
J. Carter, 'Social Integration, Victimization, and
Anomia' in Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Journal.
Volume 16(3), November, 1978.
 26. Miransky, Jeremy and Ellen J. Langer. "Burglary
(Non)prevention: An Instance of Relinquishing Control"
in Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin. Volume
4(3), July, 1979.
 27. Norusis, Marija J. SPSSx: Introductory Statistics
Guide. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1983.
 28. Feiff, Robert. The Invisible Victim. New York: Basic
Books, Inc., 1979.
 29. Rosenthal, J. "The Cage of Fear in Cities Beset by
Crime" in Irvin Waller and Norman Okihiro, Burglary:
The Victim and the Public. Toronto: University of
Toronto Press, 1978.
 30. Schafer, Stephen. "The Beginning of Victirology" in
Burt Galaway and Joe Hudson, editors, Perspectives on
Crime Victims. Toronto: The C.V. Mosby Company, 1981.
 31. Separovic, Zvonimir P. "Victimology: A New Approach in
the Social Sciences" in Israel Drapkin and Emilio

- 3
- Viano, editors, Victimology: A New Focus: Volume 1
Theoretical Issues in Victimology. Lexington,
Massachusetts: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Company,
1974.
32. Smith, A. Emerson and Dal Eness, Jr. "The Decision to
Call the Police: Reactions to Burglary" in William P.
McDonald, editor, Criminal Justice And The Victim.
London: Sage Publications, Inc., 1976.
33. Smith, David Lewis. "The Aftermath of Victimization:
Fear and Suspicion" in Emilio C. Viano, editor,
Victims and Society. Washington, D.C.: Visage Press,
Inc., 1976.
34. Smith, David Lewis, Robert DuRant and Timothy J.
Carter. "Social Integration, Victimization, and
Anomia" in Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Journal.
Volume 16(3), November, 1978.
35. Srole, Leo. "Social Integration and Certain
Corollaries: An Exploratory Study" in American
Sociological Review. Volume 21, Number 6, December,
1956.
36. Taylor, Shelley E., Joanne V. Wood, and Rosemary R.
Lightman. "It Could Be Worse: Selective Evaluation as
a Response to Victimization" in Journal of Social
Issues. Volume 39(2), Summer, 1983.
37. Waller, Irvin and Norman Okinhiro. Burglary: The Victim
and the Public. Toronto: The University of Toronto
Press, 1978.

38. West, W. Gordon. Young Offenders in the State.
Toronto: Butterworths, 1984.
39. Wortman, Casille E. "Coping with Victimization:
Conclusions and Implications for Future Research" in
Journal of Social Issues. Volume 39(2), Summer, 1983.

VITA AUCTORIS

Bruno Ierullo was born on May 17, 1959 in South Porcupine, Ontario, Canada. There he attended Roland Michener Secondary School and received his Grade 13 Diploma in 1978. In the same year, Bruno was accepted into the Faculty of Arts and Science at the University of Toronto where he majored in Sociology and Criminology. In 1982, he completed his undergraduate studies and attained his Bachelor of Arts (Honours) Degree. His interest in both Sociology and Criminology prompted him to continue his studies as a graduate student and teaching assistant at the University of Windsor. Subsequently, in 1986, Bruno Ierullo was conferred the Master of Arts Degree.