THE RISKS OF NONFATAL VIOLENT VICTIMIZATIONS ACROSS INDIVIDUAL-AND

STRUCTURAL-LEVEL CHARACTERISTICS

A THESIS IN
Criminal Justice and Criminology

Presented to the Faculty of the University
of Missouri – Kansas City in partial fulfillment of
the requirement for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By
NIKEISHA JEWANA FORTENBERRY

B.A, University of Missouri in Kansas City, 2009

Kansas City, Missouri 2011

THE RISKS OF NONFATAL VIOLENT VICTIMIZATIONS ACROSS INDIVIDUAL-AND

STRUCTURAL-LEVEL CHARACTERISTICS

Nikeisha Jewana Fortenberry, Candidate for the Master of Science Degree

University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2011

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of individual characteristics and structural conditions on non-fatal violent victimization risks. Using the criminological theories known Routine Activities/The Lifestyle Model and Social Disorganization Theory, each provided explanations how and why crime and victimization are linked to individual and environmental factors; however, it is unclear whether each set of characteristics are a better rationalization for crime and thus victimization. Using data derived from the NCVS 12 Cities survey, the study will analyze whether individual characteristics or structural characteristics are better predictors of victimization risks.

APPROVAL PAGE

The faculty listed below, appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences have

examined a thesis titled "The Risks of Nonfatal Violent Victimizations Across Individual-and

Structural-Level Characteristics" presented by Nikeisha Jewana Fortenberry, candidate for the

Master of Science degree, and certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Supervisory Committee

Toya Like, Ph.D., Committee Chair
Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology

Jessica Hodge, Ph.D.
Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology

Kristi Holsinger, Ph.D.
Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology

CONTENTS

TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I first would like to thank God for his grace and mercy on my life. I thank him for always being there for me when it did not appear there was a light at the end of the tunnel. I thank him for the many blessings he has bestowed upon my life and the opportunities that I have been presented with. He is my father, he is my friend, he is everything and with him, all things are possible. I am truly blessed.

I would second like to thank Dr. Like for believing in me every step of the way and never giving up on me. I thank her for her guidance with this project because there were many sleepless nights, but her encouraging words always guided me through. Her mentorship has caused me to be a better person, professional student, and woman. Thank you, Dr. Like for everything and I love you.

To Dr, Lucas, Dr. Novak, Dr. Hodge, Dr. Holsinger and Dr. Holsinger, thank you for your assistance throughout my graduate career. I am truly honored to have such wonderful professors who were filled with brilliant knowledge. Thank you.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family. No matter what, they were always there for me and encouraged me to do the best that I could do. You all are the joy of my life and I love you with all of my heart.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this project to people who work within the criminal justice system. It is important that we learn to understand how and why crime occurs and why people are victimized. Our role is to figure out ways to combat this issue to have a safer environment.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Theory and research on violent victimization has been conducted at both the micro- and-macro level. According to Garofalo (1987), early victimization theorists (i.e., Hindelang, Gottfredson and Garofalo, 1978) indicated that lifestyle patterns (i.e., vocational and leisure activities) determined the likelihood of personal victimization through the intervening variables of associations and exposure. These lifestyle patterns, according to Hindelang et al. (1978), are determined by individual and group adaptations to structural conditions and role expectations based on age, race and ethnicity, and gender. Lifestyles are patterned, regular, recurrent and prevalent activities that individuals engage in whether they are obligatory (greater degree of constraint than choice) or discretionary (greater chance of choice than constraint) (Robinson, 1997; Hindelang, et al. 1978; LeBeau & Corcoran, 1990, 1974). Furthermore, Hindelang et al. (1978) point out that "lifestyle patterns influence the amount of exposure to places and times with varying risks of victimization and the prevalence of associations with others who are more or less likely to commit crimes" (p.26). Thus, victimization is not randomly distributed across space and time, but there are high-risk areas and high-risk time periods that increase the likelihood of victimization occurring and links victimization risks to the daily activities of specific individuals (Goldstein, 1994, p. 54; Kennedy and Forde, 1990, p. 208).

Although Hindelang et al.'s (1978) Lifestyle Model focuses on life's patterns as a predictor of victimization risk, other theorists use a similar approach— known as Routine Activities Theory—to explain crime (and thus victimization) rates (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Cohen and Felson (1978) argue that macro-level shifts in individuals' routines activities have impacted crime rates and thus the likelihood that victimization will occur. They posit that crime

results from the convergence in time and space between motivated offenders and suitable targets in the absence of capable guardians. What differentiate Routine Activities Theory from the Lifestyle Model approach are their macro-level assumptions. Cohen and Felson (1979) argue that this convergence in time and space between motivated offenders and suitable targets, in the absence of capable guardians have impacted crime and victimization rates because of the changing nature of daily routine activities for the nation. Conversely, Hindelang et al. (1978) focused on related differences in the lifestyles of populations to understand variance in victimization risks, and focused their attention heavily on personal crimes that involved direct contact between the victim and the offender (p.27).

Garofalo (1987) pointed out the similarities between the Lifestyle Model and Routine Activities approaches. One similarity is that both theories are not concerned with explaining the motivation of offenders. Garofalo (1978) stated that "criminal inclination is taken as a given, and attention is shifted to the contexts that allow the inclinations to be translated into action" (p.27). Furthermore, Garofalo also acknowledged that both theories heavily "focus on patterned behavior among population aggregates rather than with variability in individual characteristics." Although Garofalo (1987) acknowledges that the Lifestyle Model and Routine Activities approach do not focus heavily on variability in individual characteristics, they do suggest individual characteristics are predictors of lifestyle patterns or routine activities which, in turn, can increase victimization risks.

Moreover, both the Lifestyle Model and Routine Activities Theory note the importance of structural conditions, particularly those conditions under which people live that can shape their lifestyle patterns and routine activities. However, other theorists have focused more explicitly on these conditions to further explain crime and victimization risks. Theories such as

Social Disorganization Theory have placed these conditions at the forefront of their explanation of crime (and victimization) rates. Social Disorganization Theory postulates those conditions such as persistent poverty, residential instability, and ethnic heterogeneity causes social disorganization within urban environments and this, in turn, explains higher crime rates in these areas (Shaw & McKay, 1942). Based on Social Disorganization Theory, numerous researchers have consistently linked various forms of structural disadvantage to high crime, and importantly, victimization rates in urban communities (Rankin & Quane, 2000; Jargowsky, 1997; Wilson, 1987; Jargowsky & Bane, 1991; Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997; Sampson, 1988; Sampson, & Morenoff, 1997; Sampson & Wilson, 1995). Because Social Disorganization Theory focuses on the inability of urban communities to achieve shared values due to structural conditions, these environments are more likely to experience higher rates of crime and victimization.

Both the Lifestyle Model/Routine Activities Theory and Social Disorganization Theory contribute to our understanding of victimization risks. For example, the Lifestyle Model/Routine Activities Theory highlights those individual characteristics such as age, race and ethnicity, marital status, income and gender that may affect lifestyles and routine activities and therefore predict victimization risks. Social Disorganization Theory highlights those structural conditions such as poverty, unemployed, residential instability, and family disruption that may be related to victimization risks.

Despite the many contributions of the aforementioned works, much of it has focused on differences across individuals or neighborhoods. Fewer studies have considered both and more importantly, these works have ignored variations across cities. City context may be just as important as neighborhood context since those macro processes at the city-level are arguably

3

determinants of neighborhood location. Moreover, victimization reports show that rates vary across cities; however, limited research explains why crime occurs more in some cities than in others. The purpose of this research is to examine the impact of individual characteristics and structural conditions on non-fatal violent victimization risks. As aforementioned, each of these areas of criminological theory provided explanations as to how and why crime and victimization are linked to individual and environmental factors. However, it remains unclear whether one set of factors are better predictors relative to the other set of factors. Simply put, this research will examine whether demographic characteristics or the structural conditions of the cities in which people live account for victimization risks.

The focus in the present study discusses nonfatal victimization rather than fatal victimizations because fatal victimizations are far less common than nonfatal victimizations. Although homicides are portrayed via the media as the leading cause of death, homicide accounts for less than 0.5% of all violent crime, and about 1% of all serious violence (Blumstein & Rosenfeld, 1999; Fox & Zawitz, 2000). Homicides rates have been overrepresented due to media's sensationalization of violent crime which in turn causes citizens' fear. Therefore, this study focuses on nonfatal victimization due to its frequency in occurrence and its greater likelihood compared to homicide. Another rationale for the purpose of the study has to do with the fact that nonfatal violent victimizations are far less likely to be reported to agencies and jurisdictions, and as such, most non-fatal violent victimizations are underreported relative to homicides.

Thus, it is the intent of this research to analyze the extent of variation in non-fatal violent victimization risk using a sample of individuals drawn from twelve U.S. cities to explore whether such violent victimization risks are better explained by arguments inherent to the Lifestyle

Model/Routine Activities Theory or Social Disorganization Theory. Both theories offer explanations for the occurrence of victimization, yet one area proposes that individual characteristics explain victimization risks while the other argues that structural conditions may matter more. This research will consider both with the goal of understanding whether individual or city conditions are better predictors of victimization risk. By this being the ultimate goal in the present study, it will fill in the gap for existing literature that focuses mainly on crime and nonfatal violent victimization risks at the individual-and-neighborhood level rather than focusing on these issues at the city level. By understanding how the structure of the city matters, policy makers can better prevent the occurrence of crime and victimization among city residents.

The preceding chapters will be organized as the following: Chapter Two provides a review of the literature pertaining to the Lifestyle Model/Routine Activities Theory and Social Disorganization Theory. This information is important to address because both theories posit the causal process of victimization by identifying the factors central to its occurrence. Chapter Three will discuss the data and methods, and the results from this section are presented in Chapter Four. Chapter Five provides discussion of the findings, limitations of the study, suggestions for future research, and policy implications.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Earlier theorists like Garofalo (1987) and Cohen and Felson (1979) indicate that the composition of cities or demographic characteristics of residents may explain nonfatal violent victimization risks. Both The Lifestyle Model and Routine Activities Theory affirm that individual characteristics influence lifestyle patterns and daily routine activities. This chapter provides the background of individual characteristics. Each of the key variables such as age, race and ethnicity, gender, and marital status, will be highlighted.

Compositional Conditions

Age

Age is a major correlate of violent victimization. Since the 1970s, victimization reports have consistently shown that teenagers and young adults are more likely to experience violence compared to persons who are older. Data from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) reveal that persons between the ages of 12 and 19 are twice as likely as persons over the age of 20 to become a victim of a violent crime (Lauritsen et al., 1991; Finkelhor & Asdigian, 1996; Wilsem, 2003). Specifically, in 2009, persons between the ages of 12 and 15 experienced the most violent victimization. For instance, 12 to 15 year olds experienced a total rate of 36.8 per 1000 persons. Following this rate was persons between the ages of 16 and 19 who experienced violence at a total rate of 30.3 per 1000 persons. Those 65 or older were least likely to be victimized, with a rate of 3.2 per 1000 persons (Truman & Rand, 2010).

