

8-2019

Examining the Role of Capable Guardianship in Revictimization: A Test of Routine Activities Theory

Jodi Miller

Follow this and additional works at: <https://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Miller, Jodi, "Examining the Role of Capable Guardianship in Revictimization: A Test of Routine Activities Theory" (2019). *Theses and Dissertations (All)*. 1761.

<https://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd/1761>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Knowledge Repository @ IUP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (All) by an authorized administrator of Knowledge Repository @ IUP. For more information, please contact sara.parme@iup.edu.

EXAMINING THE ROLE OF CAPABLE GUARDIANSHIP IN REVICTIMIZATION:
A TEST OF ROUTINE ACTIVITIES THEORY

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

Jodi Miller

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

August 2019

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice

We hereby approve the thesis of

Jodi Miller

Candidate for the degree of Master of Arts

Sadie J. Mummert, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Criminology and Criminal
Justice, Advisor

John Lewis, Ph.D.
Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice

Daniel Scott, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Criminology and Criminal
Justice

ACCEPTED

Randy L. Martin, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Examining the Role of Capable Guardianship in Revictimization: A Test of Routine Activities Theory

Author: Jodi Miller

Thesis Chair: Dr. Sadie J. Mummert

Thesis Committee Members: Dr. John Lewis
Dr. Daniel Scott

While much of the criminological research has focused on the offenders of crime, scholars also have dedicated research to the prevalence and etiology of victimization. Reported in 2008, over 21 million victimizations occurred within the United States, and of those, 4.9 million were violent crime victimizations (Daigle, 2013, p. 24). Furthermore, 28% of individuals who experienced a victimization were likely to be victimized again two or more times within the same year (Daigle, 2013, p. 63). The purpose of this study is to continue extending the research on revictimization in relation to routine activities theory (RAT) with an emphasis on the lack of capable guardian element of the theory. The current study will seek to expand the current research regarding the extent to which RAT might explain violent victimizations, violent revictimization, and the role capable guardianship plays, specifically.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
ONE	INTRODUCTION	1
	Overview.....	1
	Definitions.....	1
	Brief Overview of Uniform Crime Report (UCR).....	2
	National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS).....	3
TWO	LITERATURE REVIEW	7
	Violent Victimization.....	7
	Violent Victimization of Children	7
	Violent Victimization of Adults.....	9
	Prevalence and Characteristics of Sexual Violence & IPV	10
	Demographic Characteristics of Sexual Violence Victims.....	11
	Characteristics of Sexually Violent Perpetrators	15
	Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)	15
	Demographic Characteristics of IPV Victims.....	16
	Family Structure and Victimization.....	19
	Revictimization	20
	Cycle of Victimization: Childhood - Adulthood	23
	Explanation of Victimization: Routine Activities Theory	30
	Theoretical Perspectives for Revictimization	33
	Current Study	36
	Research Questions	36
THREE	METHODS.....	38
	Sample.....	38
	Independent Variables	38
	Dependent Variables	39
	Control Variables	40
	Plan of Analyses	40
FOUR	ANALYSES	42
	Results.....	42
FIVE	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	50
	Summary	50

Chapter	Page
Key Findings.....	50
Limitations	51
Directions for Future Research	53
REFERENCES	55

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Characteristics of Total Sample in Analyses	44
2	Bivariate Analyses of Violent Victimization	47
3	Bivariate Analyses of Violent Revictimization	49

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Overview

Victimization and revictimization are areas of study that have been examined throughout several sources of literature, (Chiu, Lutfey, Litman, Daigle, 2013; Link, Hall, & McKinlay, 2013; Shichor & Tibbetts, 2002; Sickmund & Puzanchera, 2014; Tjaden & Theonnes, 2006; Turner, Finkelhor, Hamby, & Shattuck, 2013), which will be cited throughout this thesis; however, there are still gaps in research that need to be addressed. The purpose of this thesis is to examine the factors that might contribute to a person's victimization and revictimization. The theoretical perspective of routine activities theory, along with risk heterogeneity and state dependence, will be defined and discussed as a means to explain revictimization. Although routine activities theory has been studied extensively, there has been variation regarding the operationalization of a capable guardian; this has created inconsistencies in research (Hollis, Felson, & Welsh, 2013). Three research questions will be addressed in subsequent sections for the purpose of this thesis with regards to the extent in which the theoretical perspectives explain victimization and revictimization. The goal of the research questions is to test routine activities theory in explaining victimization and revictimization, with particular focus on the capable guardian element of the theory and how it may be associated with victimization and revictimization risk.

Definitions

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) (2018) defines victimization as a crime that any individual or household is affected by. For personal crimes, the number of victimizations is equal to the number of victims involved. The number of victimizations may be greater than the number

of incidents, because more than one person may be victimized during an incident. Each crime against a household is assumed to involve a single victim, the affected household. Daigle (2013) defines revictimization as “a victimization of any type followed by a victimization of any type” (p.62). In other words, Daigle (2013) explains that the victimization incidents can be within any given time of each other; these incidents generally reoccur during different developmental time periods (p.62). For example, if an individual during childhood experiences physical assault, he or she may experience sexual assault as an adult. In a study done by Hosser, Raddatz, and Windzio (2007), rates of physical victimization range from 24% to 51% for adults with history of childhood abuse. It important to note, the perpetrator of subsequent victimizations can be, but does not have to be, the same person. Recurring victimization, according to Daigle (2013), is similar to revictimization and is defined as, “a victimization of any type followed by a victimization of any type; there can be any time between incidents” (p. 62). For the purposes of this thesis, revictimization will be defined as experiencing more than one victimization.

Brief Overview of the Uniform Crime Report (UCR)

Data from the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) allows for learning about victimizations and crimes, however; it does not evaluate or represent any information on the victim characteristics of each crime/victimization, as does the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) (Daigle, 2013, p. 20). In 2008, the FBI reported 1,382,012 violent crimes were recorded by U.S. law enforcement agencies that reported data to the UCR (Daigle, 2013, p. 21). However, since the UCR is only representative of the crime that was reported to select law enforcement agencies in the U.S. and uses a hierarchical reporting system, the NCVS has been demonstrated to be a more comprehensive evaluation of victimization(s), as it captures the dark-figure of crime (i.e. those crimes not reported to the police, as well as each crime that occurred during an incident).

National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS)

To improve upon the limited data gleaned from the UCR, the NCVS captures the dark figure of crime; this data include the victim's relation to the offender. The lack in reporting to the police often is due to the victims' relation to the offender. Often, the perpetrator is someone the victim knows. In the NCVS, most victims identified their perpetrators as an acquaintance or friend. One third of perpetrators/offenders were strangers (Daigle, 2013, p. 21-25). As stated by Daigle (2013) the NCVS is a nationally represented sample of approximately 43,000 households or about 76,000 individuals ages 12 years and older that is distributed by the U.S. Census Bureau. The period of time a household stays in the study is three years, completing seven interviews that are administered every 6 months. With concern of recall bias, the NCVS tries to resolve this issue by using a method called, "bounding". "Bounding serves a purpose by giving respondents a concrete event to reference when answering questions in the next interview" (Daigle, 2013, p. 22).

There are two stages in which the NCVS is conducted. The first stage is when each person is asked about any of the seven types of victimization recognized by the NCVS (i.e., rape and sexual assault, aggravated/simple assault, robbery, household burglary, motor vehicle theft (MVT), personal theft, and theft). Specifically, participants are asked if they have experienced any of these types of victimization(s) within the past six months. When individuals report victimization experiences, they complete an incident report for each victimization type reported. For example, individuals are asked to report on where the incident happened, who the perpetrator was, if the victim tried any protective techniques to prevent the offender from committing the crime, etc. In doing this, it helps to divulge the circumstance of the victimization experience (Daigle, 2013, p. 22).

The frequency and likelihood of crime victimization and types of victimization(s), in addition to who is most likely to be a victim, are measured by the NCVS and published by the BJS (Daigle, 2013, p. 23). Among the households within the United States in 2008, Daigle (2013) states that over 21 million victimizations happened; of those, 4.9 million (23%) were violent victimizations and of those the most common victimization reported was simple assault (p. 24). As mentioned, the common type of victim is identified; excluding rape and intimate partner violence (IPV), males experienced violent victimizations more so than females (Daigle, 2013).

Blacks and individuals younger than age 24 years had higher likelihoods of violent victimization as well. The characterization of incidents of victimization is identified as well; lower than half of all experienced victimizations reported to the NCVS also are reported to the police. This underreporting can be attributed to the victim-offender relationship; most victims know who their perpetrator is and, most often than not, they report that their perpetrator is an acquaintance or friend. One-third of all violent victimizations reported to the NCVS were committed by strangers. Also, it was noted that in 20% of the incidents, offenders had weapon(s) (Daigle, 2013, p. 24).

In October of 2018, the BJS revised the estimated data from the NCVS; this included the amount of residents in the U.S. aged 12 and older who faced a single, or multiple forms of violent victimization(s). Within this report the BJS states that the crimes included in the NCVS are classified by the year the survey was administered, and not the year the crime was committed. The unit of analysis in the revised BJS report is the number of victims of each crime, with crimes against households considered to be a single victim. The report classifies these

crimes against households, or single victims, as “the affected household”. The BJS (2018) reports that the crime rate from 1993 to 2016 has declined by 75% for people ages 12 or older.

The BJS report observes changes from 2015 to 2016 in regards to victimization. Violent victimization rates for males 12 and older had increased from 15.9 to 19.6 per 1,000 persons and 2.7 to 4.2 per 1,000 persons for aggravated assault against males within this age group. For the persons 25 to 34 years old, violent victimization increased from 21.8 to 28.4 per 1,000 and decreased from 24.6 to 22.4 for females within this age group. The amount of people who experienced one or multiple violent victimizations rose from 2.7 million in 2015 to 2.9 million in 2016. Rape and/or sexual assault rates decreased from 1.6 to 1.1 per 1,000 persons 12 years or older; specifically, female rape or sexual assault victimizations decreased from 2.7 to 1.8 per 1,000 persons 12 or older (BJS, 2018).

In addition to the NCVS reporting on crime not reported to law enforcement, it includes questions about why the crime(s) were not reported to the police. The BJS (2018) reported that in 2016, “44% of violent victimizations were reported to police” (p. 5). Some of the reasons the NCVS found for underreporting included, but were not limited to, fear of retaliation, getting the offender in trouble, perception police would not, or could not be effective, or that the issue was personal (BJS, 2018). Those who report to police are not always the victims. Those who report may include witnesses, secondary victims, members in the household, or other officials such as school or workplace officials.

