

SOC 3290 Deviance
Lecture 17.2: Measuring Deviance and Crime II:
Victimization Surveys

Given the problems we have noted with regard to official police statistics on crime, there have been a variety of attempts to get at its incidence and characteristics through other methods. Today we will review and critique the available data on victimization from victimization surveys.

Self-report surveys have become a common methodological tool used by criminologists - and especially by victimologists - in the past few decades. Victimization surveys have been the preferred methodological tool of victimologists since the 1970's. These gather information directly from victims without the intermediary of the police. Generally, individuals, in a representative sample of the larger population, are sought out and questioned anonymously about their experiences of victimization, if any. Such victimization surveys essentially focus on types of crime where:(i) there is a direct and identifiable victim; (ii) a direct and potentially identifiable perpetrator; and (iii) those forms of criminal victimization for which some information is available. This, in effect, limits the focus to traditional categories of interpersonal crime, and avoids others such as, for example, corporate crime.

Victimization surveys arose for one simple reason: generally, a great deal more has been known about perpetrators of crime than about their victims. In the past, official crime statistics gave virtually no information on the victims of crime nor on the incidence of crimes not reported to the police. Because of this, little could be said about which people were more likely to be victimized by crime, or about how many people were actually victimized.

In Canada, the first attempt to solve this problem was the Canadian Urban Victimization Survey conducted in 1981. It looked at 7 major urban centers across Canada with a random sample of over 60,000 people. It found that there were more than 700,000 personal victimizations (i.e. sexual assault, robbery, assault, and theft of personal property), plus almost 900,000 household victimizations (i.e. break and enter, motor vehicle theft, household theft, and vandalism).

The survey found that the more serious the type of crime, the less likely for it to occur. *Gender* differences were notable. Women were 7 times more likely than men to be victims of sexual assault or personal theft. Men were almost twice as likely as women to be victims of robbery or assault. As for *age*, those under 25 had the highest rate of victimization in all categories of personal offences, which declined rapidly with age after this point. With regard to *Income* and victimization, with some qualifications,

the higher the family income of urban residents, the more likely it was that they would experience some form of household victimization or personal theft. Finally, *lifestyle* was another important variable, with a strong positive relationship found between one's number of nights spent outside the home and rates of victimization.

Fear of crime was found to be a significant issue, but more so for those walking alone in their neighborhood at night. Women and the elderly were more likely to express fear in this regard (50% and 98% respectively), compared to 18% of men. For those who have been the victim of sexual assault, these numbers increased considerably, even during the daytime - even though the incidence of sexual assault was relatively low compared to other offences.

The survey found that fewer than 42% of crimes were reported to the police, indicating that many more Canadians were victimized than official crime statistics would suggest. The most likely crime to be reported was theft or attempted theft of a motor vehicle (70%); the least likely was theft of personal property (29%). Women were found to have a higher reporting rate than males for sexual assault, robbery, and assault, and that those 65 and older were more likely to report incidents than younger victims.

The most common reasons given for failure to report an offence were that the crime was "too minor" (66%), that police could do nothing about it anyway (61%), and that it was too inconvenient/they didn't want to take the time (24%). However, when broken down by offence category, the reasons for non-reporting by sexual assault victims varied in some important respects. Two thirds of women who had been sexually assaulted did not report the crime to the police. The most common reason was that police could do nothing about it (52%), but this was closely followed by 43% who cited concern about the attitude of the police or courts towards this type of crime (compared to a mere 8% of all victims of crime). In addition, fear of revenge is common among victims of sexual assault (33%), and female victims of assault generally (21%).

Finally, the data revealed that victims were most likely to report crimes which result in a significant financial loss, rather than those resulting in pain, injury and fear. Overall, it found that property crimes occurred more frequently than crimes of violence, that most of these resulted in low financial loss, and that victims themselves do not report them because they define the incidents as being too trivial to warrant police intervention. Crimes of violence were less frequent, and did not necessarily result in serious injuries, but there were serious issues raised about the consequences of making a report.

Since this pioneering survey, other surveys including information on

victimization have been conducted in Canada. These include the General Social Survey (1993, 1999, and 2004), the 1993 Violence Against Women survey, and the International Crime Victimization Survey (1989, 1992, 1996, 2000, and 2004). We will briefly review some of their most important findings.

Violence Against Women Survey (1993)

- * 51% of Canadian women experienced at least 1 incident of physical or sexual assault since the age of 18 (vs. 10% in the preceding year).

- * Women were at greater risk of violence by men they know (45%) than by strangers (23%). Many reported past violence from both.

- * 39% of women had been victims of sexual assault (vs. 5% in the previous year). 17% reported physical threats or assaults by men other than spouses (vs. 1% in the previous year).

- * 29% of women had been assaulted by a spouse or live-in partner (3% in prior year). More was reported in previous relationships than current ones (48% vs. 15%).

