

CHAPTER 1

Crime and Victimology

by Ann Wolbert Burgess and Albert R. Roberts

▶ ▶ LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- Describe the victims of violence
- Outline the costs of criminal victimization
- Describe the methods used to measure victimization
- Describe the origin of the crime victims' movement
- Illustrate forensic victimology's contribution to cold case analysis

▶ ▶ KEY TERMS

Costs of victimization
Criminology
Forensic victimology
National Crime
Victimization Survey
(NCVS)
Victimology

■ Introduction

The unsettling reality regarding crime in the United States and Canada today is that it is widespread, very often violent in nature, and it completely disregards all boundaries. There is no home, no community, and no region in North America that can consider itself to be safe from the risk of criminal assault. With recent estimates of the number of crime victims in the United States reaching as high as 38 million, it behooves all of us, both individually and collectively, to support emerging efforts aimed at two distinct but related areas: crime prevention and crime victim assistance. To be sure, averting criminal behavior altogether is the more preferable of the two. Given the improbability of accomplishing this in the immediate future, however, it becomes all the more urgent to be prepared to assist those who are victimized.

Unprecedented numbers of victims are turning to victim assistance programs, mental health centers, domestic violence shelters, and victim compensation programs. Research, as well as experience, has shown that these individuals frequently suffer from significant emotional pain and trauma, physical injuries, and/or financial loss, and “secondary victims”—the relatives and close friends of victims—also endure both mental anguish and economic hardship. Emergency medical care, mental health counseling, social services, financial aid, victim compensation,

and law enforcement protection must be readily available for those injured as a result of either violent or property-related offenses. Unfortunately, despite remarkable advances that have been made in terms of our understanding of the nature of crime victimization and our awareness of the need for victim support, to date most victim assistance policies and programs need to be expanded and updated. This chapter describes the victims of crime, the **cost of victimization** and methods to measure victimization, trends in crime, the crime victim's movement, and the application of **forensic victimology** in solving cold cases.

■ Victims of Violence

People are fascinated by crime. Crimes, and the legal proceedings that surround them, excite the public's interest for a variety of different reasons: some, according to Fletcher (1988), because they involve celebrities, some because they are gruesome, some because they raise important social or legal issues, some because of their racial character, some because of the bizarre behavior of the parties, and some because of the plight of the victim. Cases that have received wide media attention for specific reasons include the following.

Murdered child: On July 25, 2008, Cindy Anthony, the mother of 22-year-old Casey Anthony and grandmother of 2-year-old Caylee Anthony, called Orange County Florida police to report the theft of her car by her daughter, who had been missing for a month, when she inadvertently reported that her granddaughter had also been missing for the same length of time. Casey claimed that she last saw her daughter when she dropped her off on the morning of June 9 at the nanny's house and that when she returned from work in the evening there was no one home.

On July 16, 2008 at 4:30 p.m., Casey Anthony was arrested for child neglect, filing false official statements, and obstructing a criminal investigation. Although the authorities were confident that Casey had murdered her daughter she could not be charged with murder without a body.

On December 11, 2008, a utility worker found the skeletonized remains of Caylee Anthony in a black plastic trash bag about a quarter-mile from the Anthony home off the highway. Prosecutors then charged Casey Anthony with first-degree murder.

Hate: The Howard Beach case began on December 20, 1986, when racial tension exploded in New York headlines. Teenager Jon Lester led a group of teenagers on an assault of three black men whose car had broken down in a predominately white Queens neighborhood. The gang of white youths brutally beat the three black men, chasing one of the three to his death when he was hit by a car while crossing the Shore Parkway. The gang then cornered Cedric Sandiford, who was beaten with a baseball bat and tree branches. The third man, Timothy Grimes, escaped.

Lester was convicted of manslaughter and assault for chasing Michael Griffith, a 23-year-old construction worker. The description of cold-blooded violence was the basis for Lester's 15- to 30-year prison sentence, later shortened by law to 20

years. Two other Howard Beach teenagers, Jason Ladone and Scott Kern, got similar sentences. Lester was released in 2001, 15 years after the killing and was deported to England. Ladone was released in April 2001 and Kern was released in 2002.

Victim turned offender: The case of Carroll Edward Cole, a serial killer, illustrates the homicidal behavior of bully–victim turned offender. Cole, born on May 9, 1938, in Sioux City, Iowa, suffered a tumultuous childhood in which his mother abused him and he witnessed her sell sex to strangers while her husband was overseas in the military. His mother both physically beat him and verbally threatened him if he ever told his father about her dalliances in the sex trade. When his father returned from the war, the domestic abuse eased, but childhood bullies replaced the abuse he suffered at home. He was mercilessly teased for having a “girl’s name,” which often left him in tears. The taunting caused him to become even more antisocial and dependent. His anger reached a breaking point when he murdered a fellow classmate named Duane while swimming. The boy agitated Cole by asking him, “How does it feel to have a girl’s name?” Cole waited for Duane to jump into the water and quickly wrapped his legs around Duane’s neck and pushed him underwater until he stopped breathing. The murder was dismissed as an accident, but Cole remained fearful of being apprehended. In a later statement he admitted that, “I hated him and I am glad I stood up for myself.” Cole felt no remorse after Duane’s death, furthering his antisocial behavior.

The important point of this case is how the early warning signs of a violent youth were missed. A careful investigation was not conducted on the death of Duane nor was a thorough interview of Cole held. Background information on Cole had added red flags of the child abuse, child witnessing of sexual violence, the absent father, and the social isolation of the boy.

Revenge: On Christmas Eve 2008, the newly divorced husband of their daughter, Bruce Jeffrey Pardo, arrived at the home of Joseph and Alicia Ortega dressed in a Santa Claus suit. He opened fire and killed nine people inside the house, including the elder Ortegas, his ex-wife Sylvia, three of their children, two daughters-in-law, and a teenager who was working at a computer. Police speculate that the motive of the attack was related to marital problems. Pardo’s wife of 1 year had settled for divorce in the prior week. However, Pardo held no criminal record and had no history of violence. He had also lost his job in July. There is some speculation that the divorce may have been caused by Pardo concealing a child from a previous relationship. The child that Pardo kept secret from his wife was severely injured and disabled in a swimming pool accident several years ago. It was revealed that he also had plans to kill his own mother due to her apparent sympathy for Sylvia Pardo during the divorce. Pardo owed his ex-wife \$10,000 as part of the divorce settlement, according to court documents that detailed a bitter split. He also lost a dog he doted on and did not get back a valuable wedding ring. Pardo complained in a court declaration that Sylvia Pardo was living with her parents, not paying rent, and had spent lavishly on a luxury car, gambling trips to Las Vegas, meals at fine restaurants, massages, and golf lessons.

■ Definition

The word “victim” is derived from the Latin “victima” and originally contained the concept of sacrifice. The sense of an offering to the temple is implied in the Bible (Lev. 1:2, 1:14, 2:1, etc.). The word “victim” is not found in the Bible, but the concept of a person suffering from acts committed by an aggressor is. The first case of murder is found in the Bible involving Adam and Eve’s first- and second-born sons, Cain and Abel. Cain was described as “a tiller of the soil,” and Abel was described as “a keeper of sheep.” According to Judaic translations, both prepared a thanksgiving sacrifice, but God showed a preference for Abel’s offering, whereupon, in a fit of jealousy, Cain slew his brother and became the first murderer in history. When confronted by God, Cain first lied by saying he did not know who killed his brother. He then asked, “Am I my brother’s keeper?” and to this God replied, “Your brother’s blood cries out to Me from the ground!” (Gen. 4:9–10). Cain is banished from civilization, but first a sign is placed on him, not as a felon’s brand (“the mark of Cain”), but to protect him from roving hunters. The rabbis, although they condemned Cain’s sin, also saw him as a genuine penitent who was therefore not punished by death. This story reflects the ancient rivalry between the farmer and the nomadic shepherd as well as extreme sibling rivalry (Wigoder, 2002). This Biblical reference reflects several points. First, sibling rivalry is the primary issue. Second, the suffering of the victim (brother’s blood cries out) is acknowledged. Third, Cain’s denial of the act is countered by the forensic facts, and the heinous nature of the act (murder) is punished by exile. Fourth, the ancient rivalry between the farmer and the nomadic shepherd is developed.