Although the BJS report distinguished a continuous decline of crime, 75%, from 1993 to 2016, violent crime rates increased for certain demographic groups. The rate of violent victimizations increased for males; however, there were no significant changes for these types of crimes for females. The aggravated assault rates for females did not show any change, but did so

for males 12 and older (BJS, 2018). More detailed information of the crime rates for certain demographic groups will be discussed in subsequent sections. Moreover, Bunch, Clay-Warner, and McMahon-Howard (2014) contend that past victimization incidents are predictive factors for future experiences of victimization. Since past victimization is a predictive factor for future victimizations and the NCVS reports on individuals as young as 12 years old, understanding the prevalence of childhood victimization is important.

CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Violent Victimization

Within this chapter, the violent victimization of children and adults will be discussed in order to explicate the prevalence of victimization and revictimization. Additional information regarding the prevalence of victimization will also be discussed, such as the effect demographics may or may not have on one's victimization, the risk factors associated with experiencing victimization, characteristics of the perpetrator, and family factors. This discussion of victimization will lead to further discussions about the likelihood of experiencing subsequent victimizations with the support of theoretical concepts such as, routine activities theory, risk heterogeneity, and state dependence.

Violent Victimization of Children

Research has explored the violent victimization experienced by children. Shichor and Tibbetts (2002) state that although the NCVS show Americans experience over 30 million victimizations each year, there is a 3% chance a person is at risk for being the victim of a violent crime. Expanding the information provided by the NCVS, Shichor and Tibbetts (2002) explicated that children and adolescent youths are more susceptible and vulnerable to being victimized than any other age group (i.e. adults). Youth, such as teens, commit roughly 18% of crime, but make up 25% of victims (Shichor & Tibbetts, 2002).

Annually, there are roughly 1 million violent crimes that involve children as victims, which are reported to law enforcement, and 1.1 million additional cases of the abuse of children reported to Child Protective Agencies (CPA). According to Shichor and Tibbetts (2002), the nation has about 22 million adolescents aged between 12 and 17. Of the aforementioned 22

million adolescents, approximately 1.8 million are reported as victims of sexual assault, 3.9 million victims of physical assault, and roughly 9 million adolescents witness a serious violent crime.

In 2014, the National Report from the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) reported that most maltreated children were neglected. While the rates of maltreatment declined, the rates of neglect increased, specifically emotional neglect. Girls were sexually abused at a rate of 3.8 per 1,000 and boys were sexually abused at a rate of 1.0 per 1,000 (Sickmund & Puzzanchera, 2014).

Research has focused on the characteristics of children and how these characteristics might be related to victimization risk. Race and ethnicity have been shown to be associated with a higher rate of maltreatment. By categorizing all types of maltreatment (physical abuse, sexual abuse, and neglect) into one group, it was stated that 49.6% of children maltreated were Black, 28.6% White, and 30.2% Hispanic. In 2018, the BJS reported that from 2015 to 2016, statistically significant changes were not present for violent crime in regards to race and Hispanic origin (BJS, 2018). This information was taken from the NCVS from a sample including those individuals age 12 and older. Regarding class, children of a lower socioeconomic status (SES) are more likely to be maltreated in some way, abused or neglected. Additionally, children with two married, biological parents have lower rates of maltreatment compared to children living with a single parent who has a cohabitating partner, which had the highest rate of maltreatment (Sickmund & Puzzanchera, 2014).

Risk Characteristics of Child Victims

Shichor and Tibbetts (2002) noted that minors are more vulnerable and susceptible to victimization because of their age, size, and dependency status. Those children whom are targeted are more likely to be shy, lonely, compliant/willing, young, emotionally disturbed, needy, and may have physical, emotional, or developmental disabilities (p. 81). Also, Shichor and Tibbetts (2002) stated minors whom are victimized or at risk for victimization are likely to be victimized by parents more so than any other assailant. However, other family members, friends, acquaintances, strangers, and/or caretakers can victimize these children as well (p. 82). It also was noted that emotional attachments between the child and caretaker(s) is imperative when determining whether one is at risk of victimization (Reid & Sullivan, 2009). Reid and Sullivan (2009) made it known that the presence of poor attachment between parent/guardian/caretaker and the child increases risk for child abuse victimization. The abused individuals observed in this study affirmed poor parental bonding experiences (Reid & Sullivan, 2009).

Violent Victimization of Adults

The BJS reported that from 2015 to 2016 violent victimizations rose for males 12 and older from 15.9 to 19.6 per 1,000 persons; however, the rates for females were so minimal that it was noted no significant change for the violent victimizations of females was present. Within the age group of 25 to 34 years, violent victimization rates rose from 21.8 to 28.4 per 1,000. All other age groups did not have any statistically significant changes from 2015-2016 (BJS, 2018). Also reported was the fact that there was no statistical significance in changes for violent crime by race or household income. However, marital status did play a role in victimization rates. Persons, who reported being widowed, experienced violent crime victimization at an increased rate from 8.5 per 1,000 to 13.4 (BJS, 2018). Those who reported being separated had an increase

rate of violent victimization as well from 2015-2016. Those who were separated, and experienced violent crime, increased from 39.5 to 66.4 victimizations per 1,000 (BJS, 2018). Research has paid considerable attention to the violent victimizations categorized as sexual violence and intimate partner violence (IPV), in particular.

Prevalence and Characteristics of Sexual Violence & IPV

Sexual Violence

Breiding, Smith, Basile, Walters, Chen, and Merrick (2014), using data from 2011, contended that sexual violence, stalking, and intimate partner violence (IPV) are crucial public health issues affecting the lives of millions of individuals within the United States (U.S). The report constructed by Breiding et al. (2014) used the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS). This survey was a telephone interview completed by a nationally randomized representative sample of individuals 18 years of age or older. There were a total of 12,727 total interviews completed by participants; 6,879 were women, and 5,848 were men. Victims were evaluated based on experiences of sexual violence, stalking, and IPV over the individuals' lifetime and within the 12 months prior to the interview. Questions in this survey consisted of what the experiences of physical violence were like; for example, being slapped, pushed, or shoved. Items of physical violence included being hurt by pulling hair, being hit with a hard object, getting slammed against something, attempted hurt such as, choking or suffocating, getting beaten, purposely burned, and/or the partner using a gun or knife against the victim.

Breiding et al. (2014) defined sexual violence as rape which includes completed or attempted forced penetration and alcohol/drug-facilitated penetration; and sexual violence other than rape such as sexual coercion (i.e., non-physically pressured unwanted penetration) and

unwanted sexual contact (i.e., kissing or fondling). There are four sub-types of IPV as distinguished by Breiding et al. (2014). The four sub-types include, sexual violence, physical violence, stalking, and psychological aggression. Current and former spouses can be perpetrators of IPV, as well as domestic partners, dating partners (i.e. boyfriends/girlfriends), and continuous sexual partners. Smith, Chen, Basile, Gilbert, Merrick, Patel, Walling, and Jain (2017) also used the NISVS; however, they considered the data between years 2010 – 2012 at the state and national levels. There were a total of 18,584 men and 22,590 women who completed the survey. Smith et al. (2017) stated that within the U.S. over one in three women, roughly 37.3%, have experienced sexual violence, physical violence, and/or stalking victimization by an intimate partner within their lifetime.

The BJS (2018) used information from the NCVS to determine that in 2015 victims experienced rape or sexual assault at a rate of 18.6 per 1,000 persons and in 2016 these rates increased to 21.1 per 1,000 overall. However, when looking at specific demographics, such as age groups, those 12 and older in 2015 – 2016 experiencing sexual assault or rape decreased from 1.6 – 1.1 per 1,000 victimizations (BJS, 2018).

Demographic Characteristics of Sexual Violence Victims

Sex

The BJS reported that rates of sexual assault or rape from 2015 to 2016 decreased for females – 2.7 to 1.8 per 1,000 victims 12 or older. With regard to males, there was less of a significant difference from 2015 to 2016 for rates of sexual assault or rape, 0.5 to 0.3 per 1,000, respectively (BJS, 2018). Breiding et al. (2014) report on the prevalence of sexual violence by sex. They conclude that about 19.3% (>23 million) of women in the U.S are raped within their lifetime; 11.5% of women will/have experience(d) forced penetration. Furthermore, 1.6% (1.9

million) females were raped within the 12 months prior to taking the survey. With regard to male victims, 1.7% (about 2 million) were raped in their lifetime and 0.7% were forced into penetration. Note, that in the last 12 months of this survey, the number of men who experienced this type of violence, rape, was reportedly too small to be significantly reliable, and therefore it was not provided. During their lifetimes, 43.9% of women were victims of sexual violence, *not* rape, and of these types of victimizations 5.5% of females experienced this violence within the 12 months prior to the survey. With regard to women and the prevalence of sexual violence within a 12-month period and lifetime period, Smith et al. (2017) reported on rape, completed or attempted, and unwanted sexual contact among others. Reports of rape during the lifetime among women had an estimated number of victims at almost 23 million and within the previous 12 months was approximately 1.5 million. The reports on unwanted sexual contact showed approximately 33 million female victims during the lifetime and roughly 2.5 million within the previous 12 months for female victims (Smith et al., 2017).

On the other hand, reportedly about 23.4% of men were violently sexually victimized, *not* raped within their lifetime, and about 5.1% males experienced this same type of victimization within the previous 12 months prior to the study. The lifetime prevalence of men who were forced to penetrate a perpetrator was about 6.7%, or more than 7.6 million, 1.7% of men within the last 12 months before the survey were made to engage in this same kind of victimization; the number for women in the last 12 months was too small to be significantly reliable (Breiding et al., 2014). Smith et al. (2017) contend that about 219,000 men experience rape, and about 1.9 million experienced unwanted sexual contact.

Examining sexual coercion, roughly 12.5% of women experienced this type of act in their lifetime, and 2.0% within the previous 12 months. Approximately, 5.8% of men, on the other

hand, were victimized by sexual coercion during their lifetime, and about 1.3% of men experienced this victimization within the last 12 months (Breiding et al., 2014). In relation to unwanted sexual contact, 1 in 4 women, or approximately 27.3%, experienced this type of victimization in their lifetimes and 2.2% in the past 12 months. Unwanted sexual contact was also experienced by 10.8% of men during their lifetime, and 1.6% in the 12 months leading up to the survey (Breiding et al., 2014). This research indicates that women experience significantly more sexual victimization than males. In addition to observing the prevalence on sexual violence on sex, focusing attention on the prevalence of sexual violence with respect to race also has been examined in existing research.