- * There was a continued risk of violence to women from ex-partners despite a divorce or separation.

- * The most common forms of violence were threats, followed by pushing, grabbing and shoving, slapping, throwing something, kicking, biting, and hitting with fists.

- * The proportion who had been beaten up, choked, sexually assaulted, or had a weapon used against them were all less than 10%.

- * A majority of respondents who have suffered violence had been victimized more than once. This was particularly evident in sexual violence.

- * Women were at risk of sexual violence in a variety of locations/situations. 46% of sexual assaults occurred in a private place, 10% at work, and were not an uncommon risk in public locations

- * Wife assault did not merely involve low level violence such as threats, pushing, grabbing and shoving.

- * The majority of abused women were assaulted repeatedly, 1/3 more than ten times.

*Men from previous relationships were reportedly more violent than others.

The VAWS also detailed the *relationship dynamics* involved:

- * The percentage reporting emotional abuse was higher than those reporting physical or sexual violence (35% vs. 29%).
- * Emotional abuse was used in conjunction with violence by the majority of violent men
- * Obsessive and controlling behaviors were prominent in serious battering relationships, & its frequency increased dramatically as the seriousness of the battering increased
- * Controlling and abusive men often found a woman=s pregnancy a threat to his exclusivity of attention and affection.

Finally, the VAWS indicated important *demographic* correlates:

- * Young women 18-24 experienced rates of sexual assault twice that in the next age group (25-34), & had rates of wife assault 3 times higher.
- * The rate of wife assault in new marriages (2 years or less) was almost three times the national average.
- * Common-law relationships showed rates of violence 4 times higher than legal marriages.
- * Single women & those with some (but not completed) postsecondary education reported the highest rates of sexual assault.
- * In wife assault, both men with less than a high school education, & those who are unemployed, assaulted their partners at twice the rate of others
- * Wife assault and sexual assault were twice as high among those with low incomes
- * Witnessing violence in childhood was a very important risk factor for both abusers and potential victims
- * Alcohol abuse was strongly correlated with violence & seriousness of injury.
- * Rates of violent victimization varied from higher levels in Western Canada to lower levels in the east.

* When all of these associated factors are weighed statistically, the most important predictors were:

verbal abuse/putdowns,
sexual jealousy
efforts to limit women's autonomy/social
contacts
age
the man's education
living in a common-law relationship
early exposure to violence
the man's unemployment.

* This VAWS picture of intimate violence contradicts lifestyle and routine activities theories of victimization.

General Social Survey 2004

- 28% of Canadians aged 15+ reported being victimized one or more times in the preceding 12 months, up slightly from 26% in 1999
- Increases in victimization rates were recorded for 3 of the 8 offence types measured: theft of personal property, theft of household property, and vandalism. There were no significant changes in rates of sexual assault, robbery, physical assault, and motor vehicle theft, while there was a decrease in B&E.
- Household victimization offences occurred most frequently (34% of incidents), followed by violent victimization (29%) & thefts of personal property (25%).
- Residents of Western provinces generally reported higher rates of victimization than residents living east of the Manitoba/Ontario border.
- The risk of violent victimization was highest among Canadians aged 15-24. Other risk factors include being single, living in an urban area, and having a low household income (under \$15,000).
- For household victimization, rates per 1000 households were highest among renters, those living in semi-detached, row or duplex homes, and urban dwellers. Yet, higher household income made both households and individuals more attractive targets for victimization
- In total, only about 34% of criminal incidents were reported to police in 2004, down from 37% in 1999. Household victimization incidents were

most likely to be reported (37%), while thefts of personal property were least likely (31%)

- In 4% of all incidents, victims believed the act was hate-motivated (same as 1999). In 2004, 65% of these were believed motivated by the victim's race or ethnicity, 26% by their sex, 14% by religion, and 12% by sexual orientation
- Canadians who self-identified as Aboriginal were 3 times more likely than members of the non-Aboriginal population to report being victims of violent victimization.
- There was a significant difference between visible minorities and non-visible minorities, while rates were lower among immigrants than non-immigrants (68 vs. 116 per 100,000 population)
- Although the proportion of violent incidents without a weapon has remained relatively stable since 1999 (69% in 2004 and 72% in 1999), violent incidents resulting in injury increased (25% vs. 18%)
- Most often, violent incidents took place in a commercial establishment or public institution (38%). Workplace violence represented 43% of these.

International Crime Victimization Survey 2000

This is the fourth round of this survey, previously conducted in 1989, 1992, & 1996. Key findings:

- On average, for 13 of the industrialized countries, 22% of the population aged 16+ were victims of at least 1 of the 11 listed offences in the prior year. Canada was near the average at 24%
- Between 1996-2000 victimization rates were fairly stable. Of the 10 countries that participated in both rounds, 6 (including Canada) did not experience any significant change. The rest showed decreases.
- Of the 11 types of offences measured, the most prevalent in 2000 was car vandalism (7% of population on average), followed by theft from car at 5%.
- On average, just over half of incidents were reported to police. These range from a high of 65% (Scotland) to a low of 39% (Japan). Canada's figure was near the low end at 49%. Many incidents were not reported because the victim did not believe they were serious.
- In 2000, a majority in each of the 13 countries felt safe when walking

alone after dark. Figures were highest for Sweden (85%), followed by Canada and the U.S. (both 83%). Respondents in Australia and Poland were least likely to feel safe (64% for each).