The NCVS includes four types of violent victimization: simple assault, aggravated assault, robbery and rape/sexual assault. Simple assaults are the most common form of violent

victimization and 12 to 15 year olds reported the highest rate (25.9 per 1000). Persons aged 16 to19 experienced the second highest rate (19.3 per 1000). The age groups 20 to 24 (16.3 per 1000), and 25 to 34 (13.4 per 1000), and 35 to 49 (11.1 per 1000) experienced almost similar rates of simple assault. The age group that experienced the least amount of this form of violence is persons aged 65 and older (2.2 per 1000) (Truman and Rand, 2010).

Aggravated assault is another common form of violent victimization. In 2009, those age 12 to 15 were not the highest group in this category. Instead, persons age 20 to 24 experienced the highest rate (7.5 per 1000) and were followed by persons age 12 to 15 that had a rate of 6.9 per 1000. Those ages 16 to 19 and 25 to 34 experienced similar rates per 1000 (5.3 and 4.5, respectively). Again, like with simple assaults, persons aged 65 or older were the least likely to be victims of aggravated assault (0.3 per 1000).

Furthermore, robbery victimizations varied by age category and persons age 16 to19 experienced the highest level of this type of violent victimization (5.2 per 1000).). Individuals who were 12 to 15 year old and 20 to 24 year old experienced similar rates (3.1 and 3.5, respectively). The lowest rate of robbery victimization was for persons 65 and older; they experienced a rate of .04 per 1000.

Rape and sexual assault are the least common form of violent victimizations. The NCVS report indicates that rape and sexual assault incidences are at times based on 10 or fewer incidents, making it difficult to calculate adequate rates of such for these types of crimes. For example, the categories for rape/sexual assault for 12 to 15 year olds were 0.9 per 1000; for 16 to 19, 0.6 per 1000; for 20 to 24 and 25 to 34, 0.8 per 1000; and for 65 or older, 0.2 per 1000 (Truman, & Rand, 2010).

Patterns for violent victimization have remained consistent throughout the years. For example, from 1976 to 2000, persons age 12 to 17 and 18 to 24 have reported higher victimization rates compared to other age groups. Specifically, from 1979 to 1982, the violent victimization rate for those ages 18 to 24 increased to more than 100 per 1000 persons. The increase was even higher for 12 to 17 year olds and by 1991 their rate had increased to 123 per 1000. Conversely, the rates were notably lower for those 65 and older. Specifically, their victimization rate was 3 per 1000 in 2000. Although rates for violent victimization have declined dramatically since the early 1990s, younger persons are still more likely to be victims of violence than any other age group (Klaus & Rennsion, 2002; Klaus, 2005).

Race and Ethnicity

As shown in the NCVS, another correlate of violent victimization is race and ethnicity. The NCVS reports generally recognize categories of race which include White, Black, Asian, American Indians, and two categories of ethnicity which include Hispanic and Non-Hispanic. Reports commonly indicate that minorities, specifically Blacks, American Indians, and Hispanics, have higher rates of violent victimization than do Whites and Asians. Data from the 2009 NCVS report show that Blacks experience rates of violence at 26.6 per 1000, American Indians and Asians had a combined rate of 9.8 per 1000, and Hispanics experience rates of violence at18.1 per 1000. These numbers are compared to Whites who had a rate of 15.8 per 1000. In this particular report, American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asian, Native Hawaiians, and other Pacific Islanders are grouped together into one category because the populations for these groups are low. However, a special NCVS report on American Indians showed that this group was more likely to report being violently victimized than are other groups (Rennison, 2001).

According to Rennison (2001), American Indians experienced dramatically higher levels of violent victimization (147.4 per 1000) compared to Blacks and Whites (68.0 per 1000 and 59.1 per 1000, respectively). Similar to findings from traditional NCVS reports, Asians were the least likely to report being violently victimized (27.1 per 1000) (Rennison, 2001).

In addition to these overall differences in violent victimization across racial groups are differences across specific crime types. Traditional NCVS reports commonly show that rates for simple and aggravated assault, robbery and rape/sexual assault are higher for Blacks. In 2009, Blacks experienced a rate of simple assault at 13.0 per 1000 compared to Whites who experienced 11.0 per 1000. For the categories of "two or more races", they experienced a rate of 27.5 per 1000. For "other race" which consists includes American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asians, Native Hawaiians, and other Pacific Islanders, they experienced a rate of 7.4 per 1000 For aggravated assault, Blacks had a rate of 6.8 per 1000 compared to Whites who had a rate of 2.7 per 1000. For the categories of "two or more races", they had a rate of 9.3 per 1000. For "other race", they experienced a rate of 1.9 per 1000. For robbery, Blacks experienced the highest rate of 5.6 per 1000 compared to Whites who experienced a rate of 1.6 per 1000. "Two or more races" experienced a rate of 5.2 per 1000. For "other race", they experienced a rate of 0.5 per 1000. Rape/sexual assault were the lowest category for all racial groups. Blacks experienced 1.2 per 1000 compared to Whites who had a rate of 0.4 per 1000. The "two or more races" category experienced the least amount of rape/sexual assaults because they had a rate less than 0.05 violent victimizations per 1000 persons. For "other race", they experienced a rate less than0.05 per 1000 (Truman & Rand, 2010).

In regards to ethnicity, surveys have indicated that Hispanic persons report higher rates of violent victimization overall than do non-Hispanic persons. Particularly, 2009 NCVS reports

show that Hispanics experienced an overall rate of 18.1 per 1000 for violent victimization compared to non-Hispanic persons who experienced an overall rate of 17.0 per 1000. While these rates reveal that Hispanics persons experienced slightly higher rates overall, that typically does not apply to all categories of violent victimization. For example, for simple assault non-Hispanics experienced a rate of 11.3 per 1000 relative to Hispanic persons who experienced a rate of 11.0 per 1000. Furthermore, for aggravated assault non-Hispanic persons experienced a rate of 3.3 per 1000 compared to Hispanics whose rate was slightly lower at 3.2 per 1000. Conversely, robbery was the only category in which Hispanics rates exceeded that of non-Hispanics (3.4 versus 1.9 per 1000, respectively). For the categories of rape/sexual assault, both Hispanic and Non-Hispanics persons shared a rate of 0.5 per 1000 (Truman & Rand, 2010).

Overall, differences in violent victimization for these racial and ethnic groups have remained consistent throughout the years. Victimization surveys have shown that although rates dramatically decreased from 1993 to 2005, Blacks and American Indians still experienced higher rates of violent victimization compared to Whites and to Asians. For example, in 1993, Blacks experienced a rate of violent victimization at 67.4 per 1000 compared to Whites that had a rate of 47.9 per 1000 and "other race" that had a race of 39.8 per 1000. Additionally, in 1999, Blacks experienced a rate of 41.6 per 1000 compared to Whites who had a rate of 31.9 per 1000 and "other race" that had a rate 24.5 per 1000. To continue, in 2005, Blacks experienced a rate of 27.0 per 1000 compared to Whites that had a rate of 20.1 per 1000 and "other race" that had a rate of 13.9 per 1000 (Catalano, 2006).

These patterns over the years have remained consistent. Specifically, an NCVS report from 1993 to 1998, reported that in 1993, Non-Hispanic American Indians experienced higher levels of violent victimization (104.7 per 1000). Following that rate was Non-Hispanic Blacks

(69.5 per 1000). Hispanics (62.8 per 1000) and Non-Hispanic Whites (52.5 per 1000) had

somewhat similar rates in 1993, and Non-Hispanic Asians had the lowest rate of violent

victimization with a rate of 28.8 per 1000. While the rates for Hispanics and Non-Hispanics

decreased in 1998, they remained consistent with which groups were violently victimized the

highest and which groups were violently victimized at the lowest. For example, in 1998, Non-

Hispanic American Indians experienced the highest violent victimization rate of 116.1 per 1000.

Following were Non-Hispanic Blacks who had a rate of 43.1 per 1000. Non-Hispanic Whites

(38.2 per 1000) and Hispanics (34.8 per 1000) had similar rates in 1998, and Non-Hispanic

Asians had the lowest rate of violent victimization at 22.1 per 1000 (Rennison, 2001).

Gender

      Gender is also a major correlate of violent victimization. According to the 2009 NCVS,

males are far more likely to be violently victimized than are females, except for the crime of rape

and sexual assault. For example, in 2009 males' overall rate of violent victimization was 18.4 per

1000 persons compared to females who had a rate of 15.8 per 1000. As aforementioned, the

patterns of differences between these groups depend on the crime type being considered.

Surprisingly, males and females had similar rates for simple assault in 2009. Males had a rate of

11.3 per 1000 and females had a rate of 11.2 per 1000. The differences between them are larger

for aggravated assault; males had rate of 4.3 per 1000 compared to 2.3 per 1000 for females. For

robbery, males were also more likely to be victims of with a rate of 2.7 per 1000 compared to

females who had a rate of 1.6 per 1000. While males generally are more likely victims of violent

crimes, they are not likely to be victims of rape or sexual assault. Males experienced a rate of 0.2

per 1000 compared to females who had a rate of 0.8. While both numbers are substantively low,

females are more likely to be victims of sexual assault and or rape than are males (Truman, & Rand, 2010). Nonetheless, there has been convergence between male and female rates over time. The gap between groups has narrowed substantially. For example, a NCVS selected findings report revealed that in 1973, males were far more likely to be victims of violent crimes (63 per 1000) compared to females (37 per 1000). However, the overall trend for males indicate that rates steadily decreased for males, while women remained relatively stable or slightly increased (for full report, see Craven, 1996).

Marital Status

Marital Status has also been linked to violent victimization. The risks for victimization tend to vary across the following categories: Never married, married, widowed, and divorced/separated. According to 2005 NCVS statistics, persons who have never been married are more likely to experience violent victimization, while persons who are widowed are the least likely to experience violent victimization. Particularly, persons who were never married experienced an annual violent victimization rate of 42.4 per 1000 between 2002 and 2003, and in 2004 and 2005 they experienced being violently victimization at an annual rate of 38.4 per 1000. Divorced/separated individuals had the second highest rate. Specifically, in 2002 and 2003, divorced or separated persons experienced a rate of violent victimization at 33.0 per 1000, and from 2004 to 2005 they experienced a rate of 32.3 per 1000. These rates are notably higher than the respective rates for married persons, 10.4 between 2002 and 2003 and 10.0 between 2004 and 2005. For persons who are widowed, they experienced the least amount of violent victimization during these periods. For example, between 2002 and 2003, widowed persons experienced a rate of 5.3 per 1000 and between 2004 and 2005 their rate was 5.0 per 1000. The last category is

divorced/separated who had the second highest rate for violent victimization. While rates for violent victimization have declined for each of these groups, the statistics reveal persons who were never married experience higher violent victimization rates than any other group (Catalano, 2005).