Race

Smith et al. (2017) also contend that during the lifetime and among races (e.g. Blacks, Whites, Hispanics), White women were more likely than Blacks or Hispanics to experience sexual violence. For Whites, 19.9% (approximately 16 million) experienced rape, and 38.9% (approximately 31.4 million) experienced contact sexual violence. Blacks (20.7% or approximately 3 million) experienced rape and 35.5% (approximately 5.2 million) experienced contact sexual violence¹, and lastly 15.0% (approximately 2.4 million) of Hispanics experienced rape and 26.9% (approximately 4.2 million) experienced contact sexual violence. Breiding et al. (2014) observed the prevalence of violent victimization of race/ethnicity. It was reported that approximately 32.3% (663,000) of multi-racial women, 21.2% (estimated 3 million) of Black women, 20.5% (approximately 16.4 million) of White women, 13.6% (approximately 2.2 million) of Hispanic women, and 27.5% of American Indian/Alaska Native women were raped within their lifetime; an estimated number of victims was not provided for American

¹ Contact sexual violence consists of rape, forced to penetrate another individual, sexual coercion, and/or unwanted sexual violence (Smith et al., 2017, p. 217).

Indian/Alaska Native. Moreover, the lifetime approximations of rape for men by race were not significantly reliable for reporting; however, one exception allowed for reporting, which was 1.6% (approximately 1.2 million) of white men were raped. Experiences of sexual violence other than rape, within one's lifetime, was reported as being experienced by 64.1% (approximately 1.3 million) of multiracial women, 46.9% (approximately 37.6 million) of White women, 38.2% (estimated 5.5 million) of Black women, and 55% (452,000) of American Indian/Alaska Native women. In relation to males, roughly 39.5% whom are multiracial, 26.6% (817,000) Hispanic, 24.4% (approximately 3 million) Black, 22.2% (estimated 16.8 million) White, and 24.5% American Indian/Alaska Native² experienced sexual victimization other than rape within their lifetime (Breiding et al., 2014).

Age of First Victimization

Smith et al. (2017) concluded that roughly 8.4 million female victims of completed rape were younger than the age of 18 for their initial victimization. Breiding et al. (2014) contended that of completed rape (i.e., completed/forced penetration, and completed drug/alcohol facilitated penetration), about 78.7% of females experienced their first occurrence before the age of 25, 40.4% experienced their initial completed rape prior to being 18 years of age, 28.3% from ages 11 – 17 years, 12.1% of those 10 years of age or younger; they also noted that it the first victimization of this act was experienced by about 38.3% of those aged 18 – 24 years. Additionally, the first victimization was approximated at 15.2% for those aged 25 – 34 years, and significantly decreased, as individuals got older in age (4.6% for ages 34 – 44 years and 1.5% for those 45 and older).³ Of those individuals who were forced to penetrate the offender, about 71.0% of males were first victimized before the age of 25, 21.3% prior to the age of 18 years,

² A raw number of the estimated victims was not provided.

³ Results for men were left out of the study, as they were too small to produce significant/reliable statistics.

18.6% at and between 11 – 17 years of age, and approximately 49.7% from ages 18 – 24 years (Breiding et al., 2014).

Characteristics of Sexually Violent Perpetrators

The statistics associated with female victims of rape are approximately 99% male perpetrators, and about 94.7% of male perpetrators of sexual victimization other than rape (Breiding et al., 2014). Furthermore, male perpetrators victimized approximately 79.3% of male victims of rape (Breiding et al., 2014). Breiding et al. (2014) also reported that for the other three types of sexual violence (forced to penetrate, sexual coercion, and unwanted sexual contact), majority of the male victims only had perpetrators who were females; 82.6% made to penetrate, 80% sexually coerced, and about 54.7% experienced unwanted sexual contact (Breiding et al., 2014). Smith et al. (2017) contend that those who are intimate partners, who can be the offenders, may include current or past significant others (spouses, boyfriends/girlfriends, dating partners) and sexual partners.

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)

According to Smith et al. (2017), IPV includes sexual violence, stalking, physical violence, and psychological aggression. Approximately 2.5 million women experienced contact sexual violence, and 4.7 million victimized by physical violence by an intimate partner. Reported by Breiding et al. (2014), the lifetime prevalence and 12-month prevalence of rape perpetrated by an intimate partner was approximately 8.8% and 0.8%, respectively, for women. National prevalence for women who experienced sexual violence victimization other than rape from an intimate partner was about 15.8% (approximately 19 million) for women within their lifetime, and about 2.1% (>2.4 million) within the last 12 months prior to the survey. With regard to physical violence, approximately 31.5% (approximately 38 million) of women experienced this

type of violence by an intimate partner in their lifetime. Roughly 22.3% (estimated 26.9 million) of women who were victimized by one or more acts of severe physical violence experienced this within their lifetimes. With respect to this type of victimization, about 15.4% (approximately 18.6 million) of women experienced getting slammed against something, and about 13.2% (estimated >15.8 million) of women were hit with a fist or a hard object (Breiding et al., 2014). Breiding et al. (2014) approximated 27.3% (approximately >32.9 million) of women were victimized of a sexually violent act such as rape, forced to penetrate, sexual coercion, and unwanted sexual contact, physical violence, or stalking in their lifetime by an intimate partner. Furthermore, the study found that approximately 13.4% of women was physically injured (Breiding et al., 2014).

Smith et al. (2017) reported approximately 2.1 million men experienced contact sexual violence, and 5.3 million experienced physical violence. It also was noted by Breiding et al. (2014) that about 11.5% (approximately 13 million) of men, nationally, were victimized of a contact sexually violent act, physically violent act, or an act of stalking by an intimate partner within their lifetime. In addition, about 3.5% of male victims were physically injured. However, as reported by the BJS (2018) from data observed from the NCVS surveys, IPV decreased from 3.0 to 2.2 per 1,000 persons from 2015 to 2016 (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2018); although numbers decreased according to the BJS from 2015 to 2016, the previous study indicate that there still are an immense amount of people affected by sexual violence.

Demographic Characteristics of IPV Victims

Race/Ethnicity

Beyond the differences of IPV occurrences between males and females, research also has considered the differences among the race/ethnicity of victims. Of women, nationally, 11.4%

(234,000) are multiracial, 9.6% (n= 7,730,000) White, 8.8% (n= 1,286,000) Black, and 6.2% (n= 1,011,000) Hispanic were raped within their lifetimes by their intimate partner(s). When Breiding et al., (2014) assessed sexual violence other than rape by an intimate partner among women in their lifetime, they reported that it was experienced by, 26.8%, or 550,000 multiracial women, 17.4% (n= 2,536,000) Black, 17.1% (n= 13,710,000) White, and 9.9% (n= 1,603,000) Hispanic women. Among men who were sexually victimized, during their lifetime, by an act other than rape at the hands of an intimate partner, 18.2% (n= 377,000) were multiracial, 14.8% (n= 1,878,000) were Black, 13.5% (n= 2,204,000) were Hispanic, and 7.6% (n= 5,777,000) were White. Physical violence experienced by women was reported among race/ethnicity with 51.3% (n= 1,055,000) multiracial, 41.2% (n= 5,996,000) Black, 30.5% (n= 24,469,000) White, and 29.7% (n= 4,819,000) Hispanic women reporting physical violence by an intimate partner during their lifetime. Additionally, Breiding et al. (2014) found that among men experiencing physical violence by an intimate partner during their lifetime, 39.3% (n= 814,000) were multiracial, 36.3% (n= 4,603,000) were Black, 27.1% (n= 4,428,000) were Hispanic, and 26.6% (n= 20,190,000) were White (Breiding et al., 2014).

Gross, Winslett, Roberts, and Gohm (2006) examined unwanted sexual violence against women in college including those perpetrated by intimate partners. The study included a final sample size of 903 females aged 17 – 25 at the undergraduate level located in the southeastern part of the U.S. at a state university. Of the 903 women sampled, 817 were white and 86 were African American. The percentage of the sample that had experienced unwanted sexual contact was approximately 27%, while those whom reported multiple types of sexual aggression was at 37%. Of the sample, 36% of African Americans and 26% of Whites reported experiencing unwanted sexual victimization. Conclusively, it was found that 18.8% (n = 170) of the sample

experienced forced intercourse. The study participants stated that boyfriends were most likely to be the offender of sexual aggression (n = 101; 49%), friends as the second most common at 29.7% (n = 73), and acquaintances at 21.1% (n = 52). Other aggressors noted at lesser rates among this age group and college population were, strangers, husbands, and others [i.e. supervisors, professors, etc.] (Gross et al., 2006). Although these numbers exceed 170 in totality, it is due to the possibility that some respondents reported multiple incidents.

Age of First Victimization

Smith and colleagues (2017) found that about 8.6 million female victims of IPV were under the age of 18 when the first victimization experience occurred. The NISVS consists of a random sample of individuals 18 years of age and older in the United States; these individuals are surveyed through the means of telephone communication. This survey is a nationally represented sample (Breiding et al. (2014). In 2011, 14,155 interviews were administered, and of those, 12,727 were completed and 1,428 were partially completed. In total, it was reported that 5,848 males, and 6,879 females completed the survey. Furthermore, the prevalence of female victims who were first victimized by intimate partner violence, such as contact sexual violent acts, physically violent acts, stalking, or other types of IPV was 71.1% before age 25 years, 23.2% before 18 years old, 23.1% at and between ages 11 – 17 years old, and 47.9% at and between ages 18 – 24 years (Breiding et al. 2014). As for males who first experienced the same form(s) of victimization as mentioned above, 58.2% happened before the age of 25 years, 14.1% before 18, 14% at and between ages 11 – 17 years, 44.1% at and/or between ages 18 – 24 years, 26.7% of those 25 – 34 years of age, 10.4% ages 35 – 44 years, and about 4.7% at or above age 45 years (Breiding et al., 2014). Smith et al. (2017) contend approximately 1.5 million men were

made to penetrate, and 4.2 million for IPV (completed made to penetrate, physical violence, and stalking).

Family Structure and Victimization

Turner, Finkelhor, Hamby, and Shattuck (2013) conducted a study about family structure and victimization. They looked at several different factors and the impact each had on victimization; this included community disorder, family adversity, parental conflict, parental drug/alcohol use, family structure, multiple victimization, and distress. Minors in non-traditional families (i.e., single-parent households, cohabitating households, adoptive households, etc.), especially youths in single parent households are susceptible to victimization when there are issues of economic deprivation (i.e., areas with increased levels of disorder). Youths have an increased likelihood to witness and experience personal victimization(s) when residing in areas with high community violence; this is likely to happen outside of the residence. Family adversity was another variable Turner et al. (2013) examined to seek out as risk factors of victimization. They predicted that when parents/guardians experience greater levels of stress, there is a greater likelihood they will engage in inconsistent and harsher parenting; this leads to greater risks for child maltreatment.