Contemporary Terminology

In more contemporary times, the term “victim” has been expanded to imply a victim of war or an accident or a scam or identity theft. All of the various terms indicate meanings in general use. “Victim” is neither a legal nor scientific term.

“Victim” as a scientific concept, according to Mendelsohn (1976), may be viewed as containing four fundamental criteria:

- The nature of the determinant that causes the suffering. The suffering may be physical, psychological or both depending on the type of injurious act.
- The social character of the suffering. This suffering originates in the victim and others reaction to the event.
- The importance of the social factor. The social implications of the injurious act can have a greater impact, sometimes, than the physical or psychological impact.
- The origin of the inferiority complex. This term, suggested by Mendelsohn, manifests itself as a feeling of submission that may be followed by a feeling

of revolt. The victim generally attributes his injury to the culpability of another person.

A victim of a violent crime can be operationally defined as an individual who has been confronted, attacked, assaulted, or violated by a perceived predator, and the result is serious short-term as well as long-term physical and/or mental injuries to the crime victim. Crime victims suffer from illegal criminal acts and usually struggle with a number of medical, psychological, and financial problems caused by burglary, rape, theft, domestic violence, robbery, pickpocketing, carjacking, purse snatching, stalking, or attempted murder. In sharp contrast, victims of accidents, natural disasters such as hurricanes, tornadoes, or earthquakes, and diseases such as cancer, AIDS, or other social and public health problems are *not* harmed by illegal criminal acts.

There is no characteristic profile of a crime victim. Persons of all ages, races, ethnicities, and socioeconomic ranges are subject to criminal assault of one form or another. However, victimization statistics from the Bureau of Justice Statistics reveal that not all groups have an equal likelihood or probability of becoming a crime victim. Research indicates that young black males, 16 to 24 years of age, who live in high-crime, urban areas are the most likely to fall victim to crime, due largely to factors such as lack of adequate housing, education, or employment. In sharp contrast, elderly white females who live in low-crime areas and generally do not venture out at night are the least likely to become victimized. Lifestyle, location, and race appear to be the primary predictors of who is most likely to become a victim of crime, and, specifically, based on a review of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) Uniform Crime Reports and the National Crime Survey, African Americans and Latinos are much more likely than Caucasians to be assaulted, raped, or robbed.

■ Victimology and Criminology

Criminology is the study of crime as a social phenomenon. Edwin H. Sutherland (1947) defined the objectives of criminology as the development of general and verified principles and knowledge regarding the process of law, crime, and treatment of prevention. The etiology of crime and the characteristics of the criminal become the focus of criminological study. In contrast, **victimology** is the study of the victim, including the offender and society. Victimology is a social–structural way of viewing crime and the law and the criminal and the victim. The social context provides challenging insights when the analysis of crime rates and crime situations are analyzed in the mirror of social change. The concept of social change is not easy to define, but there are key years of social change to which there is general agreement. For example, 1934 was one of the peak years of economic depression in the United States; 1939 was viewed as a relatively peaceful year despite the anxiety about growing world conflict; in 1944 America was deeply involved in World

War II; in 1949 veterans were returning home; in 1964 violence and crime in general started to increase; in 1970 the feminist movement began to focus attention on rape and sexual assault; in 1979 the battered women's movement focused attention on violence against women; 1984 saw a shift in legal proceedings from offenders' to victims' rights; the 1990s saw an increase in hate crimes; and 2001 was witness to an attack on American soil by foreign terrorists. Most of these major events impacted victims in our society, specifically when there was loss of life.

In the 1940s and 1950s, based on the research of Benjamin Mendelsohn and Hans von Hentig, victimology began to emerge as a distinct and viable field of study. Historically, victimology was a branch of criminology, and as such the early criminologists and victimologists focused their analysis and writing on typologies of crime victims, assessing the ways in which a victim may contribute, knowingly or unknowingly, to his or her own victimization. Von Hentig's work identified categories of individuals who seemed to be prone to becoming crime victims. Marvin Wolfgang's doctoral dissertation at the University of Pennsylvania in the 1950s built on von Hentig's theories and led to Dr. Wolfgang's major finding that the majority of criminal homicides in the city of Philadelphia were victim precipitated because the victim either provoked the perpetrator or the victim was motivated by an unconscious desire to commit suicide (Wolfgang, 1958). As one might expect, such findings inevitably resulted in a gross misunderstanding of the plight of crime victims and categorical dismissal of the validity of their rights and needs.

■ Scope of the Field

A 2-year multidisciplinary research effort, funded by the National Institute of Justice and published in 1996, estimated the costs and consequences of personal crime for Americans. Their report noted the direct tangible costs to crime victims annually are estimated to be \$105 billion USD in medical expenses, lost earnings, and public program costs related to victim assistance. Pain, suffering, and reduced quality of life increase the cost to \$450 billion USD annually (National Institute of Justice [NIJ], 1996). Canada has approximately one-tenth the population of the United States. In 2003, crime in Canada cost an estimated \$70 billion CAD, the majority of which (\$47 billion CAD or 67%) was borne by the victims. Victim costs include the value of damaged or stolen property, pain and suffering, loss of income and productivity, and health services. Criminal justice system expenditures, such as police, courts, and correctional services, comprised \$13 billion CAD or 19% of the estimated total cost of crime. The remaining \$10 billion CAD, or 14%, was spent on defensive measures, such as security devices and protective services. Assessments by type of crime category revealed that property crimes cost Canadians the most, at \$40 billion CAD, and violent crimes cost \$18 billion CAD and other crimes cost \$12 billion CAD (Government of Canada, 2006).

A breakdown of the costs can be reviewed in three areas: health and medical costs, economic costs, and criminal justice costs.

Health Costs

Tangible losses consist of direct costs for damages and injuries resulting from victimization, including medical and mental health expenses. Physical means of violence to a victim include a person's body (hands, fists, feet), instruments such as firearms and knives, flammable liquids and explosives, poisons, and animals (such as attack dogs).

Types of Injuries

Physical injury can range from minor harm, such as bruises and lacerations, to serious harm of broken bones and need for hospitalization, to lethal injury and death. There are some violent crimes that leave no visible sign of injury. This is true in some rape cases where, contrary to popular opinion, there are no general body injuries or any pelvic or genital injuries. Wallace (2007) lists four general classifications of physical injuries to victims.

There are *immediate injuries* that include cuts, contusions, and broken bones that generally heal fairly quickly and are not viewed as serious by the victim. Immediate injuries can take longer to heal in elderly persons, those who have existing disabilities, or persons with an immune disorder.

For example, Larry was hit over the head and robbed of his wallet by four men in a restaurant parking lot. At the hospital emergency room, the physician who stitched his head remarked that Larry was lucky; the last man who was attacked in that parking lot did not survive. Larry filed a civil lawsuit and received a jury verdict of \$200,000 based on the fact that the restaurant was on notice because their parking lot was not secure; there was no security surveillance system nor security officers patrolling the lot.

Second, there are *injuries that leave visible scars*, such as facial scarring, loss of teeth or fingers, or loss of mobility. Victims who have been shot will have permanent scars that remind them daily of the crime. Child abuse victims or victims of domestic violence may have lasting scars from physical beatings. As an illustration, Lin was exiting her car at her apartment complex when at gunpoint she was forced back in to the passenger side and carjacked. After she was forced to withdraw money from an ATM, Lin was ordered out of the car and instructed to keep on walking and not to look back. Despite her following instructions, she was shot three times in the back. She managed to crawl to a porch and call for help. The three men were found and prosecuted. Lin won a jury award of \$1.3 million.

Third, there are *unknown long-term physical injuries* that can cause a change in life activities. Rape victims may be exposed to a permanent sexually-transmitted disease, such as herpes virus or HIV and AIDS. For example, Jaylee was working in a convenience store when a man forced her into a back room at gunpoint and raped her orally. Later she developed gonorrhea of the throat and had significant voice changes due to scarring of her vocal cords.

Fourth, there are *long-term catastrophic injuries* that can restrict a victim's mobility. In one rape case, the perpetrator intentionally broke a victim's neck, resulting

in a paraplegic outcome. These severe injuries result in great stress on the victim's family members, who also need to alter their lifestyles to care for the victim. Such injuries may reduce the life span of the victim and alter his or her quality of life.