This pattern remained consistent throughout the years. For example, NCVS reports from 1993 to 1998 consistently show that persons who were never married for all racial groups, experienced higher rates of being violently victimized compared to those other groups. On the other hand, persons who are widowed were least likely to experience being victimized (Rennison, 2001).

Income

Income is another characteristic that has also been linked to violent victimization. It is commonly measured as the annual household income in the NCVS reports and is typically presented across seven categories: less than $7,500, $7,500-$14,999, $15,000-24,999, $25,000-$34,999, $35,000-$49,999, $50,000-$74,999, and $75,000.   For 2005, the NCVS reported the highest rate of violent victimization for persons who were living below $7,500. For example, in 2004 to 2005 persons receiving less than $7,500 had a rate of 38.1 per 1000. This was higher than the remaining categories. For example, persons in the category of $7,500-$14,999 had a rate of 32.9 per 1000. For persons in the category of $15,000-$24,999, they had a rate of 27.1 per 1000. Individuals earning $25,000-34,999 (24.1 per 1000), $35,000-49,999 (22.0 per 1000), and $50,000-$74,999 (21.6 per 1000) had similar rates of violent victimization. The lowest income category to experience violent victimization was $75,000 or more with a rate of 16.7 per 1000 (Catalano, 2006).

This pattern remains across crime type. For simple assault, persons living below the poverty level (less than $7,500) experienced a rate of 20.1 per 1000 compared to the highest annual income group ($75,000 or more) who had the lowest rate of 11.1 per 1000. This was also the case for aggravated assault. They experienced a rate of 9.7 per 1000 relative to the rate found for persons who had an annual income of $75,000 or more (2.6 per 1000). For robbery, persons living below poverty level experienced a rate of 5.6 per 1000 compared to the rate of 2.1 for persons having a household income of $75,000 or more. Lastly, for rape/sexual assault persons living below poverty level had a rate of 2.2 per 1000 compared to persons having a household income of $75,000 or more with a rate of 0.6 per 1000 (Catalano, 2006).

These patterns and trends were consistent throughout the years. For example, victimization surveys from 1993 to 1998 show persons who receive a household income of less than $7,500 per year had the highest level of victimization rates compared to the remaining categories. The lowest rate was found for persons who receive a household income of $75,000 or more. These findings were consistent regardless of race and ethnicity (Rennison, 2001).

Overall, these statistics for age, race and ethnicity, gender, and marital status reveal the patterns and trends for nonfatal violent victimization risks. This information is important to the study because demographic characteristics or the composition of cities are possible predictors of nonfatal victimization risks.

Theoretical discussion of Lifestyle Model and Routine Activities Theory

Overall, victimization reports have routinely associated the aforementioned characteristics with victimization risks. Routine Activities/Lifestyle Theory suggests that these characteristics are indicative of activity or lifestyle patterns that predict victimization. Surveys

pertaining to victimization commonly demonstrate that the most powerful predictors generally are age, race/ethnicity, gender, income, and marital status (Cohen et al., 1981, Gottfredson, 1984, 1986; Laub, 1990). These characteristics, though, are important only insofar as they predict lifestyles and routine activities that are directly related to victimization risks. Researchers have linked specific routine and lifestyle activities to violent victimization risks. Those activities that have commonly been associated with victimization are evenings spent away from home, activities one engages in when away from home and associations with criminal others. These lifestyle patterns or routine activities can increase the likelihood of victimization.

Earlier theorists like Cohen and Felson (1979) posited that activities away from home are positively related to victimization. For example, Cohen and Felson (1979) hypothesized that these activities increase the likelihood of criminal opportunities and thus explain higher crime rates. This is also similar to findings from contemporary research. Specifically, Mustaine and Tewksbury (1999) using a sample of 1,513 college/university students (57.7 % males and 42.3% females) found that evenings away from home, and drinking in particular, is a predictor of violent victimization among college men and women. Moreover, Miethe, Stafford and Long (1987) conducted a study with a sample of 107,678 residents in thirteen U.S. cities to examine with the nature and quantity of routine activities out the home are indicators of victimization. They focused on individuals' patterns of major activities during the day (e.g., work) and night (e.g., night activity) and found that these routine activities/lifestyle variables have relatively strong direct and meditational effects on individuals' risks of property victimization, but not violent victimization. Overall, these articles suggest that time spent away from home may predict victimization risks and importantly, specific activities such as evenings out drinking can increase one's chance of being victimized.

15

Aside from evenings spent away from home being a major indicator for victimization, there are more contemporary works that have attempted to detail those specific activities that explain victimization risk. These other activities, like criminal association, have been directly linked to victimization. Beginning with criminal association, research has commonly shown that those who are involved in criminal activity (and thus associated more with criminal others) are at a heighten risks for victimization. In their study, Lauritsen, Sampson, and Laub (1991) examined the effect of delinquent lifestyles on the criminal victimization of teenagers and young adults. Using the first five waves of the National Youth Survey, the analyses revealed that adolescents' involvement in delinquent lifestyles strongly increases the risk of both personal and property victimization. The results indicated that victimization patterns among youth cannot be understood apart from criminal and deviant behavior because the risk of victimization results from greater involvement in lifestyle characteristics of those associated with others that are delinquent.

Furthermore, Schreck, Wright, and Miller (2002), in their study of 1,139 high school students, found that delinquent peer associations and spending time in unstructured/unsupervised socializing activities with peers was an antecedent of violent victimization. Importantly, these peer associations were significant predictors after individual traits such as low self-control and environmental factors such as weak ties to family and school were considered (Schrek, Wright, & Miller, 2002). Likewise, Schreck and Fisher (2004) examined the influence of peers on violent victimization. In their research, they used the routine activities and lifestyle framework to reveal how strong bonds of family attachment can promote more effective guardianship while simultaneously making children less attractive as targets and limiting their exposure to motivated offenders. They used data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health and found

16

that criminal association with family and peers do correspond with higher risk of violent victimization among teenagers, net controls for unstructured and unsupervised activities and demographic characteristics. Comparatively, Woodward and Fergusson (2000) conducted a longitudinal study of more than 1,000 New Zealand children in their assessment of risks for victimization risks. Specifically, they examined the whether the contextual, lifestyle, and childhood risk factors are associated with young people's exposure to physical assault in late adolescence. They found that criminal associations significantly increased the likelihood of assault victimization. For example, males in the study were more likely to report delinquent involvement in early adolescence and 23% of this group reported being victims of assault during late adolescence (16 to 18 years of age). However, females were less likely to be victims during adolescence of assault because they were less likely to have criminal associations (Woodward & Fergusson, 2000).

Lastly, contemporary research has linked multiple aspects of routine activities/lifestyle patterns to victimization risks. For example, Mustaine (1997) examined female and male victimization risks across three domains: home, work, and leisure/public. She posited that people's status and lifestyle characteristics as evidenced by these domains can differentially influence their risks of victimization by altering their amount of exposure to potential offenders. Her study highlighted the importance of considering gender- and domain-specific activities in victimization analyses. Among a sample of 25,238 individuals (13,422 were women and 11,816 were men) her results indicate that the most influential lifestyle characteristics and behaviors on the use of self-protective measures (and thus victimization risks) are exposure to potential offenders and neighborhood characteristics. For example, risk for female victimization in the home was determined by marital status, unemployment status, home security, and place of

residence, while in the work domain, female victimization risk was determined educational status only. On the other hand, male victimization risk increased in the workplace, out in public, or living at home. Moreover, Lauritsen, Laub, and Sampson (1992) conducted a study guided by the routine activities theories/lifestyle approach to describe the relationship between time spent with peers, sports activities, and delinquent involvement regarding the risk of assault and robbery victimization among adolescents in the United States. They gathered their information from two well known data sources: The National Youth Survey (NYS) and the Monitoring the Future Study: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth (MTF). Not surprisingly, given the aforementioned studies, their findings revealed that youth who engage in delinquent activities (i.e., assault and robbery) have the highest level of victimization. However, Lauritsen et al. (1992) found that very few conventional activities (e.g., how often adolescents go to parties, bars, movies, watch television, read, etc.) protect adolescents from victimization net of background factors such as gender, race and structure. Additional researchers, like Mustaine and Tewksbury (1998) note other activities that could potentially lead to violent victimization. Their study highlighted a wide range of individual demographics (e.g., sex, race, age, marital status, etc), daily routines (e.g., eats out frequently, leaves home often for studying, goes out walking, drinks at a bar, goes to the shopping mall, etc) and social community structural and contextual variables. Using a 95-item self-administered survey for a total of 1,513 college and university students in nine postsecondary institutions, theirs findings indicated that it is not leaving one's home and going out in public that increases risk for victimization, but where individual goes and does that is important to their victimization risk. For instance, specific activities like frequently eating out, drinking at a bar, or going shopping can increase risk for violent victimization.

18

Overall, these studies indicated that individual characteristics matter in that they are associated with the routine activities and lifestyle patterns of individuals. Based on the above studies activities such evenings spent away, involvement in criminal activities and associations with criminal others, and particular activities such as eating out frequently, drinking at a bar, or attending a shopping mall can increase the risk for violent victimization among individuals.

Structural Conditions

The relationship between structural conditions and crime has also been an issue widely analyzed by criminologists. Shaw and McKay's (1942) Social Disorganization Theory states that structural conditions such as persistent poverty, residential instability, and ethnic heterogeneity causes social disorganization within urban environments. As a result of this disorder, crime rates in these areas are typically higher. Clearly, these characteristics matter in regards to violent victimization because high levels of poverty and limited resources can make crime a viable alternative if legitimate opportunities for survival and success are blocked. Overall, it is clear that structural conditions such poverty , unemployment, family disruption and residential instability can play a role in how and why victimization risk are increased in certain urban environments.

Poverty & Unemployment

Poverty and unemployment have long been linked to offending and victimization in criminology (Wilson, 1987; Crutchfield, 1989; Massey & Eggers, 1990; Massey & Denton, 1993; Wilson, 1996; Jargowsky, 1997; Anderson, 1999). Since the 1970s, poverty has become more concentrated in urban environments and, in turn, has been associated with higher levels of victimization rates. Many researchers argue that urban areas experience higher levels of poverty

due to changes in the inner city that produced a new distinct, and growing phenomenon of "the underclass" (Kasarda, 1989; Wacquant & Wilson, 1989, Wilson, 1987; Massey & Denton, 1993; Marks, 1991; Lawson, 1992, Mincy, 1994; Jargowsky & Bane, 1990). In other words, the inner cities have been deprived from job opportunities and other resources that would establish financial stability in these particular urban areas. As a result to the departure of jobs from the city, social limitations, and scare resources, poverty levels have become more concentrated within the urban core.

