

REPEAT VICTIMISATION & THE ROLE OF THE CRIME VICTIM IN PREVENTION STRATEGIES

**Paper for the Second National Crime Symposium
Australian Institute of Criminology**

**by
Robyn Holder ***

**Canberra, ACT
March 1997**

Robyn Holder, ACT Victims of Crime Coordinator (Tel: 06 257 8452)

REPEAT VICTIMISATION & THE ROLE OF THE CRIME VICTIM IN PREVENTION STRATEGIES

The phenomenon of repeat victimisation has been recognised for some considerable time not only by criminologists but also by police and victim support workers (1). Yet its implications for policy and program development in law enforcement and crime prevention - let alone in support services for crime victims (2) - is only lately being acknowledged. This time lag has occurred for a number of different reasons (3):

- a number of different victimisation realities have been conflated and different terminologies have been used almost interchangeably to describe them;
- the law enforcement and justice systems are constructed to address the single crime incident and moreover make little effort to link data or share information;
- crime prevention practice is itself an evolving field which is only recently, at least in Europe and North America, developing increasingly sophisticated responses on top of traditional opportunity reduction and situational prevention methods;
- actually quantifying repeat victimisation is quite difficult;
- there is concern not to exacerbate the fear and trauma of people already made vulnerable by victimisation, criminal or otherwise, and
- many have expressed fears that, by focussing on repeat victimisation, there is a danger of victim blaming.

In 1996, when I first took up the statutory appointment of Victims of Crime Coordinator in the ACT, I conducted a series of workshops with the Australian Federal Police. As part of the discussion about the needs of crime victims, I mentioned the requirement for protection and gave residential burglary as an example. I did not expect dissent but a number of officers strongly asserted that repeat victimisation for this offence was not a problem in the ACT. "Lightening doesn't strike twice", I was told. This was a lesson, I supposed, in not assuming the transferability of criminological theory. Yet at the next workshop quite the opposite happened. The issue was raised rather more tentatively and, almost to a person, officers nodded sagely in agreement. I concluded, ladies and gentlemen, that I'd better check the data!

(1) See Johnson *et al* (1973), Zeigenhagen (1976), Sparks *et al* (1977), Sparks (1981), Hindelang *et al* (1978), Reiss (1980), Fienberg (1980), and Gottfredson (1984). References in Farrell & Pease (1993).

(2) Except perhaps in services provided for victims of sexual assault and abuse, and for domestic violence.

(3) Much of the information and discussion on these issues for this paper derives from Farrell & Pease (1993)

All my career in crime prevention (or community safety as it is more commonly known) has been in the UK and, as early as 1993, the Home Office had begun to promote attention to repeat victimisation vigorously. In fact, very vigorously for an imposing central government bureaucracy. At the beginning of what were a series of conference/seminars on the issue, Dr Gloria Laycock, the Head of the Police Research Group at the Home Office, exclaimed in a calm Whitehall sort of way, “there isn’t much that we get excited about at the Home Office, but we are excited about this”. So, what exactly is “this”?

A Definition

“Repeat victimisation occurs when the same person or place suffers from more than one criminal incident over a specified period of time.”(4) Commonly, the experience is of the same or similar criminal offence.

Repeat victimisation should be distinguished from *multiple victimisation*, which can describe the cumulative life experience of criminal victimisation across a range of offences or for similar offence types, or the experience of victimisation from a range of sources not necessarily criminal; and from *revictimisation* - a term which traditionally arises from a critique of how agencies respond to and treat the crime victim.

Research Evidence from Overseas

It is almost *de rigeur* these days for crime commentators to remark that crime is not a random occurrence nor simple ‘bad luck’. Research into repeat victimisation in the UK and elsewhere has put comments such as these under the spotlight. It reveals that:

- the 1982 British Crime Survey revealed that 14% of the population reported 71% of all incidents (Farrell & Pease 1993)
- the 1988 and 1992 BCS showed a similar pattern that between 4-5% of respondents experienced 43-44% of crimes (Farrell & Pease 1993)
- 8% of respondents in 3 surveys experienced 22% of all incidents of motor vehicle theft (Mayhew *et al* 1993)
- on the worst industrial estates, businesses can expect to be victimised 5 times a year (Johnston *et al* 1994)
- 98% of crimes recorded by 33 schools in Merseyside (UK) were repeat crimes (Burquest *et al* 1992)
- a minimum of 16% of recorded residential burglaries in an 11 month period were repeats as were 28% of commercial burglaries (Anderson *et al* 1995)
- households victimised once by burglary were found to be four times as likely to be repeat victimised as those which had not been victimised (Forrester *et al* 1988)
- 18% of households burgled were repeat victims within a year (Bennett & Durie *Focus* 1996:35)

(4) National Board for Crime Prevention, *Wise After the Event*, Home Office, May 1994

The evidence for personal crimes which, by their very nature, are repeat victimisations is also germane (5). For example:

- 67% of ethnic minority families on a London housing estate were “multi-victims” of racially-motivated crime (Sampson & Phillips, 1992)
- 9-10% of pupils at a school in Sussex had been bullied weekly or more (Yilmaz, cited in Whitney & Smith, 1991)
- an estimated 90% of domestic violence involves systematic beatings often with escalating violence (Hanmer & Stanko, 1985)
- two thirds of sexually assaulted respondents reported more than one incident (Sorensen 1991)

There are other particular features to repeat victimisation which are important to note, especially its time course.