- Satisfaction with police performance is quite high, particularly in the U.S. and Canada. 89% of Americans and 87% of Canadians felt the police were doing a very or a fairly good job at controlling crime in their area (highest among 13 countries).
- When asked to decide on a sentence for a two-time burglar, most people in 8 countries, including Canada, preferred a non-prison sanction. Leading the way were France (84%) and Finland (79%). Canada came in at 52%.
- Canadians do appear to have grown more punitive in their attitudes towards sentencing over time, as have people in 7 other countries.
- * In 2000, a majority of households in 11 of the countries used at least 1 type of security measure. Poland was the exception, where only 40% of households used one of these devices.

The ICVS thus provides a great deal of information on victimization, but provides the added value of placing Canada's experiences in a broader international context.

Survey Research: Problems:

Now that we have done an overview of the survey data on crime and victimization, we will critique these data, squarely addressing the pros and cons of this methodology.

The chief advantages of surveys over official statistics are that: (i) respondents are asked about theoretically relevant concerns; and (ii) they weed out public decisions not to report or police decisions not to record, resulting in improved estimates of crime and victimization.

Yet, there are numerous problems with these methods. First, such studies depend upon victims *knowing* that they have been victimized and offenders knowing that they have committed a crime. For example, victims of fraud may not know that they have been cheated, and some obscure criminal acts may not be recognized as such by respondents unless brought to their attention. Moreover, what some individuals would perceive as abusive, others deny and excuse.

Secondly, standardized surveys, in which researchers attempt to ask all respondents the same questions in the same way, can sometimes be

insensitive to cultural factors that affect the manner in which individuals *interpret* certain matters. Gomme (1993) gives the example of child abuse, which may be interpreted differently by cultures that consider a certain amount of "spanking" in the child's best interest, and not meaning the same thing as "hitting" the child. Fixed choice questionnaires may be useful, but they depend upon interpretive inferences and context-bound judgements about what is or isn't a meaningful answer to a pre-packaged question. Many respondents are unable to "get into" or hear questions in the same way as those who made them up. This is because respondents, when asked to choose an answer, are likely to be involved in an entirely different set of interpretive relevancies than researchers."

Third, respondents may not always be honest in their answers. Some may be reluctant to confess having done bad things or having experienced them. Some may be embarrassed or ashamed of having been the victim of some forms of crime, or fear revenge.

Fourth, the accuracy of data may suffer due to the faulty memories of respondents. Respondents may either forget incidents, or "telescope" prior events forward in time to the period covered by the survey. Indeed, Gomme suggests that there may be a "class bias" in survey results due to the fact that educated people are more likely to recall events and describe them accurately. This means that lower-class persons and "disadvantaged" members of certain minority groups may give artificially low estimates of both their victimization experiences and their criminal involvements.

Fifth, many subjects will seek to give socially desirable answers or please the researcher, tempering their views in light of their beliefs about what the interviewer wants to hear.

Sixth, inquiring about only *some* offences limits the accuracy of overall estimates of crime based on these surveys. According to Gomme, self-report surveys enumerate mostly trivial offences. Victimization surveys do not ask questions about respondents' experiences with consensual vice crimes. Involvement in "victimless" crimes such as drug use, gambling, and prostitution remain unmeasured. Other crimes regularly omitted from victimization studies include disturbing the peace and public drunkenness. Furthermore, since victimization studies confine themselves to individuals as respondents, they provide no estimates of crimes, such as vandalism and arson, that are most often suffered by organizations.

Seventh, how researchers choose respondents for inclusion in their samples may affect generalizability. Some may use nonrandom samples based on student rosters or urban households - thereby ignoring the often important experiences of dropouts, street youth, small town and rural residents, and transients.

Finally, because "serious" crime is comparatively rare, researchers must draw very large samples in order to get at the entire range of offences. This can be very expensive and time-consuming.

Despite these objections, however, so long as one does not reify survey data as "the Truth," it can bring some suggestive descriptive information to bear on existing theoretical formulations in the "big picture." The images of deviance and crime provided from official sources and surveys of victims and criminals can be likened to aerial photographs. While such snapshots offer, from distant vantage points, informative glimpses of broad and general patterns, they unavoidably leave obscure much of the finer detail regarding the nature and processes of involvement in crime and victimization. However, one must be cautious. To color in the rough sketches provided by such methods other, inductive, and more qualitative methods are required.