Higher levels of poverty have resulted in higher unemployment rates within urban areas. These environments tend to experience higher rates of violent victimization because people are deprived of opportunities and the amount of resources is extremely limited. The institutional structure of urban environments greatly depends to a large extent on economic support, but sadly, this support is lacking in urban areas. Jargowsky (1997) acknowledges that in impoverish neighborhoods, less than half of the population is unemployed. Additionally, he notes that many people are unemployed in urban neighborhoods because there are no quality jobs with good pay, that are stable, with good working conditions, and on-the-job training available which is necessary to improve the conditions of the working poor. He also explains that urban areas have a much higher concentration of poor and otherwise disadvantaged residents. He states that the economic support for persons residing in penurious conditions is limited. This lack of resources, as explained by Rankin and Quane (2000), inadvertently disconnects persons who are living in poor neighborhoods from opportunities and interactions with socially connected persons who will provide feasible resources. Coincidently, Jargowsky and Bane (1991) asserted similar arguments in their discussion on poverty in the United States. They posited that persons living under the poverty level are becoming more and more isolated from mainstream society and

20

opportunity and their upward mobility is partial. Additionally, they explained this is partly because the rate of labor force participation among the poor has declined (p.236).

Patterson (1991) and others note that people living below the poverty level are deprived of opportunities, comforts, and self-respect—thus increasing the areal variation in criminal activity and victimization risks (p. 756-78). Furthermore, Rankin and Quane (2000) also discuss how concentrated poverty disrupts the social organization of urban neighborhoods—therefore causing more affluent neighborhoods to have better institutional resources than those neighborhoods that are poverty-stricken. Because there is a high level of poverty in these urban environments, there is a higher chance that victimization risks are prevalent. Correspondingly, Jargowsky (1997) also assert that because social environments of high-poverty areas may have an ongoing influence on the life course of those who reside in them, conditions of persons living below poverty level can cause profoundly harmful environments. As a result of weakened economic structure of urban neighborhoods, people in low-impoverished areas are at greater risks for violent offending and victimization (Jargowsky, 1997).

Aside from urban environments experiencing high levels of poverty, unemployment rates are also a major concern for impoverished persons. Jargowsky (1999) postulated that men who live in low-impoverished areas are nearly twice as likely as women to be out of the labor force and do not proceed to search for work. On the other hand, nearly about one-third of adult women are employed. The disparity of unemployment rates for males and females in urban areas are astonishing and contribute too many of the problems these communities are burdened with. Moreover, Jargowsky (2007) explains that even if jobs were available to people living in urban areas, they are part-time, with low-paying wages. He noted that in 1989, approximately 40 percent of males residing in low-impoverished neighborhoods worked part-time or did not work

at all. In contrast, 15 percent of women living in low-impoverished neighborhoods worked part-time jobs. Unfortunately, these low-paying jobs were not enough to lift families above the poverty line which was $12, 674 (p. 95-98).

Female Headed Households

Today, many people are living in female headed households like never before. Peterson (1992) noted that in 1960, 25 percent of the poor were living in female-headed families, but by 1980, this figure raised to 35 percent, and by 1987, 40 percent of families were living in one-parent households (p. 6) By the 1990s, six in ten children lived in female-headed households (Jargowsky, 1997).

Female-headed households have higher rates of poverty regardless of the neighborhood type. Urban (and particularly poor) neighborhoods tend to have higher concentrations of female-headed households given the limited economic resources available to one-parent households. Unfortunately, urban neighborhoods are not rooted in opportunities which will allow families to have access to available resources. Because of this barrier, many families headed by females become strained and are located in disadvantaged environments, placing women and their children at a greater risks for violent victimization (Lauritsen, 2003). Smith and Jarjoura (1989), in their study of the relationship between household characteristics, neighborhood composition and victimization risks, found that households occupied by single adults (e.g., female-headed households) have higher rates of victimization. These households, explained by the researchers, are disproportionately located in more transient, less affluent areas that have higher crime rates. Again, neighborhoods with higher concentration of female headed households have limited resources available when there is only one parent supporting the family. Both the limited

22

resources and geographic location of these households affect violent victimization. Overall, the research presented above has shown those persons living in female-headed households in poverty-stricken neighborhoods have a higher risk of violent victimization.

Residential Instability

Residential stability is a major feature of social organization within the urban core. Persistent high levels of poverty, unemployment and family disruption in urban environments work in conjunction with and can cause residential instability in these areas as well (Shaw & McKay, 1942; Bursik & Grasmick, 1993; Elliott et al., 1996; Sampson, 1997; Sampson, 1988; Taylor, 1997). According to Social Disorganization theory, residential instability in urban neighborhoods can cause crime and thus victimization. This is because residential instability impedes social cohesion among residents—thus creating disorganization among community residents which, in turn, increases crime rates in the neighborhood. Therefore, urban environments are plagued by negative social conditions such as poverty, unemployment, and family disruption which cause these areas to become less attractive to those more upwardly mobile residents (i.e., those with more resources and income). However, those persons with limited resources are trapped in these deplorable conditions which places them in the category of the less fortunate or 'truly disadvantaged' (Wilson, 1987; Rankin & Quane, 2000).

In sum, these works have indicated that structural conditions such as poverty and residential stability, unemployment and female-headed households undermine order and social organization in urban environments and thus increase victimization risks.

Despite the large body of work on individual or structural characteristics, there have been fewer studies conducted which examined both individual characteristics and structural conditions

23

in order to have a better understanding of victimization risks. For example, Esbensen, Huizinga, and Menard (1999) conducted a study of families in Denver to investigate the influence of family factors in predicting adolescent victimization. Using both Routine Activities/Lifestyle Theory and Social Disorganization Theory, they assessed whether the following structural characteristics of the family were predictors of victimization risk: individual and family socio-demographic characteristics, family vulnerability to victimization, parental involvement in violence and substance use, parental discipline and monitoring practices and the climate of interaction in the family. The results revealed that the family contexts (i.e., family vulnerability, parental involvement, parental discipline and monitoring characteristics) are significant predictors of adolescent victimization versus individual characteristics. Furthermore, Sampson (1987) notes that tests of Routine Activities/Lifestyle theories typically focus on individual-level characteristics and ignore the fact that the environment should also be considered when addressing victimization risks. Sampson (1987) addressed this oversight by examining the causes and consequences of property and violent victimization. Based on a sample of nearly 11,000 residents of England and Wales in 1982 drawn from the British Crime Survey (BCS), the findings indicated that individual and structural factors predicted property and violent victimization. Individual characteristics such as age, marital status and gender were significantly related to property and violent victimization risks. However, he found that evenings spent away from home are only significantly related to property victimization. Moreover, only one measure of structural characteristics – family disruption – was a significant predictor of property and violent victimization. On the other hand, residential instability significantly predicted violent but not property victimization. Finally, Mustaine and Tewksbury (1998) also conduct a study that directly examines the predictive value of individual and structural characteristics on

victimization risks. They consider the impact of individual-level factors (e.g., sex, race, age, marital status, employment status, etc) and neighborhood conditions (e.g., living near a convenience store, living near gang graffiti, living near homeless people, litter in neighborhood, living near abandoned buildings, unsupervised youth in the neighborhood, etc.) on larceny victimization. Using a sample of 1,513 college and university students in nine postsecondary institutions, they found that individual and community characteristics are predictors of larceny victimization. For example, Mustaine and Tewksbury (1998) found that college students' major theft victimization risks are strongly influenced by their participation in other illegal activities (i.e., smoking marijuana, threatening another with a gun or with no weapon) the type of social activities they were involved in (eating out frequently, playing basketball, belonging to too many clubs/organizations, etc.), the unpleasant conditions of their neighborhoods (i.e. too much crime and noise) and their demographic characteristics (i.e., social class and employment status).

Overall, these studies are informative in the sense that the findings demonstrate that both individual and structural characteristics matter to victimization risks. Despite the vast contributions from past studies, many have examined individual characteristics and neighborhood conditions. However, few studies have considered city variations in respect to victimization risks. City characteristics are important to examine because cities have been designed in such a way to separate the social classes (e.g., upper, middle, lower) and to solely develop certain area of the cities. As a result of urban planning and design, those persons that cannot benefit from how the city is structured and developed are confined to areas that are limited in resources, unconducive to safe environments. The Routine Activity/Lifestyle model and Social Disorganization Theory suggest that individual characteristics and structural characteristics are predictors of violent victimization at the micro and macro level, respectively.

25

However, this study will further examine these arguments by examining the importance of individual characteristics relative to the city conditions under which people live, thus providing a deeper understanding of the factors relevant to victimization risks.

Although there is limited research that explains violent victimization at the city-level, some researchers acknowledged that it is important to address how and why city-level variation can further explain victimization. These variations are commonly tied to differences in offending and victimization patterns across individuals (i.e., minority groups) and places (i.e., inner cities). For example, Short (1997) in his book, *Poverty, Ethnicity, and Violent Crime,* states:

Compared to Whites, the ecological niches in which poor blacks live are disadvantaged in ways that defy easy measurement, such as job quality, marriage opportunities, the lack of exposure to conventional role models, and social isolation from networks that might link them to better jobs and other opportunities in mainstream society (p. 51).

Further, Sampson and Wilson (1995) state that because of macro-structural forces at the city-level, urban minorities are particularly "vulnerable to structural economic changes related to the deindustrialization of central cities, like the shift from goods-producing to service-producing industries; increasing polarization of the labor market into low-wage and high-wage sectors; and relocation of manufacturing out of the inner city" (p.2). Past and present research has shown that victimization risks vary at both the individual and neighborhood level; however, what is lacking in the broader literature is the importance of city characteristics which can impact those individual and neighborhood characteristics commonly linked to victimization.

The present study will analyze whether individual characteristics or structural characteristics are better predictors of victimization risk using data derived from the NCVS 12 Cities survey. This study will contribute to the existing literature on victimization and broaden

our understanding of the relationship between individual characteristics, routine activities, city conditions and victimization risks.