Injuries from violent crime have notably begun to rise in the United States. According to the Uniform Crime Report published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, there were 1,417,745 victims of violent crime in 2006 that resulted in 17,034 homicides (Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI], 2007). This increase in violence is of great significance to hospitals because these victims are often brought to emergency rooms with traumatic injuries for immediate treatment and interventions. Within the healthcare industry there is increasing concern with the physical injuries associated with violent crime as well as the emotional impact it has on its victims. Complications from injuries can cause functional, cognitive, and emotional disability as well as the presence of significant comorbid conditions and potential death.

Economic Costs

Financial costs for health-related injuries of crime victims are staggering. In 2001, crime victim compensation paid \$165.9 million to victims for medical and dental costs; \$55.4 million for mental health costs; \$73.5 million in lost wages and lost support; \$40.3 million for burial costs; \$8.6 million for forensic rape exams; \$104,200 for crime scene cleanup; and other expenses estimated at \$23.1 million (National Association of Crime Victim Compensation Boards [NACVCB], 2002). The NACVCB reports that 28% of adults who received crime victim compensation benefits in 2001 were victims of intimate partner violence, and child victims of physical and sexual abuse received another 23% of all claims paid (NACVCB, 2002). The direct cost of medical treatment for battered women annually was estimated at \$1.8 billion (Wisner, Gilmer, Saltman, & Zink, 1999).

The use of weapons, namely guns and knives, in incidents of interpersonal violence are considered to be an insidious public health danger. This violence causes strain to its victims, their families, community members, healthcare practitioners, and law enforcement officials. Gunshot wounds, sometimes called ballistic trauma, refer to the physical trauma caused by the discharge of a gun during a conflict. In terms of public health, it is estimated that over 500,000 injuries are sustained annually from the use of firearms. In Massachusetts, expenditures related to stabbings and shootings are estimated to be greater than \$18 million each year (Hume, McKenna, & McKeown, 2007). Despite the reported costs of these incidents, they do not account for the emotional impact of these events on the victims and their families.

Economic Costs of Crime-Related Drug Abuse

The crime-related cost of drug abuse increased from \$60.8 billion in 1992 to \$88.9 billion in 1998 and was projected to reach \$100 billion in 2000 (Office on National Drug Control Policy [ONDCP], 2001). There are no national data on psychological consequences of crime victims. However, the less direct conse-

quences of violence may be delayed or cumulative. The stress induced by violent acts, especially when repeated within a partner relationship, may culminate in severe emotional trauma or physical illness. The cost of rehabilitation is also part of health costs (Reiss & Roth, 1993).

According to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA, 2003), in the decade preceding the report, the use of prescription opioids other than for medical purposes grew more than 330%, an estimated increase of 2.5 million people. It is estimated that 4.4 million people older than 12 years had misused opioid pain relievers in the preceding year and that nearly 1.6 million of these individuals meet criteria for opioid dependence by the American Psychiatric Association's *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders IV-TR* (SAMSHA, 2003). This increase for prescription opioids other than for medical purposes has resulted in emergency departments and mental health clinicians reporting an increase in workload time spent, and law enforcement notes an increase in crime-related drug abuse.

Substance abuse, in particular opioid dependence, is a potentially lethal and costly disorder that affects over 4 million individuals every year in the United States. The consequences of insufficient treatment for these individuals result not only in the person's decreased ability to care for him- or herself but also jeopardizes the person at risk for criminal activity that can place the individual, the family, and society in harm's way. Aside from the enormous cost of not just treatment but criminal proceedings and housing of persons in prison secondary to drug charges, the effects of criminal activity from lack of involvement in treatment place many of these individuals in the path of violence.

Economists have used a variety of measures to place monetary values on tangible and intangible losses resulting from crime victimization. Tangible economic losses include loss of productivity in terms of wages and salary and days lost from school, work, and other activities. An impaired capacity to work, to continue in school, or to maintain one's quality of life is less often recognized, but it also is a consequential cost of violent victimization. There can be loss of property or possessions during burglaries and robberies. In 2000, 36% of rape and sexual assault victims lost more than 10 days of work after their victimization, and property crimes in 2000 cost victims more than \$11.8 billion (Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS], 2002). State compensation programs paid crime victims and their families \$370 million in benefits in the federal fiscal year 2001, which represents an increase of \$52 million from 2000 and an increase of \$120 million from 1998 (NACVCB, 2002). Vandalism cost a total of \$1.7 billion in damages to households in the United States in 2000 (BJS, 2002).

Criminal Justice Costs

There are additional costs to society arising from the discretionary collective response to violent victimization. Law enforcement, adjudication, victim services,

and correctional expenditures add thousands of dollars of cost to each criminal event. There is also the phenomenon of double victimization. The first victimization is where the victim suffered at the hands of the criminal. The victim can then be revictimized by the criminal justice system. This second victimization by the system includes time lost in interviews and completing paperwork, waiting in corridors for hearings and trials, and delays and postponements of the case.

■ Measuring Rates of Victimization

Measuring the extent of victimization is a goal of researchers. Statistics assist policy makers and those who provide victim services. However, there is no one single way to define, classify, and measure domains of violent events because each counting system involves some evaluation of people's observations and reports of what they perceive as violent events. Any set of crime statistics, therefore, is based on events that are defined, captured, and processed by some institutional means of collecting and counting.

There are three nationwide measurement systems that count and classify crime:

- Official reports of law enforcement departments
- Surveys that ask people about offenses they have committed
- Surveys that ask people about victimizing experiences

None of these approaches provide a definitive answer to the number of victims of crime because there always remains the question of unreported and unacknowledged cases. The critical part of reviewing victimization numbers is to understand and cite the type and source of the statistics.

Uniform Crime Report

For events that police classify as crimes, the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) system collects basic information about the most serious crime committed. Uniform Crime Reports began recording crime information in 1931 and therefore is one of the oldest systems of crime data collection. This reporting system was designed for the law enforcement community throughout the United States. The task of implementing the directive went to the FBI.

Some of the advantages of the UCR include: (1) Data are compiled annually from jurisdictions all over the United States, which allows for comparisons and trends over the years and by location; (2) there are standardized crime definitions; for example, serious crime is divided into two groups: personal offenses such as murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault; and property offenses including burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson; and (3) a large amount of information is gathered that provides data for patterns of crime and criminals.

The disadvantages of the UCR include: (1) The statistics only report on crimes reported to the police; thus they do not provide a full picture of unreported cases;

(2) they may contain incomplete data or manipulated data as a way for a city to boost its image; (3) there is a lack of data on victims and offenders; and (4) it cites data on those who are arrested. Critics suggest that the UCR underreports the true level of crime (Doerner & Lab, 2008).

There are also specialized databases available for research, such as Supplementary Homicide Reports (SHR) and the National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS).

Victimization Surveys

Victimization surveys are interviews with a random sample of people to ask if they have ever been a victim of a crime. Hindelang (1976) described the development of surveys with “stages” or “generations.” Each stage sought to improve the methodology by identifying problems in an earlier stage.

- Stage 1: President’s Commission on Crime in mid-1960: This survey was a pilot to test the feasibility of counting crime victims.
- Stage 2: National Opinion Research Center (NORC): This survey targeted 10,000 households and asked persons to report on incidents in the past year. Then the interviewer focused on the two most recent and more serious crimes. The results of this survey claimed that UCR underreported crime by about 50%. The NORC reported four times as many rapes and over three times as many burglaries. Of note was the lone exception of motor vehicle theft. This lack of discrepancy most likely was due to the fact that insurance companies require a police report for a reimbursement check. The victimization surveys quickly pointed out the unreported crimes (Biderman & Reiss, 1967).

Second-Generation Victimization Surveys

The second-generation surveys sought to correct the problems identified in the first-generation surveys and involved several methods:

- Record checks: This method sought to compare information from police records with victimization survey data.
- Reverse record check: This check was done by locating crime victims’ names in police files and contacting them and administering a victim survey. The responses were checked against police records. An analysis of this data revealed that memory decay increased over time, and the best recall was within 3 months. Also, the wording of questions and the order of presentation affected the responses (Hindelang, 1976).
- Forward record check: This check was accomplished by asking people in a victim survey if they had contacted police about the incident. Researchers then checked police records for a written case. Police reports for about one-third of the cases could not be found. However, when records were found,

the record and the victim's survey response showed a great deal of similarity (Schneider, Griffith, Sumi, & Burcart, 1978). Skogan (1981) argued three points that underline this strategy. First, there is an assumption that police entries are accurate and filed as an official report. Second, record check studies can only deal with situations that come to the attention of the record keeper. Third, victims move around quite a bit, and thus their changing addresses makes recontact difficult.