Another variable looked at was parental conflict. Turner et al. (2013) noted that non-traditional families are more likely to deal with interpersonal issues such as increased conflict between partners. Due to the notion that verbal conflict by parents is a greater risk factor of domestic partner violence and can lead to issues with parenting, children within those households are likely to witness family violence and thus become exposed to child maltreatment. As far as the issue with parental use of drugs and/or alcohol, Turner et al., (2013) stated that these problematic behaviors are correlated significantly with child maltreatment. The authors also

discussed victimization by observing family structure and distress. Within this section of their study, they used data from Finkelhor, Ormord, and Turner (2007), which stated that among the children, whom they recorded as experiencing any victimization, 69% within the last year, experienced more than one type of victimization and 10% experienced seven or more types.

Turner et al, (2013) noted that poly-victimization, collective exposure throughout victimization type, is related to experiences of increasingly high levels of distress in youths and children. They conducted their current study to seek out whether or not children in non-traditional homes experience poly-victimization. The dataset used to evaluate this issue came from, *The National Survey of Children's Exposure to Violence (NatSCEV)*. The sample consisted of 4,046 children aged 2-17 years old within the United States (U.S.). Turner et al. (2013) found that there are higher rates of victimization among minors in families with one parent, step- or cohabitating families in comparison to those residing with their two biological or adoptive parents. Increased exposure was evident for about all types of victimizations (maltreatment, physical assault, witnessing family violence, exposure to violence in the community, etc.). Two types of victimizations that involve parents as the offenders were child maltreatment and witnessing violence in the family; this had significantly higher rates when compared to families consisting of two biological parents (Turner et al. 2013). Hosser, Raddatz, and Windzio (2007) cite that physical victimization rates for adults, who experienced childhood abuse, range from 24% to 51%; this may be indicative of a cycle of revictimization.

Revictimization

Daigle (2013) defines various forms of victimization that recurs. The first is repeat victimization, which is defined as a person or place that is victimized multiple times; this is when the same type of victimization happens. The second form is revictimization, which is when a

person is again victimized multiple times; however, it is when one is victimized by any type of victimization; this usually occurs over a wide spread of time such as childhood to adulthood. Poly-victimization is when one experiences various types of victimization; this is usually the term used for recurring childhood victimization (p. 61-62). As shown above, there are many different ways in which revictimization, or being victimized more than once, is defined. For the purposes of this thesis, the focus will be on the general conceptualization of repeat victimization, revictimization, and polyvictimization; however, the term revictimization will commonly be used interchangeably in association with the aforementioned terms. In order to go in depth more about the prevalence and cycle of revictimization, it is important to briefly understand and note the prevalence of revictimization.

Prevalence

Daigle (2013) expressed that of those who experienced any victimization type, 28% dealt with two or more victimizations within the same year, and 44% of victims of domestic violence were victimized by more than one occurrence. It was noted that victims of IPV, assault, and rape are at an increased risk of experiencing further victimization(s) following their initial incident. Daigle (2013) contends that between 1992 and 2004 roughly 15% of households whom were assessed by the NCVS faced multiple incidents of family violence involving the same victim (p. 63). Daigle (2013) states that the households of which reported domestic violence, approximately 35% did so again in five weeks (p. 65). A study done by Mele (2009) on repeat IPV was addressed by Daigle (2013), stating the median number of days between the first and second incident was 62, and the amount between the third and fourth incident was 37; this shows the acceleration of victimization over time (p. 65). In the subsequent section, this repetition of victimization will be addressed more in depth, specifically from childhood to adulthood.

Risk Factors for Revictimization

Individuals living in single-parent households are at increased risks for recurring victimization (Daigle, 2013, p. 67). Areas consisting of single parent households may not consist of adequate levels of supervision (guardianship) and may be indicative of greater risks of recurring victimization experiences (Daigle, 2013, p. 68); past victimization is a significant predictor for revictimization (Bunch, Clay-Warner, and McMahon-Howard, 2014). Increased levels of personal victimizations may be associated with certain household characteristics. These include, but are not limited to, low socioeconomic status households/neighborhoods, and having children (Daigle, 2013, p. 68). Tjaden and Theonnes (2006) assessed victim offender relationship, which may highlight the lack of a potential guardian. Of the 8,000 women surveyed in their study, 20.2% had experienced rape by their current or ex-spouse, 4.3% by current or former live-in partner, and finally 21.5% raped by their current or former non-married significant other or date (p. 21). Additionally, among the 8,000 victims who were male, Tjaden and Theonnes (2006) found that 4.1% experienced rape from their current or ex-spouse, 3.7% by current or former live-in partner, and 2.7% by current or former non-married significant other or date (p. 21).

Daigle, Fisher, and Cullen (2008) exemplify the effect of using self-protective factors, either by physical or verbal means within their own study on college-aged individuals in regards to sexual victimization and threats. They found that taking action to protect oneself by using any of the aforementioned means was more effective in preventing multiple victimizations from happening. This finding suggests that when using self-protective measures, one's likelihood of experiencing multiple victimizations potentially decreases, and may diminish the perception of the "suitable target" being vulnerable enough to victimize. Additionally, alcohol plays a

significant role in one's likelihood for victimization and revictimization as well. With regard to rape, Tjaden and Thoennes (2006) discovered that 20% of women and 38% of men were under the influence of alcohol or drugs before their victimization. Alcohol impairs one's ability to identify and avoid a potentially harmful setting (Daigle, 2013), therefore possibly increasing the likelihood of being victimized.

In addition to illicit drug and alcohol use, Walsh, Blaustein, Knight, Spinazzola, and Van der Kolk (2007) state that childhood sexual abuse (CSA) is an indicator for heightened risks of revictimization. This is not the case for everyone who experiences CSA, but more likely for those who lack a support system among other factors such as victim blaming, poor self-esteem, engaging in more provocative behaviors, etc. Lacking these coping mechanisms or support systems may increase one's overall vulnerability and contribute to being a suitable target for subsequent victimization (Walsh et al. 2007). In following sections, there will be much attention paid to the overall prevalence of revictimization, the close time-span exhibited for a second victimization experience to occur after the initial victimization takes place, and the cycle of revictimization from childhood to adulthood.

Cycle of Victimization: Childhood – Adulthood

Reports of experiencing one type of abuse—physical, sexual, or emotional abuses—during childhood resulted in 5.8 times greater the likelihood of reporting abuse as an adult. Experiencing all three types of the aforementioned abuses as a child resulted in much greater odds for any type of abuse (Chiu, Lutfey, Litman, Link, Hall, and McKinlay, 2013). Chiu et al. (2013) found that a history of childhood abuse is relative to having a greater risk of becoming a victim to all types of abuses as an adult. Chiu et al. (2013) estimated the overlap and prevalence of several abuse measures within a sample of a diverse community. The results showed a

prevalence of abuse ranges from 15%-27%, which is dependent of type, gender, and life stage (Chiu et al., 2013). Supporting the research done by Chiu et al. (2013), National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System Child files from 2003 until 2014 and the census data were used to develop the prevalence report of childhood maltreatment (Kim, Wildeman, Jonson-Reid, & Drake, 2017).

Kim et al. (2017) used this data to determine that by the age of 18, 37.4% of all children will have experienced an investigation from child protective services (CPS) for child maltreatment (sexual, physical, and emotional abuse as well as neglect). Brenner and Ben-Amitay (2015) focused on sexual revictimization of 60 adult women who experienced childhood sexual abuse (CSA). In their sample, 13 out of 14 (92%) of the women who reported that they received negative responses to reporting their CSA in childhood were revictimized. The scholars also stated that 70% of the women who reported experiencing sexual abuse during childhood experienced sexual revictimization in adulthood (Brenner & Ben-Amitay, 2015).

Chiu et al. (2013) measured abuse using The Boston Area Community Health (BACH) Survey. They used a self-administered questionnaire from BACH to test recurring victimization from childhood to adulthood. The questionnaire was administered to a sample size of a population of 2,301 men and 3,201 women. Chiu et al. (2013) identified any overlap between three types of abuse (physical, sexual, and emotional) from childhood to adulthood. For example, the prevalence of sexual abuse in adulthood was 15% among men who stated they experienced one type of childhood abuse, of the men who stated experiencing two types of abuse as a child, it was 28% in adulthood, and finally 57% of men who experienced adulthood sexual abuse, reported experiencing all three types of abuse stated above in childhood (Chiu et al., 2013).

All in all, in this study, the authors observed a pattern of revictimization stating that having a history of childhood abuse is associated with a greater risk of being victim to all abuse

types as an adult. Chiu et al. (2013) indicated that the presence of any one kind of abuse is suggestive towards experiences of other types of abuse, in addition to revictimization later in life. Chiu et al. (2013) also states that from their data, one form of child abuse may lead to increased rates of revictimization during adolescence or adulthood.

Goodlin and Dunn (2009) assessed 4,331 households were assessed on experiencing victimization through the NCVS database. Goodlin and Dunn (2009) stated that there were 5,584 “family violence victimizations” experienced within the 4,331 households. Of those households, 80% experienced co-occurrence violence, which was explained as being when a family member victimizes another in the house. This violence could include but is not limited to, parent-child violence, violence done by aunts or uncles, sibling violence, etc. However, of these 4,331 households experiencing family violence, 15% dealt with repeat victimizations (Goodlin & Dunn, 2009).

Malicoat and Ireland (2014) noted a study done by Marx, Heidt, and Gold (2005) suggesting that women who were sexually assaulted as children, are three times more likely to experience revictimization during adulthood than individuals who were not victimized in childhood (p. 84). Malicoat and Ireland (2014) assess dating violence and note that the rates of individuals experiencing assaults by intimate partners are indicative of teens being more likely to experience such abuse by a significant other, than adults. It was stated that the issue of teens being more likely to experience intimate partner abuse, raises concern that only a few parents perceive dating violence is a crucial issue for their children (p. 107). Malicoat and Ireland (2014) state that about 1/3 of youths are victimized by a dating partner during adolescence (p. 107). Silverman, Raj, Mucci, & Hathaway (2001) suggest that after the evaluation of lifetime

prevalence for IPV, the risk for intimate partner abuse for adolescents may be at a higher rate than adults (p. 577).