The goal of this study is to examine the importance of individual characteristics relative to the structural conditions under which people live in order to provide a broader understanding of factors relevant to victimization risks at the city level. Based on research pertaining to the Lifestyle Model/Routine Activities Theory and Social Disorganization Theory, it can be hypothesized that demographic characteristics when taken into account routine activities and the structural conditions are predictors of nonfatal violent victimizations at the micro-and-macro level. Therefore, when applying these variables to the city-level characteristics, nonfatal violent victimizations at the individual level and structural level matter. The following chapter discusses the collection of the data and methods for the NCVS 12 Cities.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The current research examines whether individual characteristics or the structural characteristics under which people live account for victimization risks at the city level. Using theoretical explanations inherent to the Lifestyle Model/Routine Activities Theory and Social Disorganization Theory, this information will be drawn from twelve U.S. cities to explore whether such characteristics can explain violent victimization. As stated earlier, one theory argues that individual characteristics are more important, while the other theory argues that structural conditions are better predictors of victimization risk. This chapter is organized with the data and methods of the NCVS 12 Cities study, followed by the specific variables that will be used in the current research and lastly, the analytic strategy. This organization will allow for more understanding of the NCVS 12 Cities data that was used for the presented study.

Data

The NCVS 12 Cities survey data are used in the present study. This survey was sponsored by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) and the Bureau of Justice Statistics to supplement the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) with questions related to community policing. The goal of this project is to develop an instrument and methodology that may be used by law enforcement agencies to collect information on criminal victimizations, citizens' attitudes toward the police, and the impact of different community policing strategies and tactics on crime and neighborhood conditions. The data includes measures of individual characteristics, perceptions of neighborhood conditions, perceptions of community policing, and criminal victimization. The 12 cities that are included were selected

because each had police departments at various stages of implementing community-oriented policing strategies. The cities include: Chicago, IL; Kansas City, MO; Knoxville, TN; Los Angeles, CA; Madison, WI; New York, NY; San Diego, CA; Savannah, GA; Spokane, WA; Springfield, MA; Tucson, AZ; and Washington, DC. The NCVS 12 Cities survey sample was drawn from a simple random sample design of city residents with telephones using the GENESYS Random-Digit Dialing (RDD) Sampling System (for further discussion of the methods involved in the survey see Smith et al., 1998).

The data collection took place over a four month period beginning in February of 1998. A total of 19,200 persons were targeted for inclusion in the study, with 13,918 persons actually participating in the study. The targeted and actual response rate for each city is shown below in Table 1. The data collection was done using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). Since 1992 the CATI method had been used in NCVS data collections and was implemented to reduce potential errors by interviewers and to improve the quality of the data gathered (see Cantar & Lynch, 2000 for a full discussion of the effects of CATI on NCVS data).

Table 1
Response Rate for NCVS 12-Cities Sample

City	Target	Actual
Total	**19,200**	**13,918**
Chicago, IL	1,600	1,124
Kansas City, MO	1,600	1,162
Knoxville, TN	1,600	1,198
Los Angeles, CA	1,600	1,121
Madison, WI	1,600	1,162
New York, NY	1,600	1,059
San Diego, CA	1,600	1,131
Savannah, GA	1,600	1,245
Spokane, WA	1,600	1,239
Springfield, MA	1,600	1,231
Tucson, AZ	1,600	1,233
Washington, DC	1,600	1,013

Additionally, the NCVS 12 Cities data is supplemented with data on city characteristics obtained from the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau. These city characteristics include: percent living below poverty level, percent unemployed and percent female headed-household. These characteristics were incorporated as measures of structural disadvantages at the city level which, as discussed in the previous chapter, may be predictors of victimization risks.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable is non-fatal violent victimization. The participants in the survey were asked whether they were victims of robbery, rape, simple assault, or aggravated assault in the past 12 months. Violent victimization is dichotomized so that those who reported being a victim of any of these crimes were coded as 1 while those who did not report being victimized were coded as 0.

Independent Variables

The independent variables considered are individual characteristics, measures of routine activities and structural characteristics of the twelve cities. They are included in the subsections below. The individual characteristics are age, race and ethnicity, gender, marital status, and income. The routine activities are evenings spent away, time spent shopping and time spent riding public transportation. The structural conditions are poverty, unemployed, female-headed households, and residential stability.

31

Individual Characteristics

Age is a continuous variable ranging from 12 to 90 across the sample. In the survey, race is categorized as the following: White, Black or Negro, American Indian, Asian or Pacific Islander. Ethnicity is categorized as Hispanic and non-Hispanic. Because race and ethnicity are not mutually exclusive categories, the classification of race in the present study will take into account individuals' ethnic origins. As Lauritsen and White (2001) note, Hispanics may be of any race with most (90%) self-reporting as White and the remaining reporting they are Black (6%) or of another racial category (4%), especially American Indian. The racial and ethnic groups that will be taken into account for the presented study are non-Hispanic Whites, non-Hispanic Blacks, Hispanics and non-Hispanics others (includes American Indians and Asians). Gender is a dichotomous variable and is coded 1 for males 0 for females given males are disproportionately victims of violent crimes. Marital status is divided into the following categories: married (reference group), divorced and separated, widowed, and never married individuals. Finally, income is measured using the following categories: less than $7,500; $7,500-14,999; $15,000-24,999; $25,000-34,999; $35,000-49,999; $50,000-74,999; 75,000 or more.

Routine Activities/Lifestyle

The NCVS 12 Cities participants were also asked three questions that serve as additional indicators of routine activities. The following questions were asked: 1) How often do you spend the evening away from home? 2) How often are you gone shopping? and 3) How often do you ride public transportation? The participants were given the option to answer almost every night or day (coded 1) at least once a week (coded 2), at least once a month (coded 3), less often

(coded 4) or never (coded 5). These codes were reverse-ordered so that an increase in the value for these items represented greater frequency of involvement in the respective activities. The results of principal component analyses reveal little commonality between these items. Supplemental tests also suggest the same. For example, the reliability coefficient or Cronbach's alpha for the three items is very low (0.15). Therefore, these survey items are not combined but considered separately in the analyses and are labeled *Evening Away, Shopping, and Public Transit* in the descriptive tables.

Structural Conditions

Although inclusion of measures of neighborhood conditions would be ideal, the participants in the NCVS 12 Cities study are selected by their city (not neighborhood) location. Furthermore, the impact of city characteristics on victimization risks is a goal of the present study so common measures of city-level disadvantage are considered. They include the proportion of city residents living below the poverty level and unemployed as well as the proportion of households within the city that are female-headed.

The descriptive statistics for the dependent variable and independent variables for the NCVS 12 Cities sample are shown in Table 2. The average age of the participants is 42 years. Of the 13, 918 survey participants, 54.6 percent are males, 10.0 percent are Hispanics, and 17.8 percent are non-Hispanic Blacks. The average income for participants was ranged from $30,000 to $34,999, and 5.6 percent of participants reported being violently victimized.

Table 2.
Descriptive Statistics on the National Crime Victimization Survey 12 Cities
Sample, 1998 (N=13,918)

Variable	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	%
Individual Characteristics					
Age	12.00	90.00	41.80	18.10	
Income*	1.00	14.00	10.38	3.64	
Hispanic					10.0
Non-Hispanic Blacks					17.8
Males					54.6
Never Married					33.7
Routine Activities/Lifestyle Patterns					
Evening Away	1	5	3.70	1.092	
Shopping	1	5	4.03	.723	
Public Transient	1	5	1.95	1.40	
Structural Characteristics					
Residential Stability	0	82	9.86	11.531	
Percent Impoverished	14.30	23.10	18.90	3.06	
Percent unemployed	3.50	6.80	4.84	1.03	
Percent Female-Headed Household	21.70	50.00	33.86	8.88	
Violence Victims**					5.6%

Source: NCVS 12 Cities study (ICPSR 2743).
 The descriptive statistics are based on the weighted sample of NCVS 12 Cities Survey
*Based on the 14 unequal categories of income: 1 = <$,5000; 2=$5,000-7,499; 3=$7,500-9,999;
4=$10,000-$12,4999; 5= $12,500-14,999; 6= $15,000-$17,499; 7=$17,500-19,999; 8=20,000-24,999;
9=$25,000-29,999; 10= $30,000-34,999; 11= $35,000-39,999; 12= $40,000-49,000; 13= $50,000-
75,000; 14= $75,000 or more. Due to the extent of missing cases for this variable, it is not included in
the final analytical models.
**Includes all attempted and completed rape/sexual assault, robbery and simple and aggravated
assault victims.

Analytical Strategy

Logistic regression analyses are used since this method is most appropriate when the dependent variable is dichotomous and when various types of independent variables are "normally distributed, linearly related, or have equal variances within each group" (Mertler & Vannatta, 2002, p. 314). Three separate logistic models will be considered to address the research goals of the current study. The first model will consider the relationship between individual characteristics, routine activities and violent victimization. The second model will consider structural conditions and violent victimization, and the third model will include both individual characteristics and structural conditions. This will allow for an examination of the predictive power of individual and structural conditions on victimization risks and allow for consideration of which conditions better explain violent victimization risks.

The overall implications of this research are to underscore the importance of city structure in relation to violent victimization. Furthermore, this work will contribute to the broader victimization literature in that predictors at both the micro and macro level are considered with the goal of examining whether one better accounts for victimization risks.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose and goal of this research was to examine the impact of individual characteristics and structural conditions on non-fatal violent victimization risks. By further analyzing individual characteristics relative to the structural conditions under which people live, the research provided a broader understanding of factors relevant to victimization risks at both the individual- and city-level.

In addressing these research goals, three analytical models were conducted and examined. The first model considered the relationship between demographic characteristics, routine activities and violent victimization risk. The second model considered structural conditions and violent victimization, and the third model included both individual characteristics and structural conditions. By using three models to examine the relationship between individual and structural conditions, this allowed for consideration of which conditions better explained violent victimization risks.

In the first set of analyses, the effect of individual characteristics and routine activities on risk for violent victimization is explored. The findings are presented in Model 1 of Table 3. The results provide mixed support for Routine Activities Theory/Lifestyle Model. As expected, measures of lifestyle/routine activities were significant predictors of violent victimization. For example, routine activities such as evenings away from home (b=.073) and the use of public transportation (b=.096) significantly increased individuals' risks for violent victimization. Those who more often spent evenings away from home and who more frequently rode public transportation were more likely to report experiencing a violent crime. These findings were in line with theoretical expectations of Routine Activities Theory and the Lifestyle Model which

36

suggest that these activities likely increase exposure to motivated offenders. In contrast, shopping (b=.093) was not a significant predictor of violent victimization. This finding was not aligned with Routine Activities/Lifestyle Model because research has also indicated that shopping increased the likelihood for nonfatal violent victimizations to occur because this can increase exposure to motivated offenders. Contrary to theoretical expectations, however, demographic characteristics remained significant predictors of violent victimization although routine activities/lifestyle measures are included in this model. Specifically, age has a significantly negative effect on violent victimization (b= -0.036). In other words, younger persons are more likely to be victims of violent crimes than are older persons. Similar findings were also provided for income (b= -0.034). As income increased, the likelihood of violent victimization decreased. Moreover, males were significantly more likely to be victims of violent crimes compared to females. Surprisingly, when compared to other racial/ethnic groups, Blacks were less likely to be victims of violent crimes (b= -0.189). This unexpected finding is due to the interaction between age, race and income. In baseline models not shown, Blacks are significantly more likely to be victims of violent crimes but once age and income are considered the direction of this relationship changes. This suggests that this relationship is conditioned by age and income, meaning that older Blacks with higher incomes experience less violent victimization. This is consistent with the extant literature and thus explains this counterintuitive finding. Furthermore, those of other racial and ethnic backgrounds, such as Asians, were also significantly less likely to be victimized compared to the other racial/ethnic groups (b= -0.408). These findings were also consistent with existing research in that those who comprise other racial groups outside of Whites, Blacks and Hispanics are least likely to be at risk for violent victimization. Moreover, single (b=0.438) and divorced/separated (b=0.990) persons were more

likely to be victimized than married persons. Conversely, persons who were widowed (b= -0.006) were least likely to be at risk for violent victimization. These findings across marital status are also consistent with the extant literature.