Third-Generation Victimization Surveys

The National Crime Survey (NCS) was initiated in 1972 with a probability sample of 72,000 households. The plan called for interviews with each member of the household. Households were to be contacted every 6 months for a total of seven interviews. Many of the concerns identified in the first- and second-generation surveys were address and corrected in this stage.

Fourth-Generation National Crime Victimization Survey

Concerns were again addressed about wording, bounding, memory decay, and telescoping for the fourth-generation surveys. Redesign efforts were made to address the questionnaire and the data collection procedures. The results of the **National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS)** indicate improved data regarding victim-offender relationships when a crime was a nonstranger type. It also provides data on the age, race, and gender of the offender. An ongoing survey of a nationally representative sample of residential addresses, the NCVS is the primary source of information about the characteristics of criminal victimization and the number and types of crimes not reported to law enforcement authorities. It provides the largest national forum for victims to describe the impact of crime and characteristics of violent offenders. Twice each year, data are obtained from a nationally representative sample of roughly 49,000 households (about 100,000 persons) regarding the frequency, characteristics, and consequences of criminal victimization in the United States. The survey is administered by the US Census Bureau (under the US Department of Commerce) on behalf of the Bureau of Justice Statistics (under the US Department of Justice). The NCVS was designed with four primary objectives: (1) develop detailed information about the victims and consequences of crime; (2) estimate the number and types of crimes that are not reported to the police; (3) provide uniform measures of selected types of crimes; and (4) permit comparisons over time and types of areas. The survey categorizes crimes as personal or property crimes. Personal crimes cover rape and sexual attack, robbery, aggravated and simple assault, and purse snatching and pickpocketing; property crimes cover burglary, theft, motor vehicle theft, and vandalism. The data from the NCVS are particularly useful for calculating crime rates, both aggregated and disaggregated, and for determining changes in crime rates from year to year.

Underreporting still remains a thorny problem. Victimization surveys note the reluctance or failure of citizens to report a crime to police, with as many as two out of three victimizations going unreported (BJS, 2000). Various reasons are given, including the suspect not being successful in completing the act, such as a robbery, or thinking the police would not be able to do anything.

Difficulties in Measurement

The task of describing the national pattern of violence from the various reporting systems is complicated by the fact that they differ in terms of (1) the domain of events that they attempt to capture, (2) the unit of count on which their statistics are based, (3) the timing of the counting and tabulation, and (4) the sources of discretion and error in recording the counting events. These differences are described as difficulties in recall, telescoping, and bounding.

Recall

The NCVS uses a 6-month reference period. Respondents are asked to report crime experiences that occurred in the last 6 months. Generally, respondents are able to more accurately recall an event that occurred within 3 months of the interview rather than one that occurred within 6 months; they can recall events over a 6-month period more accurately than over a 12-month period. However, a shorter reference period would require more field interviews per year, increasing the data collection costs significantly. These increased costs would have to be balanced by cost reductions elsewhere, such as reducing the sample size, but reducing the sample size reduces the precision of estimates of relatively rare crimes. In light of these trade-offs of cost and precision, a reference period of 6 months is used for the NCVS.

Telescoping

Another concern of researchers who employ reference periods in retrospective surveys is telescoping. Telescoping refers to a respondent's misspecification of when an incident occurred in relation to the reference period. For example, telescoping occurs if a respondent is asked about victimizations within the last 6 months and erroneously includes a victimization that occurred 8 months ago. Telescoped events, which actually occurred prior to the reference period, can be minimized at the time of the first interview by a technique known as bounding.

Bounding

Bounding is achieved by comparing incidents reported in an interview with incidents reported in a previous interview and deleting duplicate incidents that were reported in the current reference period. In the NCS and NCVS designs, each visit to a household is used to bind the next one by comparing reports in the current interview with those given 6 months prior. When a report appears to be a duplicate, the respondent is reminded of the earlier report and asked if the new report represents the previously mentioned incident or if it is different. The first interview at a household entering the sample is unbounded, and data collected

at these interviews are not included in NCS and NCVS estimates. However, if a household in a sample moves and another household moves into that address, the first interview with the replacement household is unbounded but is included in NCS and NCVS estimates.

■ Trends in Crime

Common perceptions are that American society is more violent than most societies, that it is more violent today than ever before, and that violence is increasing. The facts are, however, more complex, and simple generalizations can be misleading (Reiss & Roth, 1993). Crime in the United States is a significant criminal justice and public health problem, and despite a declining crime rate during the past 2 decades, the serious nature of homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, domestic violence, burglary, larceny–theft, carjacking, and motor vehicle theft impact millions of victims and their families each year.

Violent crime trends reported for 1990 included the following: The violent crime victimization rate was higher for men, theft victimization was higher for men than for women, and the highest rate of violent victimization for any age group targeted those younger than age 25 years. Statistics also revealed that as individuals age, crime rate victimization decreased, and race did not differentiate for victimization rates of simple assault and personal theft. Overall, violent crime, robbery, and aggravated assault victimization rates did differ by race; the highest violent crime victimization rates based on economic range existed for those earning less than \$7500 annually, and those least at risk were members of households with an annual income above \$25,000. Individuals with only an elementary school education experienced the highest rates of crime victimization, and persons with a college education experienced the lowest rates. The personal theft rate for 1990 was the lowest ever recorded, and the rate of household crime reached an uncommon low the same year due to lows in personal and household larceny (BJS, 1993).

Among news reporters, historians, and criminologists who review and interpret these findings, there are predictable reactionary stances, including the alarmists, the skeptics, and the realists. Frequently, members of the press tend toward alarmism, singling out and sensationalizing specific instances within the 50-year span. Such instances include cases like that of the 1993 case of Lorena Bobbit, who cut off half of her husband's penis while he lay sleeping, or the 1993 murder case of Lyle and Erik Menendez, who shotgunned their parents, or the 2006 arrest of three Duke University lacrosse players for rape. Some historians fall into the skeptic category, where a 5- or 20-year cyclical decline (with some brief growth spurts in specific years) in most crime categories is viewed as temporary because history sometimes repeats itself. The realists are many of the academic scholars and criminologists, who can examine a 10- or 23-year trend analysis and with reasonable certainty predict that 10, 20, or 25 years of overall declines in crime rates are not temporary.

According to the 23-year summary report of the extent and nature of criminal victimizations from 1973 to 1995, the rate of crime victimization dropped to its lowest level in 1995. In general, this pattern of decreasing rates occurred for personal and household crimes for many of the years over the 1973 to 1995 time frame. Most significant was the virtually uninterrupted decline in the rates of property crime victimizations. In contrast, the rate of violent crime victimizations underwent intervals of increase in the mid-1970s, 1980 to 1981, 1985 to 1986, and 1990 to 1991. Except for those few intervals, the rates of violent crime victimizations have been stable or decreasing, with the sharpest declines from 1993 to 1995. Of particular note was the fact that the victimization rates for burglary and household theft declined substantially, approximately 51% and 43% respectively, from 1973 to 1995 (Rand, Lynch, & Cantor, 1997; Zawitz, et al., 1993). The NCVS reported that an estimated 2.9 million serious nonfatal violent victimizations occurred in 1990 (nonfatal violent crimes include rape, robbery, and violent assault). Internationally, this rate ranked among the world's highest levels. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the decline in the total violent crime rate from 1993 to 1995 was the largest single-year decrease ever measured. The total rate of violent crime from 1973 to 1990 decreased 9.2%, though an analysis of year-to-year trends from 1973 to 1990 reveals no specific pattern but rather a few declines accompanied by steady increases and stable rates in total violent crime. The sharpest year-to-year reduction in crime actually occurred between 1994 and 1995 (BJS, 1997a). Although it is natural to view declines in crime rates between two consecutive years as a positive sign, the long-term trends in violent crime victimization reveal a more accurate picture in terms of demographic shift and crime factor impact.