Voith, Topitzes, and Reynolds (2016) contend that over that last 20 years, much research has exemplified victimization during childhood often seeps into later years into adulthood; this can lead to “lifelong patterns of victimization”. Violence exposure in childhood, such as physical and emotional abuse, can increase their risks of repeat victimization throughout their lives. Voith et al. (2016) conducted a 24-year prospective study that observed any links between exposure to conflicts in the household and physical abuse in childhood to violent victimization in adulthood. The results of the study indicated that 1,539 minority children in lower income families, revealed significant connections with exposure to family conflict and future revictimization.

Voith et al. (2016) also indicated that there are likely connections between physical abuse in childhood and later revictimization was probable for males, specifically. Females, however, who were exposed to a frequency of family conflict were deemed particularly more vulnerable to revictimization in adulthood. In another study, Widom, Czaja, and Dutton (2008) indicated that by the age of 40, participants ($n=882$) relayed their experiences of victimization or trauma. It was reported that 43.8% were physically harmed as a child, with an odds ratio of 2.21; this signifies that this percentage of individuals who experienced physical harm⁴ in childhood was 2.21 times more likely of being revictimized. Those who were physically abused⁵ as a child, 26.1%, were 3.56 times more likely of being revictimized (Widom et al., 2008).

Widom et al. (2008) constructed their study by using data from neglected and/or abused children in comparison to non-abused/neglected children followed into young adulthood. Widom and colleagues (2008) contend that after interviewing a group of adults who were sexually and

⁴ Physical harm was not defined.

⁵ “Physical abuse cases included injuries such as bruises, welts, burns, lacerations, wounds, cuts, bone and skull fractures, and other evident physical injuries”(Widom et al., 2008, p. 787).

physically abused and neglected during childhood and their experiences in adulthood, there is strong support that victimization in childhood increases risks for lifetime revictimization. They stated that their findings revealed the increase of risks for revictimization did not include all types of victimization categories, such as traumas; however, it did indicate that the increase of risks for revictimization is contributed by “interpersonal violence” (p. 793). This violence includes physical assault/abuse, sexual assault/abuse, kidnapping and/or stalking, and having a murder or suicide occur to a family member or friend (Widom et al., 2008).

Classen, Palesh, and Aggarwal (2005) reviewed 90 empirical studies discussing the prevalence, and risk factors, as well as the correlates of sexual revictimization. According to their meta-analysis, there is a substantial amount of research indicating that child sexual abuse (CSA) doubles, and sometimes triples, risks of adult women experiencing sexual revictimization (p. 103). The study also indicates that sexual abuse in childhood and during adolescence are risk factors for such similar victimization experiences in adulthood. It was noted that even recent victimization experiences place individuals at a high risk of being victimized again. When reviewing the empirical research and literature of sexual revictimization, it was indicative that two of three sexually victimized individuals will be revictimized, and that the experiences of CSA are probable predictors for later sexual victimization (Classen et al., 2005).

In a study done on the cycle of victimization by Benedini, Fagan, and Gibson (2016), evidence of child maltreatment was exhibited to correlate with later peer victimization. Benedini et al. (2016) observed two types of child maltreatment, physical and sexual abuse. Based on their data of 831 children and parents who participated in LONGSCAN studies, it was indicated that children who were physically and sexually abused had an increased risk for revictimization in

adolescence. Physical abuse put them at risk for physical assault and intimidation by their peers, while sexual abuse determined an increased risk for physical assault, but not intimidation.

Ports, Ford, and Merrick (2016) conducted a study observing adverse childhood experiences (ACE) and sexual victimization in adulthood. The sample was comprised of 7,272 adults whom were receiving a medical exam whilst providing information about the adverse experiences in childhood from the ages 18 and younger. Ports et al. (2016) provided a review on past literature stating that children and teens (adolescents) who are exposed to traumatic experiences earlier in life, such as neglect and abuse, are at an increased risk for going through a violent experience across their life span.

Ports et al. (2016) cited the statistics from the NISVS (2011), which stated that approximately 19.3% of women and 1.7% of men within the U.S. were raped during their lifespan. Additionally, 43.9% of women and 23% of men experienced other types of sexual violence during their lifetime. A majority of female rape victims, roughly 78.7%, experienced this victimization before they were 25 years old, and approximately 40.4% had experienced their initial sexual victimization (i.e. rape) before age 18 years. Over 25% of males experienced their first rape victimization when they were 10 years old or younger. Reportedly, in 2013, 60,956 cases of child sexual abuse were within the U.S. Youths ages 14-17 years old, had a likelihood of experiencing sexual assault over their lifetime: 14.3% for females and 6% for males.

Ports et al. (2016) contends that CSA survivors are increasingly more likely to experience adult sexual victimization in comparison to those who were not victims of a sex offense. They also implied that CSA is one of the strongest indicators of future/continued victimization (Ports et al. 2016). Ports and colleagues (2016) observed a meta-analysis done by Roodman and Clum (2001), this meta-analysis indicated that anywhere from 15-79% of women

who had prior experiences of CSA were subsequently raped as adults. According to Barnes, Noll, Putnam, & Trickett (2009) after evaluating 179 individuals (n=89 for abused; n=90 for comparison), females who experienced CSA were 1.99 times more likely to experience physical and sexual revictimization than those in the comparison group who did not experience CSA. Widom, Czaja, and Dutton (2008), determined that children who were abused and neglected had a greater risk of being revictimized; this was concluded after the interview of 892 individuals, 396 of which were matched controls (p. 787). Widom et al. (2008) stated that those who had histories of abuse and neglect reported a mean of 12.33 in comparison to the controls whom reported a mean of 9.52 ($p < .001$) (p. 789)

Expanding on this previous literature evaluated, Ports et al. (2016) conducted a study of adults from a large healthcare organization in Southern California (n=7,272) as mentioned above. The study comprised of 74.12% Caucasians, 4.28% Blacks, 11.01% Hispanics, 8.04% Asians, and 2.54% other races or ethnicities. Over half (54.17%) of the study participants were females with ages ranging from 19 – 97 years of age. Port et al. (2016) looked at the effects of Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) on adult sexual victimization. The questionnaire utilized by the researchers consisted of 28 items, which evaluated exposure to 10 kinds of ACEs, this included abuse (i.e. emotional, physical, and sexual abuse), neglect (i.e. emotional and physical), and household challenges (i.e. household substance abuse, mental health⁶, household physical violence, parental separation and/or divorce, and incarcerated family members) before the age of 19 years.

Findings indicated that persons who reported a single adverse childhood experience, had a 1.77 times greater risk of sexual victimization in adulthood in comparison to those who did not

⁶ Results of the impact mental health have had been excluded, as it is not relevant to the purpose of this thesis

report an adverse experience in childhood. The likelihood of adult sexual victimization was 8.32 times greater for those who reported five or more ACEs when compared to individuals without ACEs (Ports et al., 2016). The results of this study expand on the findings from the previous literature/studies linking these two variables by indicating the overall effect of early adversity on sexual victimization risk in adulthood. They contended that the more ACEs an individual experiences, the greater the likelihood of adult sexual victimization. In similarity to previous studies, Ports et al. (2016) found that CSA is the biggest risk factor for sexual revictimization; persons who stated CSA experiences were more than three times more likely of sexual victimization during adulthood than those who had no CSA experiences. They also indicated that CSA, having a household member who was incarcerated, emotional abuse and/or neglect, and physical abuse at the age of 18 or younger were all factors related to increased risks of adult sexual victimization (Ports et al., 2016).

Explanation of Victimization: Routine Activities Theory

Routine activities theory (RAT) suggests that due to the routines of one's daily life, he or she may be at a greater likelihood of being victimized; this daily routine may bring someone in contact with a motivated offender(s). When Cohen and Felson (1979) constructed this theory, they were less interested in explaining one's motivation for offending, but rather in the motivated offender's selection of the particular victim or *suitable target(s)*. Suitable targets are theorized to be selected by the offender(s) based off of their attractiveness and qualities, such as ease of transport. However, attractiveness does not always mean physical attributes, but may just mean that the target has a lack of capable guardianship. Capable guardianship is perceived as being a protective guard from someone being victimized. For instance, when another person is in the presence of a potential suitable target, that person may be considered the capable guardian; thus,

making the target less attractive and avoiding victimization. When the three elements (motivated offender, suitable target, and *lack* of capable guardian) combine in the same place at the same time, there is an increased likelihood of a victimization occurring (Daigle, 2013, p. 28).

Malicoat and Ireland (2014) break down the elements to routine activities theory further, stating that the motivated offender is the person(s) interested in engaging in a deviant/criminal act, the target is any potential victim (i.e., vulnerable), and the lack of capable guardianship is the absence of something or someone that could deter the offender from coming in contact with the potential victim (p. 42). Malicoat and Ireland (2014) contend that Cohen and Felson (1979) developed the name of the theory because they believed victims and guardians existed within ordinary, daily patterns of life. Subsequently, further opportunities for an offender to come in contact with a victim was due to changes in one's daily patterns of life, in other words, routines and activities (p. 42). Also noted, Cohen and Felson (1979) suggested potential guardians, who may be responsible for protecting individuals (i.e., suitable targets or potential victims) from crime might contradict their responsibilities and become a motivated offender, specifically in cases of IPV and/or sexual assault (Malicoat & Ireland, 2014, p. 42). Furthermore, Cohen and Felson (1979) developed this theory of routine activities to highlight the explanation of the trends of crime rates; they established guardians as the only agent within an event of crime who have the authority or power to preclude a crime from happening (Reynald, 2011, p. 13).

Capable Guardianship

Hollis, Felson, and Welsh (2013) highlighted the capable guardianship element and its importance. Hollis et al. (2013) stated that guardianship and the lack thereof, or absence, is the main element in routine activity theory. This central element has been the research focus for over 30 years and has changed over time. It was explicated that the initial operationalization of

guardianship has been expanded in its interpretation since its development. As previously noted, there are different elements that make up routine activities theory. Hollis et al. (2013) affirmed that attention on theory and research has been more focused on the target-hardening measurement of RAT. This has led to ambiguous and confounding understandings about the guardianship element. Throughout the evolution of redefining guardians, Felson (2006) conceptualized it as, “A guardian keeps an eye on the potential target of crime” (p. 72). This “guardian” includes anyone responsible for looking after people or property, as well as bystanders (Hollis et al., 2013). It also was distinguished that it is crucial or important to include human elements to the guardianship concept; human presence must be existent to act in a way in which the possibility of a criminal act happening is reduced (Hollis et al. 2013).