The relationship between structural characteristics and risks for violent victimization is shown in Model 2 of the table. Previous research in this area suggested that negative structural conditions increase the likelihood of violent victimization. However, this contention is not supported by the current findings. Each measure of city disadvantage – the proportion of female-headed household, persons living below the poverty level, and unemployment – had a null effect on victimization risk. Moreover, the direction of the relationship between city-level unemployment and violent victimization is negative (b=-0.043), indicating that as unemployment rates increase, violent victimization decreases. This is unexpected based on the existing literature. Previous research for unemployment has been linked to high rates of violent victimization within urban areas. As stated in earlier sections, these environments tend to have higher rates of nonfatal violent victimizations because people are deprived of job opportunities and resources are limited.

The final model examined the relationship between all of these factors – individual characteristics, routines activities, and structural conditions – and violent victimization risk. Overall, the above findings remained stable. When all conditions and routine activities were considered, activities such as evenings spent away (b=.073) and public transportation (b=.112) remained significant predictors of violent victimization. Similarly, demographic characteristics were consistent predictors of violent victimization risks. For example, age (b= -.035) did not significantly change. This is also true for income (b= -.033). Likewise, the findings across gender, race/ethnicity and marital status were largely unchanged. Males were still more likely to

38

be victims of violent victimization compared to females (b=-.394). Blacks (b=.-.222) and Others (b=-.426) were significantly less likely to be victims of violence compared to Whites and Hispanics. Lastly, single and divorced or separated individuals were more likely to be violently victimized compared to those in other marital status categories. Moreover, most of the structural conditions did not have a significant impact on violent victimization risks. The relationship between the proportion living below the poverty level and female-headed households within the city did not exert a significant effect on victimization. On the other hand, unemployment was a significant predictor of risks once individual characteristics and routine activities were considered. Interestingly, it continued to exert a negative effect on violent victimization risks (b= -.099) suggesting that as unemployment rates increased, violent victimization decreased.

Table 3
Logistic Regression Models Predicting Risk for Nonfatal Violent Victimization Across Individual and Structural Characteristics

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	b	*SE*	*b*	*SE*	*b*	*SE*
Individual Characteristics						
Age	-.036*	.004			-.033*	.004
Income	-.034*	.011			-.030*	.011
Male	.379*	.082			.391*	.084
White (**reference group**)						
Black	-.189**	.116			-.210**	.125
Hispanic	.076	.122			.055	.128
Others	-.408*	.203			-.428*	.208
Married (**reference group**)						
Single	.438*	.111			.403*	.115
Divorced/Separated	.990*	.122			.943*	.125
Widowed	-.006	.359			.081	.361
Routine Activities						
Shopping	.093	.062			.085	.063
Evenings away	.073*	.044			.073*	.044
Public transportation	.096*	.028			.110*	.029
Structural Characteristics						
Female Headed-Household			.003	.005	.000	.006
Poverty			.017	.016	.030 ⊡	.018
Unemployed			-.038	.041	-.099*	.049
Residential Stability			-.047	.005	-.009	.006
Log pseudo-likelihood	-4805.058		-5892.473		-4664.404	
Pseudo R-squared	.078		.026		.085	

⊡ *p*<.10. **p*<.05. ***p*<.01. ****p*<.001.

40

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research was to further examine the importance of individual characteristics relative to the structural conditions under which people live in order to provide a broader understanding of nonfatal violent victimization risks at the city level. Previous research indicates that individual characteristics like age, race and ethnicity, gender, marital status, and income can be predictors of crime. The Lifestyle Model/Routine Activity suggests that these characteristics are indicative of life patterns and routine activities that influence individuals' risks for victimization. Structural theories such as Social Disorganization Theory suggest that broader explanations for crime and victimization be explored. These theories posit that the environment is a better predictor of such than are individual-level characteristics. Specifically, urban blight has been linked to crime and victimization. For example, conditions such as economic and social disadvantage (i.e., poverty, unemployment and family disruption), residential instability, and the racial/ethnic composition of neighborhoods are often blamed on why crime and thus victimization occurs. These conditions purportedly cause social disorganization within neighborhoods—therefore explaining crime, and violent victimization, at the macro-level. Comparatively, there have been fewer studies that have considered both individual characteristics and structural conditions in relation to violent victimization risks.

Overall, Routines Activities Theory suggests that activities away from home can have an impact on crime rates and thus the likelihood that victimization will occur. Consistent with Routine Activities Theory, the findings here suggest that as persons frequently engage in activities that involve evenings spent away from the home and the use of public transportation, the likelihood of risks for violent victimization increases. These findings are in line with past

studies that address routine activities such as evenings spent away and public transportation as significant predictors for violent victimization (Lauritsen, Sampson, & Laub, 1991; Mustaine, 1997; Wright & Miller, 2002). These findings are similar and consistent with previous works because people often engage in activities such as drinking at a bar, sports activities, or spending time with peers outside of the home. Both routine activities increase the likelihood of contact with motivated offenders, which thus can increase the risk for violent victimizations. However, shopping was not a significant predicator of violent victimization. This finding is unexpected given that past works (e.g., Mustaine &Tewksbury, 1998) suggest that shopping does increase the likelihood of victimization. While others have successfully linked this activity to property crime in particular, it is unclear why it is not related to violent victimization risks such as robbery victimization.

Despite these findings, individual characteristics remain consistent predictors of violent victimizations. This is contrary to the expectations of Routine Activities Theory/Lifestyle Model. When demographic characteristics were considered with routine activities, I found that younger persons are more likely to be victimized than older persons. This was also similar for income. My findings indicated as a person's income increased, the risk for violent victimization decreased. On the other hand, I found that males are far more likely to be at risk for violent victimization than their female counterparts. While this finding for males is in align with past theories and research, it seems to be less plausible for females given their disproportionate experience with being violently victimized for crimes like rape and sexual assault. Also, feminist scholars and research has pointed out that females are more likely to be victimized at the hands of non-strangers (Truman, & Rand, 2010). This essentially means that evenings spent away from the home and riding public transportation may matter more to male victimization than female

42

victimization because females are more likely victimized by someone they know. Considering the findings from the present research and theoretical explanations on gender differences in violent victimization, it is imperative that future research examine the potential differential impact of routine activities on males and females risk for non-fatal violent victimizations. Future research must explore males and females separately and not assume that the predictors of violent outcomes are the same for these groups. Surprisingly, there was an unexpected finding for Blacks. While past research show Blacks are victimized at higher rates compared to other racial and ethnic groups, I found that Blacks in this study were least likely to be violently victimized compared to any other racial and ethnic group. However, this finding warrants explanation given that it is likely due to an interaction between race, class and age. The sampled group was slightly older thus reducing the occurrence of victimization and when combined with income status, the relationship between race and victimization is impacted. The lesser occurrence of violent victimization for Blacks is likely attributed to the representation of older and more affluent Blacks in the current study. This is highly plausible given that in baseline models where only race is considered, Blacks were more likely to be violently victimized than other racial/ethnic groups. However, considering Blacks were more likely violently victimized than any other racial group, it is questionable whether the same findings emerge if the current data were disaggregated across race and ethnicity. Past theoretical explanations discuss that Blacks are more likely violently victimized, however, is it possible that results may be different for each group given the fact that race is likely a determinant of differential routine activities. For example, we might expect that those who are less fortunate may be more likely to frequently use public transportation, and thus at increased risks for contact with motivated offenders. Given the income disparities across racial and ethnic groups, this activity may be more detrimental to

43

minorities (and Blacks in particular) than to Whites. Considering this notion, further research should be conducted to explore whether the factors considered in this study have the same impact on various racial and ethnic groups.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that the relationship between demographic characteristics and victimization risks are not simply attributed to routine activities or lifestyle patterns, or at least those considered in the present study. These factors – evenings spent away from home, riding public transportation, and shopping – had minimal impact on their predictive power. However, it could be that other routine activities play a more central role and therefore explain this unexpected finding. For example, association with delinquent peers was not presented in the study; however, it might nullify the relationship between demographic characteristics and victimization risks. Peer association can have a vast impact on the daily routines activities given if the family ties are broken in the home and there is no support or guidance coming from any family member. This causes individuals to become attached to their peers and engage in any activity that their friends are involved in.

Moreover, the findings provide little, if any support, for structural theories such as Social Disorganization Theory. When taking into account city conditions and namely disadvantage within these areas, the findings here contrasted with Social Disorganization/Structural Theories. These theories suggest that structural conditions like family disruption, residential instability, poverty, and unemployment impact victimization. The results indicated they were not significant predictors of violent victimization. These findings are contradictory to past research. As previously mentioned, Shaw and McKay's (1942) theory of Social Disorganization explains that structural conditions such as persistent poverty, residential instability, and ethnic heterogeneity causes social disorganization within urban environments. As a result of these worsening

conditions, urban environments have limited resources which can cause persons living in these conditions to resort to illegitimate means that increases crime and victimization rates in urban areas. In order to study this phenomenon discussed in Shaw and McKay's theory (1942), contemporary researchers examine conditions like female-headed households, poverty levels and unemployment. For example, various researchers note that poverty and unemployment are linked to violent victimization risks. They explain the reason to be inner cities being deprived from job opportunities and supplementary resources that would establish financial stability in urban areas (Anderson, 1999; Crutchfield, 1989; Jargowsky, 1997; Jargowsky & Bane, 1990; Kasarda, 1989; Lawson, 1992, Mincy, 1994; Marks, 1991; Massey & Denton, 1993; Massey & Eggers, 1990; Wacquant & Wilson, 1989, Wilson, 1987 Wilson, 1987, 1996). However, the findings for unemployment indicated that it was not significant to explaining violent victimizations. This finding clearly contradicts the theoretical assumptions of Social Disorganization Theory which explains that unemployment is a predictor as to why individuals are victimized. While unemployment was tested as a structural level variable, it potentially could be a matter that should only be tested at the neighborhood level and not at the city-level. Additionally, female-headed households have higher rates of poverty due to limited economic resources available to single-parent households and urban environments are not rooted in opportunities—thus placing women and their children at greater risks for violent victimization (Lauritsen, 2003; Smith & Jarjoura, 1989). Although research explains that structural conditions are predictors of violent victimization at the city level, my findings were not in line with Social Disorganization theory that structural conditions matter in relation to crime and violent victimization. After analyzing the results for poverty, unemployment, female-headed households and residential instability, it is clear that these conditions are not proximate causes of violent victimization risks for individuals.