From 1995 to 1996, the violent crime rate declined 10%, continuing the downward trend from 1994 (BJS, 1997b). Criminal victimization rates for US residents older than the age of 12 years declined 12.4% (to 44.5 per 1000 individuals) in 1995. Overall, personal crime fell 13% (to 46.2 per 1000 individuals) from the 1994 level (BJS, 1997b).

According to the FBI's 2006 Uniform Crime Report (UCR), from 2004 to 2005 the violent crime rate in the United States increased by 1.3%, and the property-related crime rate decreased by 2.4%. The 2007 UCR estimated the total number of reported violent offenses in 2006 at over 1.4 million, an increase of 1.9% over the 2005 estimate. Specifically, murder and nonnegligent manslaughter increased in volume by 1.8%, robbery offenses increased 7.2%, and forcible rape and aggravated assault crimes decreased 2% and 0.2%, respectively.

Violent Offenses: Subgroup Statistics

The NCVS results have supported the finding that criminal victimization rates do not occur at the same rate across subgroups of the population. Differential rates are found on the basis of race, age and gender, reflecting both bias and vulnerability.

Race

Race is an important differentiating factor in rates of victimization. For example, the statistics show that violent victimization rates for murder involve ethnic minority males in urban areas to a greater extent than white males. In 1994, black males had a 42 out of 1000 likelihood of being victims of violent crime. Comparatively, the least likely members of society to be murdered during the same year were white females, with a relatively low risk of 3 out of 1000 (BJS, 1997b). Victimization rates of black people have exceeded those of whites throughout this century, with black murder rates higher than white murder rates for all age groups. Victimization rates for individuals aged 12 years and older follow a similar pattern when identifying race and family income as affiliated factors. For example, for all victimizations in 1992, white people experienced a rate of 63.5 per 1000 for families with an income less than \$7500, and the rate for black people in the same socioeconomic bracket was 70.2 per 1000 (Dorkin, Wiersema, Loftin, & McDowall, 1996). However, it is necessary to recognize that although the rate for black people is significantly higher than for white people, they only make up 11% of the population, compared to whites, who account for almost 70% of the population. Rates of victimization steadily decrease for white and black people as annual family income increases to \$50,000 or more (Perkins & Klaus, 1996). From 1994 to 1995 there was a 12.8% reduction in the overall violent crime rate for white people. The black population saw a noticeable decrease of 24% in aggravated assault rates, with some evidence of downward trends in overall personal and violent crime rates and in rape and sexual assault (BJS, 1997a; Dorkin, et al., 1996).

In 2005, young black men with annual incomes under \$7500 were more likely to sustain a violent victimization than whites and other races. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2007) report on victim characteristics, for every 1000 persons in any particular racial group, 27 blacks, 20 whites, and 15 individuals of other races were victims of a violent crime. In contrast, blacks and whites sustained similar rates of simple assault, and black, white, and other races sustained approximately the same number of forcible rapes and sexual assaults. In terms of robbery and aggravated assault, Hispanics had noticeably higher rates of victimization than non-Hispanics. Males sustained higher rates of victimization than females for all categories of violent crime except rape and sexual assault. In 2005, with regard to race, whites experienced more burglaries and thefts than blacks; specifically, 35 out of every 1000 black households and 29 out of every 1000 white households experienced burglaries, and the theft rate was 97 per 1000 for black households and 120 per 1000 for white households. Thus, trends within the two broad categories of violent crime and property crime for 2005 indicated that the rates had finally leveled off after incremental cumulative declines when the yearly crime rates for the decades of the 1980s and 1990s are averaged.

Age

Although teenagers and young adults are more likely than older adults to be murdered, three-fourths of all murder victims are aged 24 years or older when they

are killed. A significant decline of 30.6% in victimization among children aged 12–15 years for aggravated assaults occurred in 1994 to 1995. Those children at greatest risk for any victimization, according to 1992 statistics, are children whose household income is less than \$20,000, black children, and children in large cities (BJS, 1997a; Dorkin, et al., 1996). In 1992, adolescents aged 16–19 years had the highest risk of being victims of robbery, with a rate of 15.4 per 1000 children. This rate steadily decreased throughout the lifetime of individuals to the low-end rate of 1.5 per 1000 individuals at age 65 years and older. Victims of aggravated assault were also most strongly represented in the 16–19 years age category at a rate of 26.3 cases per 1000 children (BJS, 1993).

Elderly members of society are also a vulnerable victimization subgroup. For individuals older than age 65 years, those at greatest risk of violent victimization from 1987 to 1990 were males, blacks, divorced or separated individuals, and persons who resided in cities (Dorkin, et al., 1996). The 1994 to 1995 declines in victimization among the elderly were not as significant as those declines experienced by intermediate age groups. No notable declines occurred in the age 50 years or older range (except for personal theft), but all intermediate age groups showed remarkable declines in the overall violent crime rate. The 75 years and older age group is the fastest growing segment of the US population, and it predicted that with the rapidly increasing numbers of frail elderly people in our society, the incidence of elder abuse and neglect will also rapidly increase. The primary type of abuse against the elderly is neglect, followed by physical abuse.

Gender

Overall violent crime rates declined from 1994 to 1995 both for men (10.7% decline) and women (14.4% decline). Women have approximately one-third the risk of men of being murdered, but women are four times as likely as men to be killed by a spouse or intimate partner. The rates of nonfatal victimization among women were highest for blacks (58.5 per 1000 females), for females aged 12–15 years (102.3 per 1000), and for divorced or separated women (86.2 per 1000) (BJS, 1997a; Rand, et al., 1997).

The difference in abuse of children by gender resoundingly showed higher levels of abuse in the categories of physical, sexual, and emotional abuse for female children. The greatest difference existed in the category of sexual abuse, with 28,400 incidents for boys and 90,200 for girls. However, among the child victims, the incidence for all victimizations was 57.6% of boys and 44.8% of girls, though in instances where the assault was identified as a “family assault,” girls had greater representation than boys (Dorkin, et al., 1996).

Violence in the Workplace

During the past decade, newspapers rarely have missed an opportunity to report the latest murder, robbery, physical or sexual assault, or stalking incident that occurred in the workplace. Factories, offices, criminal courts, public schools, and hospitals are no longer the safe places they once were for employees. Others

victimize people in institutions, peers, customers, authority persons, as well as strangers.

Causation is unclear in workplace crime, but there are several contributing or precipitating factors, such as easy access to handguns and semiautomatic weapons, anger control problems, financial needs, chemical dependency, mental disorders, and stressors such as loss of job or partner relationship.

According to the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), those workplaces with the highest death-by-homicide rates in the United States are taxicab establishments, liquor stores and local bars, gas stations, and hotels/motels, and the job categories with the highest risk are police officers and sheriffs, security guards, and jewelry store owners.

Violence in the workplace is a serious safety and health issue. Its most extreme form, homicide, is the fourth-leading cause of fatal occupational injury in the United States. Environmental conditions associated with workplace assaults have been identified and control strategies implemented in a number of work settings. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) has developed guidelines and recommendations to reduce workers' exposures to this hazard.

Frequently, violent episodes in the workplace can be prevented. With this in mind, some companies have begun to provide employee assistance programs (EAP), stress management and anger control workshops, and fitness and exercise facilities. In addition, corporate security and human resources personnel often receive training in crisis intervention, psychological risk assessments, and critical incident debriefing. No office, business, or institution is immune to the threat of violence, and careful planning and program development is crucial to handling threats appropriately and containing and preventing future violent incidents.

■ Crime Victims' Movement

Fortunately, the crime victims' movement that began in the 1970s ushered in an array of positive changes to the social, economic, and political forces that caused harsh and neglectful treatment of crime victims, gradually bringing an end to the victimologists' flawed notion of victim blaming. Victimologists who wrote in the 1990s overwhelmingly found that most victims of violent crimes are wholly innocent and only rarely contribute through carelessness to their own victimization. The crime victims' movement also led to landmark federal legislation that resulted in major funding initiatives throughout the nation for prosecutor-based victim-witness assistance programs, state crime victim compensation programs, police victim assistance programs, shelters for battered women, restitution programs, and sexual abuse treatment and prevention programs. Most importantly, of course, was the passage of the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) in 1984. This significant federal legislation enabled the development and funding of several thousand victim assistance programs nationwide, and by 1996 remuneration from criminal penalties and

finances paid to the federal Crime Victims Fund reached more than \$525 million. These funds provided resources for both state and federal victim compensation and victim-witness assistance programs, as well as technical assistance and regional training for victim advocates. In 1997, all 50 states combined received more than three times the amount of federal funding than had been received in any previous year.

