

Sociology 4099: Victimology
Prof. J.S. Kenney

Overheads Week 8: Victims and the Medical/Psychiatric Profession

This week we will review and critique victims' encounters with the medical and psychiatric professions. We will proceed by:

- (1) Outlining medical / psychological models
- (2) Critiquing these on the following bases:
 - Medicine as an institution of social control
 - Unwarranted assumptions of cultural universality
 - Critical literature on grief (parents/ survivors)
 - Potential impact on victims social comparison processes
- (3) Looking at the critical views of a noted psychiatrist on "manufacturing victims"
- (4) Reviewing some of my own homicide research

(1) Medical/ Psychological Approaches to Victims:

* Three main themes:

- (1) Stage models of the grieving process
- (2) Therapist assisting patient to accomplish tasks/ grief work
- (3) Diagnosis of various mental disorders

* Stage models:

- Rooted in work of Kubler-Ross (1969)
- Attempts to find temporal uniformities in emotional states/ behavior
- Many models exist
- Disseminated into popular culture/ many victim writers promote

* Task model:

- Rooted in work of John Bowlby
- Emphasizes therapist's role in facilitating "grief work" tasks

* Mental disorders:

- Utilizes framework of DSM to diagnose mental disorders
- Post-traumatic Stress Disorder a common diagnosis
- Categories/ list of diagnoses growing

* We will now critique these formulations, with a particular emphasis on the aftermath of homicide.

(2) General Critiques of the Medical Approach:

(a) Medicine as an Institution of Social Control

* Conrad and Schneider: Implications of applying medical labels:

- On one hand, relate to humanitarian trend (instead of blaming)
- On other hand, 7 negative implications of applying medical labels to victims' "emotional deviance." These are:

- (i) Removing responsibility from individuals in favor of "disorder"
- (ii) Veiling political nature of negative judgement under guise of scientific fact;
- (iii) The problem of "expert control"
- (iv) The potential for medical social control;
- (v) The individualization of social problems;
- (vi) The depoliticization of victims' behavior;
- (vii) The implicit "exclusion of evil"

(b) The Assumption of Cultural Universality:

* The above medical approaches assume no variations by culture

* Theorists debate this issue:

- Ezell, Anspaugh & Oakes (1987): Similar bereavement patterns throughout world, but influenced by culture
- Charmaz (1980): Grief felt and expressed differently across cultures
- Lofland (1985): Grief's variability a better starting point

* Much existing data comes from British/ American widows. Cross-cultural data relatively rare.

* Lofland (1985): Grief "profoundly socially shaped" depending on:

- (1) Level of significance of deceased
- (2) Definition of situation surrounding death
- (3) Character of self experiencing loss
- (4) Interactional setting

* It is at least an open question whether Western medical model uniformly applicable to victims across cultures

(c) Critical Literature on Parents/ Homicide Survivors:

Researchers and victims have attacked the medical models above on the following grounds:

* "Intentionality" of death makes this experience different

* Literature suggesting that temporal uniformities and "tasks" to accomplish do not fit the experiences of:

- (1) Bereaved parents generally (e.g. lessening of symptoms);
- (2) Homicide survivors in particular:

- Stages/tasks disrupted by court
- No “chronic stage”
- Political dimension
- Treatment for “post-traumatic stress” vs. grief

* Experiences of bereaved parents/ homicide survivors differs from prior models in significant ways

(d) Impact of Medical Models on Victims’ Social Comparison Processes:

*While goal of therapeutic intervention is to improve victims’ psychological condition, there are problems:

- Misperceptions by professionals
- Overstating seriousness of victims’ psychological problems
- Unwarranted attributions as to the locus of victims’ problems
- Bias in professionals’ expectations of victims’ social comparison processes (e.g. to similar individuals vs. worse off individuals)

* Winkel & Renssen (1998) found strong evidence of such biases: an “overly pessimistic conception of clients”

(3) Dr. Tana Dineen: Manufacturing Victims:

* Dineen is a Canadian psychiatrist highly critical of her profession

* Argues that term “victim” distorted by psychology: difficult to tell “real” victims from “fabricated” ones

* Argues that “psychology industry” requires expanding number of “fabricated victims.”