Felson (1994) claimed that his operationalization of guardianship in regards to crime is more informal, such as everyday citizens, as opposed to a more formal operationalization of guardianship such as, police officers (Felson & Boba, 2010). Informal guardians include, but are not limited to, residents and bystanders who are more likely to be present when the crime is occurring and discourage/prevent it (Reynald, 2011, p. 14). Reynald (2011) states that a guardian is most intensely significant when available/present and capable of intervening or preventing the crime from happening. This prevention can either be more direct, such as confronting or discouraging the offender, or indirect, such as calling police for additional help in preventing/stopping the perpetrator (p. 49). In addition to capable guardians being people an individual knows or otherwise, there are other forms of capable guardianship that act to prevent or protect oneself from a motivated offender. Items such as weapons, home security systems, or cameras are likely to discourage a motivated offender, as well as pets and any verbal means of self-protection. This type of capable guardian may create the perception that the assumed target

is no longer vulnerable to victimization (Daigle, 2013, p. 28; Daigle et al. 2008, p. 1309; Hollis et al. 2013, p. 67).

Reynald (2011) noted a study done in the Netherlands in April of 2008, where a total of 255 participants were interviewed (48% male, and 52% female); the participants relayed information relevant to past crimes and incidents. Through the research and interview process, it was noted that when assessing the likelihood of monitoring or supervising a potential crime, guardians are not always capable of being able to prevent crime. When residents were present or available at the home and had the means of protecting or supervising their home, this perceived “capable guardian” might decide to look the other way.

Part of the sample distinguished their unwillingness to supervising their residence. They stated that it creates a negative connotation or perception on what they know about their surroundings. This lack of awareness prohibits their capability of being an efficient guardian (Reynald, 2011, p.100-101). Reynald (2011) concluded from this study that the method of monitoring in and of itself increases awareness and understanding/knowledge, which can heighten one’s ability of identifying suspicious users of domestic spaces. Ultimately, this can lead to the confidence to intervene and directly prevent criminal acts from happening.

“Monitoring is useful for crime prevention, crime disruption, and criminal detection, as its utility can manifest before, during, and after a crime event” (Reynald, 2011, p. 108).

Theoretical Perspectives for Revictimization

RAT may not directly explain why some people may be victimized once, while others are victimized multiple times. Two theoretical perspectives seeking to explain recurring victimization are risk heterogeneity and state dependence.

Risk Heterogeneity

Risk heterogeneity focuses on what qualities the target possesses that may have contributed to the victimization (Daigle, 2013). Essentially, if a person is a suitable target for the initial victimization and the associated risk factors go unchanged, they will remain a suitable target for subsequent victimizations. As mentioned earlier, the qualities making someone more vulnerable to victimization, such as lack of capable guardian, can increase the likelihood of revictimization (Daigle, 2013, p. 68-69). Clay-Warner, Bunch, and McMahon-Howard (2016) further explain the theoretical and empirical background of heterogeneity. Clay-Warner et al., (2016) support the previously mentioned concept of risk heterogeneity made by Daigle (2013).

The researchers contend that the concept of heterogeneity offers insight about why victims of crime are essentially different from individuals whom are not victims; these differences are applied to initial and recurring victimization incidents. This concept of heterogeneity has been expanded to explicate the continuousness of the risks of victimization dictated by the routine activities and social roles one takes a part in. As previously mentioned by Daigle (2013), risk heterogeneity concentrates on the qualities the target/victim possesses that may contribute to their overall victimization. Clay-Warner et al., (2016) explain additional traits of the suitable target that may make them vulnerable to a motivated offender, which include, low self-control, impulsivity, risky behaviors, etc. These traits that distinguish victims from non-victims are due to their initial victimizations and subsequently contribute to risks of future victimizations (Bunch, Clay-Warner, & McMahon-Howard, 2014). Although there are some individual characteristics that may contribute to one's victimization, that alone cannot explain victimization or repeat victimization.

State Dependence

State dependence is the second theoretical explanation for recurring victimization. State dependence does not focus so much on the qualities or characteristics of the victim, but focuses on what happens during and after the initial victimization. The reaction of the victim to their victimization contributes to the likelihood of revictimization (Daigle, 2013). For example, if a woman is raped, but uses self-protective factors like fighting against the perpetrator, then the motivated offender may perceive her as not being an easy target, and therefore, not attempt to revictimize her in the future. However, if a woman is raped and does not use any self-protective factors during the victimization, then the motivated offender may believe the target is, in fact, a suitable target and the likelihood of that offender revictimizing the target is increased. Moreover, by the victim learning how to protect oneself, it may teach that victim how to identify and avoid risk in the future (Daigle, 2013, p. 69).

Clay-Warner et al. (2016) note the theoretical and empirical background of state dependence as well. They explicate that the state dependence concept considers that victimization transforms individuals and/or their social surroundings in such ways that can alter risks of subsequent victimization. Clay-Warner et al. (2013) explain the concept of positive state dependence, which states that victimization increases the risks of future victimization(s). In accordance to positive state dependence, more focus is on the changes in victim or offender behaviors after a victimization occurrence can increase the likelihood for subsequent victimization(s). Additionally, positive state dependence, in regards to changes of offender behavior, can lead to targeting the same victim more than once by utilizing the knowledge gained from the first victimization in order to assure success of future victimizations. Clay-Warner et al. (2016) contend that there is significantly more empirical support for the positive state

dependence and that victimization increases the probability for subsequent victimization(s).

Importantly, Clay-Warner et al. (2016) argue that state dependence and risk heterogeneity as separate concepts cannot explain revictimization; however, both concepts together can contribute to explaining the overall risks of repeat/revictimization. The researchers indicated that although heterogeneity and state dependence “shape” repeat victimization, heterogeneity explains the broader amount of variation in the risks of victimization. Clay-Warner et al. (2016) also note a finding made by Ousey, Wilcox, and Brummel (2008) in that heterogeneity and positive state dependence account for the series of victimization(s) over the life-course (p. 1409).

Current Study

The current study seeks to gain a better understanding of how routine activities might explain violent victimization and revictimization, specifically paying attention to the capable guardianship element of the theory. As noted, this aspect of the theory has had a limited examination, and perhaps vague conceptualization, in the extant literature (Hollis, Felson, & Welsh, 2013). The purpose of the current study is to provide a better understanding of capable guardianship’s role, in the context of routine activities theory, in the explanation of violent victimization and revictimization.

Research Questions

1. To what extent does routine activities theory explain violent victimization?

H1: Routine activities variables such as proximity to motivated offenders and capable guardianship will be related to violent victimization risk. The presence of a capable guardian will decrease victimization risk.

2. To what extent does routine activities theory explain violent revictimization?

H2: Routine activities variables such as proximity to motivated offenders and capable guardianship will be related to violent revictimization risk. The presence of a capable guardian will decrease revictimization risk.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

Sample

The NCVS surveys people ages 12 and older using a telephone survey to self-report their victimization experiences. The NCVS enhances the data of the UCR in that it reveals the dark figure of crime (i.e. any victimizations or crimes not reported to the police). The U.S Census Bureau administers the NCVS among a national sample of about 43,000 households of household members 12 and older; this results in roughly 76,000 individuals being screened and interviewed (Daigle, 2013, p.20-22). For this thesis, data from the 2016 NCVS will be analyzed to measure what factors consistent with RAT contribute to victimization and revictimization risk.

Independent Variables

OffenderLive

In order to determine if the offender had a right to be where the incident took place (e.g. home) suggesting the victim's proximity to a motivated offender, the respondent was asked, "Did the offender live (here/there) or have a right to be (here/there), for instance, as a guest or a repair person?" Respondents indicated if there was any right by stating, 1 = yes, 2 = no, 3 = don't know. This item was recoded to reflect 0 = no, 1 = yes.

VictimOffRela

In order to determine any relationship between the offender and the respondent, respondents were asked, "What was or were the offender(s) relationship to you?" This variable measures who perpetrated the victimization experience, which will include a compilation of multiple variables including, spouse/ex-spouse, parent/step-parent, friend/ex-friend, neighbor,

other non-relative, and other. This measure was recoded to reflect 0 = no relationship, 1 = relationship.

AnyonePresent

In order to determine if anyone else was present during the incident other than the offender and respondent (i.e., a potential capable guardian), respondents were asked, “Was anyone present during the incident besides you and the offender (other than those under age 12)?” Respondents indicated their response as 1 = yes, 2 = no, 3 = don’t know. This variable was recoded to reflect 0 = no, 1 = yes.

OthersActions

In order to determine if those who were present helped the victim during the incident (i.e., capable guardianship), respondents were asked, “Did the actions of (this person/any of these people) help the situation in any way?” Response categories included 1 = yes, 2 = no, 3 = don’t know. This item was recoded to reflect 0 = no, 1 = yes.

Dependent Variables

Violent Victimization

This variable measures whether a person experienced one violent victimization. This measure was created by combining multiple items of violent victimization including sexual victimization (i.e. sexual assault and rape) as well as physical victimization (i.e. grabbed/held/tripped, hit/slapped/knocked down). The coding of the variable reflected 0=not victimized, 1=experienced one victimization.

Violent Revictimization

This measure indicates whether a person experienced more than one violent victimization. This measure was created by combining multiple items of violent victimization

including sexual victimization (i.e. sexual assault and rape) as well as physical victimization (i.e. grabbed/held/tripped, hit/slapped/knocked down). The coding of the variable reflected 0=experience one victimization, 1 = experienced more than one victimization.

Control Variables

Age

In order to determine the age of the respondent, they asked respondents what their date of birth was and then to verify their specific age. Ages was a continuous variable which ranged from 12 years of age to 90 years of age.

Marital Status

In order to determine the marital status of the respondent, participants were asked to indicate their current marital status. Responses included 1 = married, 2 = widowed, 3 = divorced, 4 = separated, 5 = never married.

Sex

In order to determine the sex of the respondent, respondents were asked to specify their biological sex by responding, 1 = male, 2 = female.

Race

In order to determine the race of the respondent, respondents were asked to identify their race by indicating 1 = White only, 2 = Black/African American only, 3 = American Indian or Alaska native, 4 = Asian only, 5 = Hawaiian/Pacific Islander only, 6 = Other.