In 1998, in preparation for the next century, Attorney General Janet Reno and the US Department of Justice's Office for Victims of Crime (OVC) released *New Directions from the Field: Victims' Rights and Services for the 21st Century*, a comprehensive volume reviewing the progress that had been made in fulfilling the recommendations set forth in 1982 in the final report of President Ronald Reagan's Task Force on Victims of Crime. In issuing 250 new recommendations, this volume poised itself to set the agenda for expanding victim rights, advocacy, and services for the next millennium (with more than 150 consulting editors and advisors acknowledged as contributors in the appendix to this volume, two of the authors of the current book were among the expert reviewers).

During the 1980s and 1990s, important legislation was enacted that expanded victims' rights and allocated critical funding for victim-witness assistance programs, battered women's shelters, sexual assault treatment and prevention programs, and victim compensation programs. Society's fear of crime, fueled by advances in the women's movement, the report of the US Attorney General's Task Force on Victims of Crime (1982), and the passage of the Federal Victim and Witness Protection Act in 1982 and the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) in 1984, resulted in federal subsidies to state and local victim services, victim compensation, victim-witness assistance, and domestic violence and sexual assault prevention programs. The VOCA legislation created a substantial federal fund within the US treasury that was accumulated from federal criminal fines, penalties, and asset forfeitures. In 1988, amendments to VOCA required that victim compensation eligibility in all states be extended to include domestic violence victims and victims of drunk-driving accidents, as well as nonresident commuters and visitors.

During the 1990s, the federal government and a growing number of states adopted victims' rights legislation. Most of these new statutes identified certain specific rights of victims and their families:

- To bring the accused to a speedy trial
- To be present at all critical stages of a suspect's trial, including sentencing and appeals hearings
- To be treated with dignity, respect, courtesy, and sensitivity
- To be notified in advance of scheduled or rescheduled court proceedings
- To be provided a separate waiting area from the one used by the alleged offender and his or her family during all stages of the investigating process
- To promptly receive information concerning their rights, just as criminal suspects must be read their rights

- To be informed of monetary assistance and concrete services (e.g., emergency food coupons), crisis counseling, criminal injury compensation, and other available services
- To have property promptly returned unless there is a compelling reason for a delay
- To receive full restitution from the offender, if possible
- To be informed of a defendant's release or escape
- To testify at any parole or probation hearing or plea bargaining process
- To insist that the offender undergo a blood test if bodily fluid capable of transmitting the HIV virus may have been transferred during the criminal act

As of 2007, there were approximately 12,000 victim–witness assistance and service programs, including sexual assault treatment programs, battered women's shelters, self-help and support groups for families of homicide victims, support groups for battered women, and community coalitions and task forces on sexual assault and battered women (for detailed information about issues, policies, and programs for victims of sexual assault, see Chapter 3 in this book, and for detailed information about battered women, see Chapter 7 regarding intimate partner violence in this book).

■ Forensic Victimology and Investigative Profiling

The study of the victim has been especially useful to criminal profilers in analyzing crime scenes for the purpose of identifying offender profile characteristics. In turn, profile characteristics provide police with data on which to classify a crime and identify suspects in unsolved cases. The work of investigative analysts at the FBI Academy in Quantico, Virginia led to an expansion of traditional crime categories. The result of this work was the publication of a book, the *Crime Classification Manual* (CCM) (Douglas, Burgess, Burgess, & Ressler, 2006).

To classify a crime using the CCM, questions about the defining characteristics of the crime need to be answered. These characteristics include information about the victim, the crime scene, and the nature of the victim–offender exchange. Victimology is the complete history of the victim and is the crucial part in the anatomy of a crime. The critical question is to evaluate why a particular person was targeted for a violent crime; the answer will lead to motive.

Forensic victimology is defined by Turvey and Petherick (2008) as the scientific study of victims for the purposes of addressing investigative and forensic issues. It involves the skeptical investigation of facts and a thorough examination of the evidence. Forensic victimology, explains Turvey, provides a scientific balance against the idealization or demonization of victims, a filter for deception and false reporting, and the means for identifying a threshold of relevance for victim information and opinions already at work in the criminal justice system.

Turvey and Petherick (2008) explain that the forensic victimologist is best conceived as an objective, dispassionate scientific examiner. These examiners are critical and skeptical, and they put the establishment of fact before politics or any other consideration. To that end, they take nothing for granted, look for corroboration of any alleged victim's statements, seek out collateral sources of information, and investigate alternate or contributing motives for victim behavior. Most importantly, the forensic victimologist is barred from assuming that alleged victims must have been victimized. For their purposes, victimization must be established unequivocally and may not be asserted simply for ideological purposes. They investigate as scientists, they report as educators, and they understand the gravity of their eventual courtroom testimony (Turvey & Petherick, 2008).

Investigative Criminal Profiling

Investigative profiling is best viewed as a strategy enabling law enforcement to narrow the field of options and generate educated guesses about the perpetrator. It has been described as a collection of leads (Rossi, 1982) as an informed attempt to provide detailed information about a certain type of criminal (Geberth, 1981) and as a biological sketch of behavioral patterns, trends, and tendencies (Vorpapel, 1982). Geberth (1981) noted that the investigative profile is particularly useful when the criminal has demonstrated some clearly identifiable form of psychopathology. In such a case, the crime scene is presumed to reflect the murderer's behavior and personality in much the same way as furnishings reveal a homeowner's character.

Investigative or criminal profiling is, in fact, a form of retroclassification, or classification that works backward. Typically we classify a known entity into a discrete category, based on presenting characteristics that translate into criteria for assignment to that category. In the case of homicide investigation, we have neither the entity (for example, the offender) nor the victim. It is thus necessary to rely on the only source of information that typically is available: the crime scene. This information is used to profile, or classify, an individual. An important part of profiling is using the concepts of victimology and crime scene investigation. The assessment areas are described followed by an analysis of a cold case.

Crime Scene Analysis

Victimology is critical to a crime investigation as a first step in determining motive. Victims are assessed as to their risk level in terms of lifestyle and situation. Lifestyle risk level is a function of age, physical size, race, marital status, living situation, location of residence, and occupation.

Situational risk assesses the victim's location and activities at the time of the crime and interacts with lifestyle risk. For example, the situational risk of a person remains the same inside a residence unless the doors are unlocked. Traveling to a social site, workplace, or residence may increase a person's situational risk level. The situational risk level varies from day to day depending on a person's routine.

An example of an individual with a high lifestyle risk who increased his situational risk was a 15-year-old white male runaway from a youth residential shelter. He had been removed from his residence for truancy and being incorrigible. The victim was found on a little-traveled rural road, dead of massive thermal burns, in the ashes of a cardboard barrel, the metal rings of which were in the debris. Paint thinner was used as the accelerant, and the victim was identified through dental records. Victimology noted the victim to be a troublemaker, streetwise, and involved in all types of street activity.

The very young and the elderly may be high-risk victims under certain situations. Children walking home from school or alone at home may be targeted or stalked. Elderly people living alone may be targeted because of their situation and fragility. Several offenders who entered her house on New Year's Eve beat a 73-year-old white widow with fists about the head and face. There were no signs of forced entry. The victim was tied at the wrists using her nylon hose. She was found the next day in her backyard covered with a piece of sheet metal and boards thrown over her. She had been hit with a blunt instrument, possibly a brick found at the scene. The victim's skull was struck many more times than necessary to kill the victim. Some watches and coins were known to be taken from the home. It was not known why the victim was taken outside because she had been beaten while in the house. Victimology noted that the widow lived alone in a small-town residential area, and it was rumored that she had money in the house.

The crime scene assessment is divided into four distinct scenes. The initial contact scene is where the victim has the first contact with the offender. The assault scene is where the assault, physical or sexual, occurs. The death scene is where the death of the victim takes place. The body location scene is where the body is discovered. These four scenes can be the same physical location, multiple locations within a single building, physically separated locations, or any combinations of these locations.

For each crime scene location, an assessment is made of the risk level of the victim and the offender. The initial contact scene risk is a function of location, time of day, number of people at the location, and the routine of the victim as to the location. The risk level of location for the offender is a function of the offender's risk at being at the crime scene.