While these conditions have been recognized in theoretical explanations as significant predictors of crime and victimization, there could be additional conditions that may matter more especially at the city level. For example, other conditions like economic inequality and residential segregation could be more salient than those structural characteristics that were generated in the research. Social Disorganization Theory and other structural explanations have posited that family disruption, unemployment and poverty are neighborhood predictors of violence but it could be that these conditions are shaped by more macro-level processes at the city level. Sampson and Wilson (1995) propose that racial segregation at the city level concentrates these forms of disadvantage in Black communities thus explaining their increased rates of violent crime. This possibility should be considered in subsequent research.

Another major finding of the current study is that the results are virtually unchanged when all factors - individual characteristics, structural conditions and routine activities - are considered simultaneously. My findings for demographic characteristics when taking into account routine activities and structural conditions also remained consistent in those younger persons are violently victimized at higher rates than older adults. This is also similar for income. People with a higher income are least likely to experience being at risk for violent crimes than persons who are living below the poverty line. Blacks were still least likely to be victims of violent crimes even when all of the variables in my presented study were considered. Again, this interaction was due to the relationship between age and income. The inclusion of structural conditions still remained insignificant. I found that female-headed households and poverty did not predict risk for violent victimizations against people living in these particular conditions. As for unemployment, my findings revealed that it was significant, but the direction was negative. In other words, the rates of unemployment were high, but the risks for violent victimization

remained low.

Overall, the findings of this study emphasize the importance of individual characteristics and routine activities. These factors are significant predictors of victimization risks even after controlling for environmental conditions such as structural disadvantage within city context. However, I do caution that the findings here do not suggest that structural theories should be abandoned or dismissed in terms of their relevance to victimization risks. It is quite likely that more immediate environmental conditions such as neighborhood context matter more than city-level factors. Various studies have shown that some individual-level predictors (i.e., race/ethnicity) of violent victimization risks are accounted for by neighborhood disadvantage (Lauritsen, 2003; Laurtisen & White, 2001). The reason why individual risks may be more a product of neighborhood environmental factors rather than macro city conditions is because individual characteristics can shape organization of the neighborhood. Works have shown, for instance, that minorities are often segregated in impoverished communities within cities (Massey & Denton, 1993) resulting in their structural and cultural isolation from mainstream others and institutions and inadvertently concentrating crime in their communities (Sampson & Wilson, 1995).

Despite the current study's contribution to the extant victimization literature, more work is clearly needed in this area. First, the NCVS 12 Cities data set was gathered in 1998. The traditional NCVS is a national-level survey and is collected annually and is widely used for the purpose of victimization research. However, there are only special collections conducted at lower levels of aggregation (i.e., neighborhood and city level). Prior to the 1998 NCVS 12 Cities study, the NCVS had not been collected at the city level since the 1970s (see Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1975a, 1975b, 1978; also see Messner & South, 1986). As mentioned in my earlier

sections, city structure is critical to our understanding of crime because cities have been designed

to separate the social classes (e.g., upper, middle, lower) and to only develop those areas that will

benefit upper and middle class people and not the lower class. Due to the way in which cities are

designed, those persons who are in the lower class are at a disadvantage because the financial

stability of their areas is limited, if not non-existent. As a result, the lower classes are confined to

those certain areas that are saturated with limited opportunities and resources. Furthermore,

given that I found that city context does not matter, it may be irrelevant to continue to collect

victimization data at the city level without also including more measures of neighborhood

characteristics. It is quite possible that city, neighborhood and individual characteristics all play

an important role in the occurrence of victimization. These studies will allow for a better

understanding of how all three levels impact victimization. Secondly, it is important to note that

there are a limited number of routine activities included in the NCVS 12 Cities Study. While

research suggests that routines activities such as evenings spent away, shopping and public

transportation can be predictors as to why crime (and thus victimization) occur (Lauritsen,

Sampson & Laub, 1991; Schreck, Wright, & Miller, 2002), there are other activities, like

criminal association, that can impact violent victimization (Schreck and Fisher, 2004; Woodward

& Fergusson, 2000). These activities and their relation to victimization risks must be further

explored, and especially in the context of structural conditions at the neighborhood and city

levels. That being said, it is important to note that routine activities such as evenings spent away,

public transportation and shopping may have changed overtime which could have a bearing on

future studies. As technological advancements continue to evolve overtime, individuals begin to

engage in other daily routine activities that can pose a potential threat to their victimization risks.

For example, the abundance of cell phone usage today relative to their use in 1998 when this data

was collected could potentially nullify the effects on public transit on victimization risks. Individuals have more access to emergency contacts given their access to phones and thus the police. Given these developments over time, new activities may be more proximate causes of victimization risks. Interestingly, these advances may also serve to increase risks as cell phones, for example, might also be 'attractive' targets to motivated offenders. Furthermore, new advancements, like cell phones, portable computers, and the frequent use of credit and debit cards may have eased victimization risks—in effect changing the routine predictors of victimization risk today. Thus, future research on this topic should be explored.

Since this research focused mainly on nonfatal violent victimization risks at the individual-and city-level, policy makers can better prevent the occurrence of crime and victimization among city residents. Based on my findings, I know that routine activities place individuals at risk for victimization, particularly when individuals frequently spend evenings away from the home and use public transportation. In order to combat this issue of violent victimization occurring, city residents must be aware of potential dangers faced by spending evenings away from home. For example, individuals who spend evenings away from home must be aware of the dangers of locales such as nightclubs, bars, and random gatherings, like shopping or at a friend's house. These dangers can be curbed via the use of private security and police monitoring. Further, the use of neighborhood watches can decrease the potential dangers of violent victimization risks occurring. If individuals are spending evenings away or using public transportation, neighborhood watches could provide vital information that can be beneficial to prevent any harmful acts from occurring. Also, neighborhood watches work with local police agencies which can notify these groups of crimes occurring within or in close proximity of the neighborhood to better inform individuals/residents of the risks faced when engaging in activities

away from home. Broader initiatives such as increased police patrols in high-crime areas should also help in victimization prevention. Furthermore, rather than people spending evenings away alone, people should go out in a group setting or in areas that are well protected and guarded thus decreasing their 'target attractiveness' and increasing their guardianship. Moreover, in regards to public transportation, city officials could employ policies that would make it safer for individuals that use this service. For example, there should be surveillance cameras implemented, security guards, and transit police present in order to make public transportation safer for city residents. These policy implications can potentially reduce individual risks and city-level rates of violent victimization.

Overall, the presented study is a guide to understanding whether individual characteristics and structural conditions at the city-level are predictors of nonfatal violent victimization risks. Additionally, it is the intent of this study to encourage more research to be conducted in order to expand our understanding of victimization by examining both micro- and macro-level processes that influence its occurrence.

REFERENCES

Anderson, E. (1990). *Streetwise: Race, class, and change in an urban community.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bailey, W. (1984). Poverty, inequality, and crime. *Criminology, 22*, 531-50.

Blau, J., & Blau, P. (1982). The cost of inequality: Metropolitan structure and violent crime. *American Sociological Review, 47*, 114-29.

Blumstein, A., & Rosenfeld, R. (1999). Trends in rates of violence in the U. S. A. In *Studies on Studies on Crime and Crime Prevention 8,* 139–167.

Bonger, W.A. (1943). *Race and crime*. New York, New York: Columbia University Press.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2005). *Juvenile victimization and offending, 1993-2003.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Bursik, R.J., & Grasmick, H.G. (1993). *Neighborhoods and crime.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Cantor, D., & Lynch, J.P. (2000). Self-report surveys as measures of crime and criminal victimization. *Criminal Justice, 4*, 85-138.

Catalno, S.M. (2005). *Criminal Victimization, 2004.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Catalano, S.M. (2006). *Criminal Victimization, 2005.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Cullen, F.T. (2006). *Criminological theory: Past to present*. Los Angeles, California: Roxbury

Cohen, L.E., & Cantar, D. (1980). The determinants of larceny: An empirical and theoretical study. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 17*, 140-159.

Cohen, L.E., & Cantar, D. (1981). Residential burglary in the United States: Life-style and demographic factors associated with the probability of victimization. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 18*, 113-27.

Cohen, L.E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review, 44*(4), 588-608.

Cohen, L.E., Kluegel, J.R., & Land, K.C. (1981). Social inequality and predatory criminal victimization: An exposition and test of a formal theory. *American Sociological Review, 46*, 505-524.

Craven, D. (1996). *Female Victims of Violent Crime.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Crutchfield, R.D. (1989). Labor stratifications and violent crime. *Social Forces, 68*(2), 489-512.

Elliott, D.S., Wilson, W.J., Huizinga, D., Sampson, R.J., Elliot, A., & Rankin, B. (1996). The effects of neighborhood disadvantage on adolescent development. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 33*, 389-426.

Esbensen, F.A., Huizinga, D., & Menard, S. (1999). Family context and criminal victimization in adolescence. *Youth Society, 31*, 168-198.

Fingerhut, L.A., & Kleinman, J.C. (1990). International and interstate comparisons of homicide among young males. *The Journal of the American Medical Association, 263*, 3292-3295.

Finkelhor, D., & Asdigian, N.L. (1996). Risk factors for youth victimization: Beyond a lifestyles/routines activities theory approach. *Violence and Victims, 11*(1), 1-19.

Fox, J. A., & Zawitz, M. (2000). *Homicide trends in the United States*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Garofalo, J (1987). Reassessing the lifestyle model of criminal victimization. In M. R. Gottfredson & T. Hirschi (Eds.), *Positive criminology* (pp. 23-42). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Goldstein, A. (1994). *The ecology of aggression.* New York: Plenum Press.

Gottfredson, M.R. (1984). Victims of crime: The Dimensions of Risk. Home Office Research Study No. 18. A Home Office Research and Planning Report. London: Her Majesty's Stationer.

Gottfredson, M.R. (1986). Substantive contributions of victimization surveys. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and justice: An annual review of research.* Vol. 7. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Harrell, E. (2007). Bureau of Justice Statistics. *Black victims of violent crime.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Hindelang, M.J. (1976). *Criminal victimization in eight American cities*: *A descriptive*

analysis of common theft and assault. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Hindelang, M.J. (1981). Variations in sex-race-age-specific incidence rates of offending. *American Sociological Association, 46*(4), 461-474.