Plan of Analyses

Descriptive statistics and frequencies for each variable were conducted in order to determine the rates of violent victimization and revictimization, to provide a description of the victimization (i.e. routine activities risk factors—proximity to motivated offender and capable

guardianship), and to provide a description of the sample (i.e. age, marital status, sex, and race). Bivariate analyses also were be conducted in order to determine statistically significant correlations between each of the independent variables and each of the dependent variables as well as each of the control variables and each of the dependent variables using t-tests and crosstabulations with Chi Square. Due to the insignificant findings on the bivariate level, multivariate analyses were not warranted.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSES

Results

Table 1 displays the frequency distributions for all independent variables (Victim/OffenderRelationship, Offenderlive, AnyonePresent, and OthersActions), dependent variables (Violent Victimization and Violent Revictimization), and control variables (Age, MaritalStatus, Sex, Race). The independent variables measured are, Victim/OffenderRelationship (n=177), Offenderlive (n=3,576), AnyonePresent (n=3,891) and OthersActions (n=1,813). The Victim/OffenderRelationship variable had a mean of .8148 and standard deviation of .33595; those who responded yes to having a relationship with the offender totaled to 149 respondents (84.2%), while 28 (15.8%) stated no relationship was present. The variable, Offenderlive observed whether the offender had the right to be at the household or if the offender lived there; the mean was .4912 and the standard deviation was 1.8299. Of the respondents who distinguished if the offender had the right to be there, 1,263 (34.8%) state the offender did have the right to be there while 2,313 (63.6%) stated the offender did not have the right. The independent variable, AnyonePresent had a mean of .5590 and standard deviation of .49657. Respondents who were asked if someone other than themselves and the offender were present during the incident, 2,175 (55.9%) stated yes and 1,716 (44.1%) stated no. The last independent variable, OthersActions had a mean of .3402 and standard deviation of .47390; individuals were asked if the actions of others helped, and of those, 676 (34.0%) stated yes and 1,137 (66%) stated no.

The two dependent variables were the experience of one violent victimization (Violent Victimization) (n=834), mean=.8075, standard deviation (s.d.)= .33593 and the experience of

more than one violent victimization (Violent Revictimization) (n=341), mean= .6833, standard deviation (s.d)= .46588. Of those total respondents, 726 (87.1%) individuals stated they did experience one violent victimization and 233 (68.3%) stated they experienced more than more violent victimization. The control variables were, Age (n=134,685) with a mean of 51.25 and a standard deviation of 17.561, MaritalStatus (n=133,450) with mean of 2.41 and a standard deviation of 1.689, Sex (n=134,685) with a mean of 1.78 and a standard deviation of .417, and finally Race (n=134,685) with a mean of 1.33 and standard deviation of .884). The control variable MartialStatus was categorized into five separate types: married (n= 66,963), 49.7%; widowed (n=13,197), 9.8%; divorced (n= 20,902), 15.5%; separated (n= 3,405), 2.5%; and never married (n=28,983), 21.5%. Sex was categorized into Male (n=30,222), 22.4% and Female (n=104,463), 77.6%. The last control variable that was broken down into different categories was Race. Race was categorized into: WhiteOnly (n=110,554), 82.1%; BlackOnly (n=15,301), 11.4%; Amer.Indian/AKNative (n=908), .7%; AsianOnly (n=5,873), 4.4%; Hawaiian/Pac.Islander (n=327), .2%; and Other (n=1,722), 1.3%.

Table 1

Characteristics of Total Sample in Analyses

<i>Sample Characteristic</i>	Total	Mean (s.d.)	%
Independent Variables			
OffenderLive	3,576	.4912 (1.8299)	
Yes	1,263		34.8
No	2,313		63.6
VictimOffRela	177	.8148 (.33595)	
Relationship	149		84.2
No Relationship	28		15.8
AnyonePresent	3,891	.5590 (.49657)	
Yes	2,175		55.9
No	1,716		44.1
OthersActions	1,813	.3402 (.47390)	
Yes	676		34.0
No	1,137		66.0
Dependent Variables			
Violent Victimization			
Experience one violent victimization	834	.8705 (.33593)	
Yes	726		87.1
No	108		12.9
Violent Revictimization			
Experience more than one violent victimization	341	.6833 (.46588)	
Yes	233		68.3
No	108		31.7

Table 1 (continued)

Characteristics of Total Sample in Analysis

<i>Sample Characteristic</i>	Total	Mean (s.d.)	%
Control Variables			
Age	134,685	51.25 (1.689)	
Marital Status	133,450	2.41 (1.689)	
Married	66,963		49.7
Widowed	13,197		9.8
Divorced	20,902		15.5
Separated	3,405		2.5
Never Married	28,983		21.5
Sex	134,685	1.78 (.417)	
Male	30,222		22.4
Female	104,463		77.6
Race	134,685	1.33 (.884)	
White Only	110,554		82.1
Black Only	15,301		11.4
Amer. Indian/AK Native	908		.7
Asian Only	5,873		4.4
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	327		.2
Other	1,722		1.3

In reference to Table 2, bivariate analyses on violent victimization were conducted to assess the relationship between violent victimization and each of the independent and control variables. Age, a control variable, was evaluated by using a t-test because it is a continuous variable. All other variables, independent and control, were tested by using crosstabs with Chi Square (χ^2) because they were categorical variables. When evaluating all independent variables, none of the measures of proximity to motivated offenders or capable guardianship measures were significant: Offenderlive (n=220), $\chi^2 = .128$; VictimOffRela (n=24), $\chi^2 = 1.745$; AnyonePresent (n=734), $\chi^2 = .931$; OthersActions (n=387), $\chi^2 = .094$. When evaluating the control variables, the only variable to show significance was, Age (n=134,685), $t=1071.028$ with a p value $\leq .001$. All other control variables were not significant. Marital Status (n=590), $\chi^2 = 8.897$; Sex (n=590), $\chi^2 = 1.217$; Race (n=590), $\chi^2 = 5.462$.

Table 2

Bivariate Analyses of Violent Victimization

<i>Sample Characteristic</i>	Mean (s.d.)	%	t/ χ^2
Independent Variable			
OffenderLive (n=229)		0.1	.128
VictimOffRela (n=24)		0.0	1.745
AnyonePresent (n=735)		0.4	.931
OthersActions (n=387)		0.2	.094
Control Variables	51.25		
Age * (n=134,685)	(17.561)		1071.028
Marital Status (n=590)		0.3	8.897
Sex (n=590)		0.3	1.217
Race (n=590)		0.3	5.462

*p \leq .001

In reference to Table 3, bivariate analyses on violent revictimization were conducted to assess the relationship between violent revictimization and each of the independent and control variables. Variables in Table 3 were measured the same as in Table 2. Age, a control variable, was evaluated using a t-test because it was a continuous variable. All other variables, independent and control, were tested using crosstabs with Chi Square (χ^2) because they were categorical. When evaluating all independent variables, each was not significant: Offenderlive (n=306), $\chi^2 = .000$; VictimOffRela (n=37), $\chi^2 = 1.524$; AnyonePresent (n=859), $\chi^2 = 2.199$; OthersActions (n=432), $\chi^2 = .284$. When evaluating the control variables, the only variable to show significance was, Age (n=134,685), $t=1071.028$ with a p value $\leq .001$. All other control variables were not significant: Marital Status (n=671), $\chi^2 = 5.152$; Sex (n=671), $\chi^2 = .036$; Race (n=671), $\chi^2 = 2.595$.

Table 3

Bivariate Analyses of Violent Revictimization

<i>Sample Characteristic</i>	Mean (s.d.)	%	t/ χ^2
Independent Variable			
OffenderLive (n=306)		0.1	.000
VictimOffRela (n=37)		0.0	1.524
AnyonePresent (n=859)		0.4	2.199
OthersActions (n=432)		0.2	.284
Control Variables			
Age * (n=134,685)	51.25 (17.561)		1071.028
Marital Status (n=671)		0.3	5.152
Sex (n=671)		0.3	.036
Race (n=671)		0.3	2.595

*p \leq .001

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Summary

This thesis attempted to measure crime prevention, specifically in relation to the elements of routine activities theory (i.e. motivated offender, suitable target, and capable guardian) and its role in victimization/revictimization experience(s). However, it is important to note that in any research, measuring crime prevention is difficult to accomplish. Due to the ambiguous operationalization of capable guardianship and the available data from the NCVS, the direct assessment of routine activities theory and revictimization in regards to crime prevention became difficult to measure; this will be explicated in the subsequent sections.

Key Findings

For this study, the main element of capable guardianship that was being tested as a protection factor for victimization and revictimization was insignificant. The findings of this study indicate regardless of a potential capable guardian being present, one's risk of victimization or revictimization is not increased or decreased. Within the aforementioned literature, Reynald (2011) reported a guardian is most intensely significant when available/present and capable of intervening or preventing the crime from happening. This prevention can either be more direct, such as confronting or discouraging the offender, or indirect, such as calling police for additional help in preventing/stopping the perpetrator (p. 49). However, for the current study when participants were asked, if anyone helped during the incident, many responded yes, but results were shown not to be significant perhaps indicating that, while someone was present, their actions were not influential enough to have an impact on the incident. This finding does not support or disprove the statement made by Reynald (2011);

however, additional research is required to better conceptualize and operationalize what is “a capable guardian”. This discussion is expanded in the limitations section of this chapter.

The only statistically significant variable associated with victimization and revictimization was age. Age was statistically significant. As the data indicates, as one gets older, that person has a higher risk of victimization and revictimization. This could be an indication that those who are victimized may be revictimized as they age, supporting the idea of state dependence. In order to better understand age’s role in state dependence, future research should assess longitudinal data for the ability to consider victimization and revictimization risk over the life course.

Limitations

There were many limitations to this study due to the variables used and decreased sample size in the dataset. For example, the original dependent variable, violent victimization, was envisioned to be a combination of rape and sexual assault. For this data set of 134,685 respondents, only 51 respondents reported either being sexually assaulted or raped, far less than the 15% required for statistical analysis. For analysis, the dependent variable was modified to include additional non-sexual violent acts. The new dependent variable had 1067 respondents, who reported being a victim or victims of physical violence [sexual assault (n = 30), rape (n = 21), hit, slapped, or knockdown (n = 577, and/or grabbed, held, tripped (n = 521)]. As several of these respondents reported revictimization during this period, there were 1149 victimizations recorded. Even by capturing 1067 respondents, only 82 (7.68%) reported some form of physical violent revictimization, which could include multiple victimizations during the same incident.

Using the modified dependent variable, the only significant result produced was age. All other variables produced insignificant results; this insignificance in results contradicts the

previous literature mentioned in Chapter 2 of this thesis based on the current data/variables ran. However, the contradictory findings appear to be more an issue with the NCVS secondary data set. Although the data are comprehensive and thorough, the data was not collected in a manner that permitted a direct assessment of revictimization or elements of routine activities theory.