Cold Case Analysis

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) defines a cold case as any case whose probative investigative leads have been exhausted. Heurich (2008) suggests that investigations regularly slow or stop completely, resulting in cold cases, often due to police agencies' lack of manpower, equipment, and funding to support units dedicated to investigating and analyzing these cold cases. As homicide and sexual assault units are backlogged with active cases, cold cases rarely get attention, leaving survivors angry and society at risk. As a result, the NIJ's Solving Cold Cases with

DNA grant program was designed to assist states and local governments identify, review, investigate, and analyze violent crime cold cases—homicides and rapes—that had the potential to be solved through DNA analysis. Since NIJ issued its first solicitation for the cold case grant program in July 2004, the Institute has received more than 200 requests for funding, many from agencies trying to get cold case units started. Others have been looking for support to enhance established units, and in some cases even to keep them in existence. In 2005, NIJ awarded a total of \$14.2 million to 38 state and local agencies; in 2007, the Institute awarded more than \$8 million to 21 state and local agencies. Funds have been used for personnel, including overtime; equipment and supplies (both investigative and laboratory); investigative travel; training related to cold case investigation or DNA analysis; and outsourcing samples to private DNA laboratories when necessary. The program has given agencies the opportunity to put resources toward solving homicides, sexual assaults, and other violent offenses that may never have been reviewed or reinvestigated. Crime scene samples from these cases—thought to be unsuitable for testing several years ago—have yielded DNA profiles, and samples that previously generated inconclusive DNA results have been reanalyzed using newer methods (Heurich, 2008). Despite the advances of DNA evidence, however, other investigative techniques must be utilized, as demonstrated in the case below.

Example of Cold Case Analysis

The crime scene: On June 23, 1991, Dorothy D. was found dead, lying on a blood-soaked bed in her upstairs bedroom, by a police officer and the victim's son while the officer responded to a call made by the son in reference to a suspicious black male seen on their property.

Victimology: Mrs. D., a 70-year-old white widow, lived alone in a two-story farmhouse in a rural area of the state. She was described as gentle, loving, and family oriented. Her son lived in a trailer next to her property. These residences were on a rural road off of a main road leading to town. The victim had no car and was dependent upon others for rides. One good friend drove her to church on Sundays. She had a few friends who visited on occasion, the last being 2 weeks prior to her death. Two daughters were in daily contact with her. She had talked with one daughter by phone several hours before her death and was visited by another daughter around 9:00 p.m. Her habits were well-known to her family. She watched television on her downstairs couch until about 11:00 p.m. and then retired to one of three upstairs bedrooms. She selected the bedroom based on the outside temperature.

Analysis: Mrs. D. was a low-risk victim who lived in a low-risk environment. Her property was basically farmland; her neighbors were on property distant from her. She was not known to have sums of cash. Her income was from rental of farm property. There was nothing in her background to suggest why she would become the victim of a brutal murder. The only reported significant event prior to the homicide was her taking out an insurance policy whereby she named her son as beneficiary.

Crime scene: There was one crime scene. To reach the second-floor bedroom, the offender had to pass two other bedrooms. There were bedsprings and clutter in the hall leading to the bedroom and in the bedroom itself, which was small in size. The victim was believed to be sleeping prior to being attacked. She had defense wounds indicating she awoke to the intruder. There was no evidence to suggest she left the bed prior to, during, or after the attack. Blood was spattered on the headboard and the bed. The point of entrance to the house was through the back door. The responding officer found a pane of broken glass, but it was not large enough for an adult arm. The door was unlocked.

The crime was committed indoors in the middle of the night. The location was a deserted country road. The offender was at the crime scene for a very short time. Nothing was noted to be disturbed in the bedroom or any other room in the house. Nothing was found to be missing. The victim's purse, which contained \$14 in cash and a checkbook, was undisturbed. The body was sexually positioned postmortem, and some time was needed for that in addition to the stabbings of the victim.

Analysis: The organization and disorganization in the crime scene data pointed to the possibility of two offenders, one who planned and directed the crime and a second who entered the bedroom and left bloody fingerprints. The crime scene indicated a violent attack on an elderly woman who could have been easily controlled and killed with much less aggression. She was immediately blitzed and incapacitated. The organized aspects of the scene indicated someone was familiar with the house, knew which door to enter, could maneuver around the clutter, knew which bedroom the victim slept in, and maneuvered in her room to not disturb the clutter. The intruder also did postmortem placement of the pillow and staged a sexual assault, leaving no bloody fingerprints. The evidence of bloody prints on the blanket, box springs, knob of the railing, handrail, sofa pillow, light switch, and phone cord indicated a disorganized and hasty retreat. There were 29 stab wounds with a knife or some type of cutting instrument that was not a screwdriver. The weapon was never recovered. The body was openly displayed and left where she was killed. Nothing was noted to be removed from the scene.

There was purposeful alteration of the crime scene. First, the broken pane to the back door indicated the glass had been broken from the inside rather than the outside as would be expected in a break-in. The first responding officer said she stepped on a very small amount of glass that was on the steps outside of the residence, and at that point the son offered to open the door with a key. The officer advised him to be quiet, and she turned the doorknob slowly, found it to be unlocked, and opened it 3 inches, at which time a large amount of glass fell out. The daughters reported that their mother locked the door at night. No blood was reported to be on the door area. Second, a pink sofa pillow from the first floor was brought to the crime scene and placed over the victim's face. The blood spatter on the pillow was inconsistent with the wounds and blood from the victim's face, indicating it was done postmortem. Police investigators speculated this could be done

to depersonalize the victim. The murderer also could have placed the pillow to avoid looking at the violence committed. Third, the victim's nightgown was pushed up to her breasts after having been folded back, again postmortem. Third, the legs were spread in a provocative sexual position, indicating a staged sexual homicide. No bloody fingerprints or palm prints were noted on the pillow, nightgown, or positioned legs. Fifteen years after the homicide, DNA and palm prints from the crime scene were matched to a 38-year-old black male, Mr. C.

There were many inconsistencies with the crime scene data and the linking of this homicide to Mr. C., a stranger to the victim. Because the state attorney was seeking the death penalty, a forensic nurse was called as an expert witness by the defense to review the victimology and analyze the crime and the crime scene. The following are important points to the case. Several witnesses identified Mr. C. as a person who sought a ride in the late evening or early morning prior to the murder. It is inconsistent that he would then walk in the rain down a dark road and past a house with a car to a house without a car and in the opposite direction of his home. It is out of character that this stranger, looking for a ride, would suddenly turn into a violent predator on his own volition.

Mr. C., on police interview, said Mrs. D.'s son gave him a ride. Money was discussed because Mr. C. said he wanted money for drugs. The son told him there was money in the car parked alongside his trailer, and he dropped Mr. C. off at his residence. Mr. C. did not find any money. He then went back to the son, who told him there was money in the house (Mr. C. did not know it was Mr. D.'s mother's house). The son told Mr. C. to go upstairs, and he did. Mr. D told police he didn't recall stabbing Mrs. D.

Mr. C. confirmed that he threatened the son with a screwdriver that was in the truck. It is inconsistent that he would then change weapons to use a knife. Also, to find another weapon of opportunity in the victim's house would require turning on lights and searching in the kitchen. A disorganized offender would have dropped the weapon at the crime scene. The crime scene was inconsistent with a stranger as killer. Nothing was disturbed. If the stranger's goal was to rob and kill, he would have taken some items of value or searched for money. It is inconsistent that a stranger would enter the house and go to the bedroom of the victim to violently kill her.

Mr. C.'s forensics placed him at the crime scene. However, he implicated the son to have a much greater role in this crime than the son admitted. The son had scratches and bruises on his body that were not consistent with Mr. C.'s report of poking him in the ribs with the screwdriver and punching him in the face. The point of entrance had a small pane of glass that was broken from the inside, and the son had a key to unlock his mother's house with him when the officer arrived. Mr. C. later saw the son at his own residence. However, the son denied any contact with Mr. C. except the one ride when the altercation occurred.