Hindelang, M., Gottfredson, M., & Garofalo, J. (1978). *Victims of personal crime: An empirical foundation for a theory of personal victimization.* Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Jackson, P. (1984). Opportunity and crime: A function of city size. *Sociology and Social Research, 68*, 172-93.

Jargowsky, P.A. (1997). *Poverty and place: Ghettos, barrios, and the American city.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Jargowsky P.A, & Bane, M.J. (1990). Ghetto poverty: basic questions. In L.E. Lynn, Jr. & M.T. McGeary (Eds.), Innter-city poverty in the United States (pp. 16-67). Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences Press.

Jargowsky, P.A., & Bane, M.J. (1991). Ghetto poverty in the United States, 1970-1980. In C. Jencks & P.E. Peterson (Eds.), *The Urban Underclass* (pp. 235-273). Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Kasarda, J.D. (1989). Urban industrial transition and the underclass. *Annals*, *501*, 26- 47.

Kennedy, L., & Forde, D. (1990). Risky lifestyles and dangerous results: Routine activities and exposure to crime. *Sociology and Social Research: An International Journal, 74*(4), 208-211.

Klaus, P. (2005). *Crimes against persons age 65 or, 1993-2002.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Klaus, P., & Rennison, C.A. (2002). *Age patterns in violent victimization, 1976-2000.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Kposowa, A., Breault, K., & Harrison, B. (1995). Reassessing the structural covariates of violent and property crimes in the USA: A county-level analysis." *British Journal of Sociology, 46*, 79-105.

Land, K., McCall, P., & Cohen, L. (1990). Structural covariates of homicide rates: Are there any invariances across time and space? *American Journal of Sociology, 95*, 922-63.

Laub, J.H. (1990). Patterns of criminal victimization in the United States. In A.J. Lurigio,

W.G. Skogan, and R.C. Davis (Eds.), *Victims of crime: Problems, policies and programs*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lauritsen, J.L. (2003). *Juvenile victims of violence: Individual, family, and community factors (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Bulletin).* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Lauritsen, J.T., Sampson, R.J., & Laub, J.H. (1991). The link between offending and victimization among adolescents. *Criminology, 29*(2), 265-292.

Lauritsen, J.T., Laub, J.H., & Sampson, R.J. (1992). Conventional and delinquent activities: Implications for the prevention of violent victimization among adolescents. *Violence and Victims, 7*(2), 91-108.

Lauritsen, J.T., & White, N.A. (2001). Putting violence in its place: The influence of race, ethnicity, gender, and place on the risk for violence. *Criminology,* 37-59.

Lawson, B.E. (1992). *The underclass question*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

LeBeau, J., & Corcoran, W. (1990). Changes in calls for police service with changes in routine activities and the arrival and passage of weather fronts. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 6*, 269-291.

Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research (2001). *Ethnic diversity grows, neighborhood integration lags behind.* Retrieved January 3, 2005 from www.albany.edu/mumford/census.

Like, T.Z. (2009). Urban inequality and racial differences in risk for violent victimization. *Crime & Delinquency, 20*(1), 1-26.

Marks, C. (1991). The urban underclass. *Annual Review Sociology, 17*, 445-66.

Massey, D.S., & Eggers, M.L. (1990). The ecology of inequality: Minorities and the concentration of poverty, 1970-1980. *American Journal of Sociology, 95*(5), 1153-1188.

Massey, D.S., & Denton, N.A. (1993). *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

McNulty, T.L. & Bellair, P.E. (2003). Explaining racial and ethnic differences in serious adolescent violent behavior. *Criminology, 41*(3), 709-748.

Mertler, C.A., & Vannatta, R.A. (2002). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods*

(2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Pyrczak.

Miethe, T.D., Stafford, M.C., & Long, J.S. (1987). Social differentiation in criminal victimization: A test of routine activities/lifestyle theories. *American Sociological Review, 52*(2), 184-194.

Mincy, R.B. (1994). *The underclass: Concept, theory, and evidence. In confronting poverty: Prescriptions for Change*. New York: Russell Sage Found.

Mustaine, E.E. (1997). Victimization risks and routine activities: A theoretical examination of gender-specific and domain-specific model. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 22*(1), 42-70.

Mustaine, E.E., & Tewksbury, R. (1998). Predicting risks of larceny theft victimization: A routine activity analysis using refined lifestyle measures. *Criminology, 36*(4), 829-857.

Mustaine, E.E., & Tewksbury, R. (1999). Assessing the likelihood of drunk driving: Gender, context, and lifestyle. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 22*(1), 386-402.

Osgood, D.W., Wilson, J.K., O'Malley, P.M., Bachman, J.G. & Johnston, L.D. (1996). Routine activities and individual deviant behavior. *Sociological Review, 61*(4), 635-655.

Patterson, E.B. (1991). Poverty, income inequality, and community crime rates. *Criminology, 29*(4), 755-775.

Peterson, P.E. (1992). The urban underclass and the poverty paradox. *Political Science Quarterly, 106*(4), 617-637.

Rankin, B.H. & Quane, J.M. (2000). Neighborhood poverty and the social isolation of inner-city African American families. *Social Forces,* 139-164.

Reisig, M.D., & Cancino, J.M. (2004). Incivilities in nonmetropolitan communities: The effects of structural constraints, social conditions, and crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 32*, 15-29.

Rennison, C. (2001). *Violent victimization and race, 1993-98.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Rennison, C. (2002). *Hispanic victims of violent crime, 1993-2000.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Robinison, M. (1997). Burglary re-victimization: The time period of heightened risk.

British Journal of Criminology, 38(1), 76-85.

Sampson, R. J. (1985). Neighborhood and crime: The structural determinants of personal victimization. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 22*, 7-40.

Sampson, R.J. (1987). Personal violence by strangers: An extension and test of the opportunity model of predatory victimization. *Criminology, 4*, 647-673.

Sampson, R.J. (1988). Local friendship ties and community attachment in mass society: A multilevel systemic model. *American Sociological Review, 53*, 766-779.

Sampson, R.J. (1997). Collective regulation of adolescent misbehavior: Validation results from eighty Chicago neighborhoods. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 12*, 227-244.

Sampson, R.J., & Lauritsen, J.L. (1990). Deviant lifestyles, proximity to crime, and the offender-victim link in personal violence. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 27*(2), 110-139.

Sampson, R. J., & Morenoff, J. D. (1997). Ecological perspectives on the neighborhood context of urban poverty: Past and present. In J. Brooks-Gunn, G. J. Duncan, & J. L. Aber (Eds.), *Neighborhood Poverty: Vol. 2. Policy implications in studying neighborhoods* (pp. 1-22). New York. Russell Sage.

Sampson, R.J., Raudenbush, S.W., Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science, 277*, 918-924.

Sampson, R.J., & Wilson, W.J. (1995). Toward a theory of race, crime, and urban inequality. In J. Hagan & R.D. Peterson (Eds.), *Crime and inequality* (pp. 37-54). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Sampson, R.J., & Wilson, W.J. (2005). *Race, crime, and justice.* New York: Routledge.

Schreck, C.J., & Fisher, B.S. (2002). Specifying the influence of family and peers on violent victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(9), 1021-1041.

Schreck, C.J., Wright, & R.A., Miller, J.M. (2002). A study of individual and situational antecedents of violent victimization. *Justice Quarterly, 19*(1), 159-180.

Shaw, C.R., & McKay, H.D. (1942). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Short, J.F. (1997). *Poverty, ethnicity, and violent crime.* Colorado: Westview Press.

Simpson, M. (1985). Violent crime, income inequality, and regional culture: Another

look. *Sociological Focus, 18*, 199-208.

Skogan, W.G. (1990). *Disorder and Decline: Crime and the spiral of decay in American neighborhoods.* California: University of California Press.

Smith, D.A., & Jarjora, G.R. (1989). Household characteristics, neighborhood composition and victimization risk. *Social Forces, 68*(2), 621-640.

Smith, S.K., Steadman, G.W., Minton, T.D., & Townsend, M. (1998). *Criminal victimization and perceptions of community safety in 12 United States cities, 1998.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Social Science Council. (1968). *Research on poverty.* London, England: Heinemann.

Taylor, R.B. (1997). Social order and disorder of street blocks and neighborhoods: Ecology, microecology, and the systemic Model of Social Disorganization. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 34*, 113–55.

Tewksbury, R., & Mustaine, E.E. (1999). Assessing the likelihood of drunk driving: Gender, context and lifestyle. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 22*(1) 57-93.

Tewksbury, R., & Mustaine, E.E. (2003). College Students' Lifestyles and self-protective behaviors: Further considerations of the guardianship concept in routine activity theory. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30*(5), 302-327.

Truman, J.L., & Rand, M.R. (2010). *Criminal victimization, 2009.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Williams, K. (1984). Economic sources of homicide: Reestimating the effects of poverty and inequality. *American Sociological Review, 49*, 283-9.

Wilsem, J.A.V. (2003). Crime and context: The impact of individual, neighborhood, city and county characteristics on victimization. *Dutch Organization for Scientific Research, 1*-184.

Wilson, W.J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy.* University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, W.J. (1989). The cost of racial and class exclusion in the inner city. *Annals*, *501*, 8-25.

Wilson, W.J. (1996). *When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor.* New York: Random House.

Wolfgang, M.E., Figlio, R.M., Tracy, P.E., & Singer, S.I. (1985). *National Survey of*

Crime Severity. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Justice.

Woodward, L.J., & Fergusson, D.M. (2000). Childhood and adolescent predictors of physical assault: A prospective longitudinal study. *Criminology, 38*(1), 223-261.

Yuan, N.P., Koss, M.P., Polacca, M., & Goldman, D. (2006). Risk factors for physical assault and rape among six Native American tribes. *National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism,* 1566-1590.

VITA

Nikeisha Jewana Fortenberry was born June 6, 1987 in Saint Louis, Missouri to the parents of Jethro and Cynthia Fortenberry. She received her education in the Pattonville School District and graduated from Pattonville High School in 2005. Nikeisha continued her education at the University of Missouri-Kansas City; receiving her Bachelor of Arts in Criminal Justice and Criminology in 2009. In August 2009, Nikeisha was accepted into the master's program at the University of Missouri-Kansas City.

As Nikeisha continued her education, she was the Graduate Assistant for programming at the university's Women's Center where she was assigned to developing and creating programs pertaining to women's issues and women's equity on campus and within the community.

Outside of her involvement with the university, Nikeisha was a victim advocate for the Metropolitan Organization to Counter Sexual Assault (MOCSA) where she was involved in addressing the needs and concerns for people who were sexually victimized. Upon completion of Nikeisha's degree, she plans on becoming a victim advocate specializing in all forms of victimizations.