* Fabricated victims manufactured through three processes:

- (1) Psychologizing (e.g. “Experts” interpreting unconscious)
- (2) Pathologizing

(3) Generalizing

* *Psychologizing* involves:

- (i) Descriptively constructing a theory about victimization
- (ii) Applying that theory to individuals
- (iii) Turning personal events into psychological symbols/ language
- (iv) Creating the need for psychologists who can interpret symbols/ cure the patient

Essentially, the personal experiences of victims morph into the clinical theories through which others are *assessed* and *treated as if* they are victims.

* *Pathologizing* involves “authoritative” experts:

- (i) Turning ordinary people in difficult situations into “abnormal” people who are “damaged,” “wounded,” “abused,” or “traumatized”
- (ii) Assuming, looking for, and emphasizing the negative (e.g. individual weaknesses, lasting effects)
- (iii) Turning reactions and feelings that are “normal under the circumstances” into emotional problems
- (iv) Ignoring or downplaying the possibility - and potential - for traumatized individuals to cope
- (v) Identifying the need for psychological treatment

* Bruno Bettelheim: POW camps:

- Implications of term “survivor”
- Traumatized individuals are either “in denial” or “in therapy”
- Meaning of term “normal” changed from average to exceptional cases

* *Generalizing* involves “slippery slope” reasoning where exceptional/ brutal circumstances are equated with the ordinary/mundane

* Example: Iran Hostage Crisis: psychologists identified

- Their own prior feelings of victimization (e.g. from divorce, break-ins, etc.)
- Thought of hostages
- Felt empathy
- Concluded they understood

* Example: Holocaust “death guilt” progressively applied to:

- Dr’s attending dying patients
- Anyone seeing someone die
- Anyone knowing someone who died

* “Everything means ‘victim’ and ‘victim’ means nothing at all”

* Dineen provides evidence to counter these practices:

- Iran hostages: while professionals predicted lifelong emotional problems, most had few problems readapting to freedom;
- Concentration camp survivors: many were later found to be well-adapted

* While not trivializing suffering of victims, must realize that many are capable of coping, getting better, even thriving

* This runs contrary to medical view: if a victim, should be a patient

* We must be wary of the “psychology industry” predisposition to see deviance, psychopathology and weakness wherever they look

(4) My Homicide Study: Encounters with Mental Health Professionals:

* Subject’s experiences involved an interaction between:

- (1) The ongoing severity of their upset

(2) Professionals' general orientation to survivors/ their problems

* Findings revolved around three categories:

- (i) Information that subjects encountered re: coping
- (ii) Matters increasing/ decreasing their upset
- (iii) Coping strategies that emerged by gender

* Coping information encountered:

- Dr's view of patient (weak/ incapable vs. otherwise well-adjusted)
- Long term prognosis: (poor vs. good despite initially severe upset)
- Lack of progress (attributed to individual vs. situational factors)
- Progress (attributed to psychiatric treatment vs. making aware of options/ practical assistance)

* Matters increasing/ decreasing subject's upset:

- Long term vs. short-term drug treatment
- Focusing on horror vs. careful listening/ encouraging subject to work through in practical ways
- Narrow treatment focus vs. broad emphasis on awareness of options
- Subject's comfort level with professional

* Coping strategies emerging by gender:

- Dealing with professionals *a strategy* in itself
- Women: Engaged in therapy more often
Medicated more often
Hospitalized more often
- Strategies for *dealing with* professionals:
 - Committing minor crime to get appointment (men)
 - Hedging/ making hard to gauge reactions (both)

- Ignoring advice and increasing, decreasing or discontinuing medication (more men)
- Quitting/ finding another therapist (more women)

* Ultimately, along with initial severity of subjects' reactions:

- Therapist's treatment orientation found significant
- Predominantly "individualistic" therapists most closely associated with problems noted throughout lecture
- Therapists who adopted practical, task oriented approach less problematic in this sense