There were a number of inconsistencies between the stories of the witnesses, Mr. C., and the victim's son. First, where did the confrontation occur? Some said

it happened outside the restaurant, some said outside the truck at the intersection, and some said inside the truck. Second, the time dimension was inconsistent. There was a 2.5 hour time interval to account for. The son left work at midnight. The restaurant time period was next, around 12:30 a.m. The son gave Mr. C. a ride around 12:45 a.m. There was a fight, and the son drove off without Mr. C. and drove around for 20 minutes. He then saw Mr. C. again outside his mother's residence. He drove around, returned to the restaurant, called the police, waited an hour, and returned to his residence with the officer. The body was discovered, and the investigation started around 3:00 a.m.

The son took the officer into his mother's house after the officer entered the unlocked door. The son immediately led the way to the body. He passed two bedrooms that, according to the daughters, were also used by the mother. It is not clear if the bedroom light was on before the son entered the room or if the son turned on the light. He then stated, "He killed her. I can't believe he killed her." The son admitted he was talking about Mr. C. (the hitchhiker). Nobody who exited the crime scene noted blood on the back door.

There is inconsistency in how Mr. C. got back to his destination after leaving the victim's home. It would be a long 3-mile walk in the rain to the restaurant. He would have passed houses with cars he could have stolen. He told investigators that the son gave him a ride. There was no forensics of blood found in the son's truck.

The weapon issue is inconsistent. A couch pillow was found covering the victim's face, and it was placed after her death. A cutting instrument was used to stab the victim. There is no evidence that Mr. C. had a knife because he could have used it during the confrontation with the son.

Crime classification: The *Crime Classification Manual* (Douglas, et al., 2006) notes that a blend of motivations inspires many violent crimes. This is especially true when multiple offenders are involved because there may be as many motives as there are offenders. The motive is key in this case. Financial gain was a common factor between the son and Mr. C. The son told police of his financial problems, and the sisters talked of an insurance policy. On the night of the murder, Mr. C. was searching for a ride when he encountered the victim's son. According to Mr. C., they talked at the restaurant. A plan was suggested by the son for Mr. C. to get some money by breaking and entering a car and a residence and, if needed, to injure.

One hypothesis to this case is that it was a Criminal Enterprise murder, where two persons were involved in the crime. The son hired Mr. C. to kill his mother with the promise of money for drugs. It also can be classified as a Domestic Homicide by proxy with the planning by the son. However, without a confession or forensic evidence, the son could not be charged. Based on the inconsistencies found in the case, the state's attorney offered Mr. C. a plea of life imprisonment, which he accepted.

■ Summary

The definition of “victim” dates back to early religious practice and sacrifices. Victimology, as a new discipline, was fully launched in the mid-1970s. The costs of victimization are staggering when including costs to the victims and their families, costs to the systems who care for victims, and costs to society through the criminal justice system and the fear it engenders in the public.

Victimology is a critical component of investigating violent crime and of analyzing a crime scene with the goal of identifying profile characteristics. Forensic victimology is the key to crime analysis, crime motivation, and suspect identification in homicide cases. The dynamics of victimization tell important information about the impact to the victim. Investigative or forensic victimology is a new and rapidly developing subdivision of victimology in general. It is one of the applied aspects of understanding crime with the goal of prevention.

■ Key Terms

Cost of Victimization Includes health and medical costs, economic costs, and criminal justice costs.

Criminology The study of the etiology of crime and the characteristics of the criminal.

Forensic Victimology An important tool for investigating and solving cold cases.

National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) A series of surveys, previously called the National Crime Survey (NCS), that has been collecting data on personal and household victimization since 1973.

Victimology The study of the victim from a social–structural way of viewing crime and the law and the criminal and the victim.

■ Discussion Questions

1. Why do you think criminal justice professionals failed to recognize that victims deserve to have their legal and constitutional rights protected prior to the late 1980s?
2. How is the victimization experience different or similar for a crime victim versus a victim of a social and public health problem?
3. Compare and contrast victimology and criminology.
4. In relation to crime trends, compare and contrast the subgroups of race, age, and gender. What demographics are least likely to be victimized? Most likely?
5. How does the factor of violence in the workplace affect victimization?
6. How does the subdivision of forensic victimology contribute to suspect apprehension?

References

1. Biderman, A. D., & Reiss, A. J. (1967, November). On exploring the “dark figure” of crime. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 374, 1–15.
2. Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1993). *Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics 1992*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
3. Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1997a). *National crime victimization survey, criminal victimization in the US, 1990: A national crime victimization report*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
4. Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1997b). *Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics, 1996* [Project grant given to the Hindelang Criminal Justice Research Center, SUNY at Albany, New York]. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
5. Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2000, September). *Crime and the nation’s households, 2000*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
6. Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2002). *National crime victimization survey: Personal and property crimes, 2000*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
7. Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2007). *Victim characteristics*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
8. Department of Justice. (1984). *Attorney General’s task for one family violence*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
9. Doerner, W. G., & Lab, S. P. (2008). *Victimology* (5th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: LexisNexis Anderson Publishing.
10. Dorkin, A., Wiersema, B., Loftin, C., & McDowall, D. (1996). *Statistical handbook on violence in America*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
11. Douglas, J. E., Burgess, A. W., Burgess, A. G., & Ressler, R. K. (2006). *Crime classification manual*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
12. Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2007). *Crime in the United States: Uniform crime report 2006*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
13. Fletcher, G. P. (1988). *A crime of self-defense: Bernhard Goetz and the law on trial*. New York: Free Press.
14. Geberth, V. (1981). Psychological profiling. *Law and Order*, 56, 46–49.
15. Government of Canada. (2006). *Cost of crime in Canada*. Retrieved April 21, 2009, from <http://www.victimweek.gc.ca/archive2006/fact-sheets/p2.html>
16. Heurich, C. (2008). Cold cases: Resources for agencies, resolution for families. *NIJ Journal*, 260, 20–23.
17. Hindelang, M. (1976). *Criminal victimization in eight American cities: An analysis of common theft and assault*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
18. Hume, B., McKenna, M., & McKeown, L. (2007). *Injuries to Massachusetts residents 2004*. Boston: Department of Public Health.

19. Mendelsohn, B. (1976). Pioneers in victimology. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 1(2), 189–228.
20. National Association of Crime Victim Compensation Boards. (2002). Compensation at record highs. *Victim Compensation Quarterly*, 3.
21. National Institute of Justice. (1996). *Victim costs and consequences: A new look*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
22. Office on National Drug Control Policy. (2001, September). *The economic costs of drug abuse in the United States, 1992–1998*. Washington, DC: Executive Office of the President.
23. Perkins, C., & Klaus, P. (1996, April). Criminal victimization 1994. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin* (NCJ-158022). Washington, DC: US Department of Justice
24. Rand, M. R., Lynch, J. P., & Cantor, D. (1997, April). Criminal victimization 1973–95. *Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Crime Victimization Survey* (NCJ-163069). Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
25. Reiss, A. J., & Roth, J. A. (Eds.). (1993). *Understanding and preventing violence*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
26. Rossi, D. (1982). Crime scene behavioral analysis: Another tool for the law enforcement investigator. *Police Chief*, 57, 152–155.
27. Schneider, A. L., Griffith, W. R., Sumi, D. H., & Burcart, J. M. (1978). *Portland forward records check of crime victims*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.
28. Skogan, W. G. (1981). *Issues in the measurement of victimization*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
29. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2003). *Cost of prescription opioid*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
30. Sutherland, E. H. (1947). *Principles of criminology* (4th ed.). Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.
31. Turvey, B., & Petherick, W. (2008). *Forensic victimology*. San Diego, CA: Elsevier Science.
32. Vorpapel, R. E. (1982). Painting psychological profiles: Charlatanism, charisma, or a new science? *Police Chief*, 49, 156–159.
33. Wallace, H. (2007). *Victimology: Legal, psychological and social perspectives*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
34. Wigoder, G. G. (Ed.). (2002). *The new encyclopedia of Judaism*. New York: New York University Press.
35. Wisner, C., Gilmer, T., Saltman, L., & Zink, T. (1999). Intimate partner violence against women: Do victims cost health plans more? *Journal of Family Practice*, 48 (6439–6443).

36. Wolfgang, M. (1958). *Criminal homicide*. New York: Harper & Row.
37. Zawitz, M. W., Klaus, P. A., Bachman, R., Bastian, L. D., DeBerry, Jr., M. M., Rand, M. R., et al. (1993, October). *Highlights from 20 years of surveying crime victims: The national crime victimization survey, 1973–92*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.