Although the two key variables (rape, sexual assault) were reported by approximately 5% of those who reported physical violence, when combined with the more frequently reported physical violence variables (i.e., hit, grab, slap, etc.) any direct findings or discussion of these two variables could not be addressed. When run together in the current study with the other victimization variables, they were being washed out because on their own they were insufficient (lacked sufficient quantity), which is why they were collapsed with the two physical assault variables. Furthermore, the revictimization variable was not necessarily tested for, since more than one victimization type could have occurred during a single incident. When the original NCVS data set/codebook was evaluated, it was observed that the revictimization variable was already collapsed and coded as, 1-5 victimizations and 6 or more victimizations. This observation of the revictimization coding was problematic because coding respondents' reports of experiencing 1-5 victimizations makes it difficult to address which respondents actually experienced more than one victimization. There was no way to differentiate those who experienced one victimization from those who experienced two or more victimization incidents.

Another limitation was that there was not an ability to completely test routine activities theory. A lack of variables measuring the suitable target element (i.e. questions/variables regarding the respondent's potential use of alcohol or drugs at the time of the incident) was detrimental to providing a complete test of the theory. Although variables assessing capable guardian were tested, such as anyone present other than the respondent and offender and if the

actions of others helped during the incident, the dataset used/screening questions for these variables did not provide a clear definition of what a capable guardian was. This makes it unclear if the conceptualization and assessment of the capable guardianship element was completely accurate. For example, at what point does someone go from being an observer to someone who intervenes? In other words, if someone were to intervene in a situation where an argument broke out before a possible attack, then that person would have been considered a capable guardian who protected someone from potentially being physically harmed (victimized). However, if someone were to intervene in the midst of a physical altercation, then they may have prevented the victimization from getting any worse. In this instance, a victimization already occurred and, therefore, the individual was not a capable guardian for preventing the initial victimization type. There needs to be more clarification for what makes someone a capable guardian for one situation, but not for another in regards to victimization and revictimization. As noted by Hollis, Felson, & Welsh (2013), the initial operationalization of guardianship has been expanded in its interpretation since its development, therefore there has been variation regarding the operationalization of a capable guardian. This confusion and ambiguity in defining a capable guardian, makes it difficult to measure, so a more definitive conceptualization of what constitutes a capable guardian, is imperative.

Directions for Future Research

Although there are several limitations throughout this study, this does not disprove that capable guardianship is potentially a protective factor against victimization or revictimization. Further studies, with greater samples sizes, that can accurately measure revictimization should be conducted in order to continue to fill in this gap in the research. The limitations of this study show that more research, specifically qualitative research, needs to be conducted in order to

evaluate the guardianship element of routine activities theory in regards to one's risk of victimization and revictimization. Although, the capable guardianship element did not product significant results some of the responses observed in the attempt to measure that element show that further research needs to be conducted.

For example, out of the respondents who were victimized and answered if the actions of others helped, 184 said no, and 150 said yes. Out of the respondents who were revictimized and responded to the same questions, 51 said no, and 47 said yes. The results showed that it was insignificant, however, more people stated that during their victimization and revictimization experiences, the help of others did not help. In addition, when respondents were asked if anyone else other than the offender and respondent were present, 350 said yes and 293 said no for experiencing one victimization. When experienced more than one victimization (revictimization) 105 respondents stated that someone else was present and 111 stated someone else was not present. Recognizing that additional persons were present is essential in regards to the victim's well-being; however further detailed information on those who were present, other than the offender and respondent, would also be important in order to determine if those individuals were potential capable guardians (i.e. what role could those individuals have played prior to, during, or after the incident: protector, or potential secondary motivated offender). Future research should focus on not just the presence of someone else, but more importantly, that person's role in the victimization/revictimization. Based on the results from this study, there are not enough statistically important variables to develop policy implications. In order to develop policy out of something so general, it becomes problematic, so more qualitative studies need to be done to assist in determining what constitutes a capable guardian from the victim's perspective.

References

- Barnes, J., Noll, J., & Putnam, F. (2009) Sexual and physical revictimization among victims of severe childhood sexual abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 33*, 412-420.
doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2008.09.013
- Benedini, K., Fagan, A., & Gibson, C. (2016) The cycle of victimization: The relationship between childhood maltreatment and adolescent peer victimization. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 59*, 111-121.
- Breiding, M., Smith, S., Basile, K., Walters, M., Chen, J., & Merrick, M. (2014). Prevalence and characteristics of sexual violence, stalking, and intimate partner violence victimization – National intimate partner and sexual violence survey, United States, 2011. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 63* (8), 1-18.
- Brenner, I., & Ben-Amitay, G. (2015). Sexual revictimization: The impact of attachment anxiety, accumulated trauma, and response to childhood sexual abuse disclosure. *Violence and Victims, 30*(1), 49-65. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-13-00098
- Bunch, J., Clay-Warner, J., & McMahon-Howard, J. (2014). The effects of victimization on routine activities. *Criminal Justice Behavior, 41*(5), 574-592.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (2018). Criminal victimization in the United States – statistical tables index. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/html/cvus/definitions.cfm>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2018). Data collection: National crime victimization survey (NCVS). Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=dcdetail&iid=245>

- Chiu, G., Lutfey, K., Litman, H., Link, C., Hall, S., & McKinlay, J. (2013). Prevalence and overlap of childhood and adult physical, sexual, and emotional abuse: A descriptive analysis of results from the Boston area community health (BACH) survey. *Violence and Victims, 28*(3), 381-402.
- Classen, C., Palesh, O., & Aggarwal, R. (2005). Sexual revictimization: A review of the empirical literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 6*(2), 103-129.
- Clay-Warner, J., Bunch, J., & McMahon-Howard, J. (2016). Disentangling the effects of state dependence and population heterogeneity on repeat victimization. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 43*(10), 1406-1429.
- Cohen, L.E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activities approach. *American Sociological Review, 44*(4), 588-608.
- Daigle, L. E. (2013). *Victimology: The essentials*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Daigle, L., Fisher, B., & Cullen, F. (2008). The violent and sexual revictimization of college women: Is repeat victimization a problem? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28*(9), 1296 – 1313.
- Felson, M. (2006). *Crime and nature*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Felson, M. & Boba, R. (2010) *Crime and everyday life*, 4th ed., Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.
- Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, K., & Turner, A. (2007). Poly-victimization and trauma in a national longitudinal cohort. *Development and Psychopathology, 19*(1), 149-166.
- Goodlin, W., & Dunn, C. (2009). Three patterns of domestic violence in households: Single victimization, repeat victimization, and co-occurring victimization. *Journal of Family Violence, 25*, 107-122. doi: 10.1007/s10896-009-9274-z

- Gross, A., Winslett, A., Roberts, M., & Gohm, C. (2006). An examination of sexual violence against college women. *Violence Against Women, 12*(3), 288-300.
- Hollis, M. E., Felson, M., & Welsh, B. C. (2013). The capable guardian in routine activities theory: A theoretical and conceptual reappraisal. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety, 15*(1), 65-79.
- Hosser, D., Raddatz, S., & Windzio, M. (2007). Child maltreatment, revictimization, and violent behavior. *Violence and Victims, 22*(3), 318-33.
- Kim, H., Wildeman, C., Jonson-Reid, M., & Drake, B. (2017). Lifetime prevalence of investigating child maltreatment among US children. *American Journal of Public Health, 107*(2), 274- 280. doi:10.2105/ajph.2016.303545
- Mallicoat, S., & Ireland, C. (2014). *Women and crime: The essentials*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Marx, B., Heidt, J., & Gold, S. (2005). Perceived uncontrollability and unpredictability, self-regulation, and sexual revictimization. *Review of General Psychology, 9*, 67-90.
- Morgan, R., & Kena, G. (2018). Criminal victimization, 2016: Revised. *U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics*.
- National Center for Juvenile Justice. (2014). Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 2014 National Report (Report Summary). Retrieved from <https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/nr2014/>
- Ousey, G. C., Wilcox, P., & Brummel, S. (2008). Déjà vu all over again: Investigating temporal continuity of adolescent victimization. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 24*, 307-335.

- Ports, K., Ford, D., & Merrick, M. (2016). Adverse childhood experiences and sexual victimization in adulthood. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 51*, 313-322.
- Reid, J., & Sullivan, C. (2009). A model of vulnerability for adult sexual victimization: The impact of attachment, child maltreatment, and scarred sexuality. *Violence and Victims, 24*(4), 485-501.
- Reynald, D. (2011). *Guarding against crime: Measuring guardianship within routine activities theory*. Ashgate Publishing.
- Roodman, A., & Clum, A. (2001). Victimization rates and method variance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 21*, 183–204.
- Shichor, D., & Tibbetts, S. (2002). *Victims and victimization*. Waveland Press Inc.
- Sickmund, M., & Puzzanchera, C. (eds.). (2014). Juvenile offenders and victims: 2014 national report. *National Center for Juvenile Justice*.
- Silverman, J., Far, A., Mucci, L., & Hathaway, J. (2001). Dating violence against adolescent girls and associated substance use, unhealthy weight control, sexual risk behavior, pregnancy and suicidality. *Journal of American Medical Association, 285*(5), 572-579.
- Smith, S., Chen, J., Basile, K., Gilbert, L., Merrick, M., Patel, N., Walling, M., & Jain, A. (2017). The national intimate partner and sexual violence survey (NISVS): 2010-2012 state report. *National Center for Injury Prevention and Control; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2006). Extent, nature, and consequences of rape victimization: Findings from the national violence against women survey. *National Institute of Justice*.

- Turner, H., Finkelhor, D., Hamby, S., & Shattuck, A. (2013). Family structure, victimization, and child mental health in a nationally representative sample. *Social Science & Medicine*, *87*, 39-51.
- United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, & Bureau of Justice Statistics. (n.d.). National Crime Victimization Survey, 2016. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR36828.v2>
- Voith, L., Topitzes, J., & Reynolds, A. (2016). Violent victimization among disadvantaged youth adults exposed to early family conflict and abuse: A 24-year prospective study of the victimization cycle across gender. *Violence and Victims*, *31*(4), 767-784.
- Walsh, K., Blaustein, M., Knight, W., Spinazzola, J., & van der Kolk, B. (2007). Resiliency factors in the relation between childhood sexual abuse and adulthood sexual assault in college-age women. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, *16*(1), 1-17.
- Widom, C., Czaja, S., & Dutton, M. (2008). Childhood victimization and lifetime revictimization. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *32*, 785-796.