- the likelihood of a repeat burglary within one month is over 12 times the expected rate, and within this month half of the second victimisations occurred within 7 days of the first (Polvi *et al* 1990, 1991)
- of the 263 incidents reported by schools as repeat crimes, 79% of these occurred within one month of the first (Burquest *et al* 1992)
- of those ethnic minority families who experienced racial attack, subsequent victimisations were most frequent within a week after the first attack (Sampson & Phillips, 1992)
- 40% of all domestic burglary repeats took place within one month (Anderson *et al* 1995)
- after one incident of domestic violence reported to police, 35% of “households” suffer a second within 5 weeks, after the second 45% of “households” suffer a third within 5 weeks (Lloyd *et al* 1994)
- the probability of a subsequent call to police for domestic violence increases with the number of previous calls (Sherman 1991)

Furthermore,

- this time course pattern has been confirmed for a range of offence types including commercial burglary, retail crime, credit card fraud, theft of and from motor vehicles, and neighbour disputes; (Farrell & Pease 1993:12)
 - the actual number of repeat victimisations are under-reported to police (Anderson *et al* 1995: 14)
 - rates of repeat victimisation are higher in “high crime areas” which may in fact be the reason why they are labelled as such (Trickett *et al* 1992)
 - repeat victimisation focuses on the most vulnerable people and places (refs)
 - future crime victims have area *plus* demography *plus* victimisation experience in common (Anderson *et al* 1995: 41)
 - such evidence as exists indicates that the same offenders may be responsible for repeats (Anderson *et al* 1995: 1)
-

- (5) And because of their very nature actually measuring separate incidents of domestic assault or child sexual assault, for example, can be very difficult but it is not impossible.

To conclude then: crime is concentrated. A person or place victimised once has a high likelihood of being repeat victimised. Moreover, in repeat victimisation, there is a likelihood that the same type of crime will occur and in a relatively short space of time. (Fienberg 1980). Repeat victimisation is a phenomena of localised import.

Evidence for Repeat Victimisation in Australia

There is evidence for the existence of repeat victimisation in Australia though it is less clear cut (6) and very little research appears to have been conducted that delves further into this phenomenon.

- 16.6% of victims of household break and enter in South Australia experienced two incidents, and 4.7% experienced 3 or more over a 12 month period (31.5% of those experiencing attempted break and enter were repeat incidents) (Thomas, *JUSTATS*, March 1993)
- the burglary rate in South Australia for 1991/92 was 15.7 per 1000 and the repeat victimisation rate was 58.4 (over one third of these took place within a month of the first) (Morgan 1993)
- 33% of people victimised by burglary in two local government areas of South Australia had previous experience of break and enter or attempted break and enter in the past 12 months (West 1994:30)
- nearly 60% of Australian businesses have experienced burglary or attempted burglary more than once in the previous 12 months (Walker in Sumner 1996:206)
- the 1993 National Crime and Safety Survey (NCSS) found that one in 5 households burgled nationally were burgled more than once in the 12 months preceding (Queensland experienced the highest repeat victimisation rate and SA the lowest) (Phillips 1996:141)
- in Queensland, victims of household crimes (break & enter, attempted break & enter, and motor vehicle theft) were three times more likely to be victimised again than a household is to be victimised at all (GSO 1996:21)
- according to 1993 NCSS, people who are living alone or are single parent households, who rent their accommodation, who have occupied their dwelling less than one year, who are not a member of Neighbourhood Watch, who have experienced an attempted break and enter, and who are aged under 34 years experience higher levels of repeat victimisation for break and enter (Mukerjee & Carach, 1997:50)
- anecdotal comments from Claims Managers of three major insurance companies suggest that households are 3-4 times more likely to be re-burgled than properties that have not been victimised, and the bulk of this will occur within the first 1-3 months after the first incident (7)

- (6) It could be argued that the Australian research, especially on personal crime, reveals more about multiple victimisation than it does repeat victimisation.
- (7) NRMA, FAI, and AAMI Claims Managers in conversation with the author, Jan-Feb 1997.

For personal crimes the Australian research reveals that:

- the likelihood of experiencing a second personal crime is eight times as high for victims than is expected by the victimisation rate (GSO 1996:21)
- households where a member has suffered any personal crime also suffer higher levels of repeat victimisation for break and enter (Mukerjee & Carach 1997:50)
- half of women who reported experiencing domestic violence said that it had involved more than one incident (of this 7.4% said it occurred often) (ABS 1996:8)
- 51.6% of women surveyed said that they had experience of more than one incident of physical or sexual violence since the age of 15 years (ABS 1996:22)
- of domestic violence victims who participated in a phone-in in the Northern Territory 38% said that the abuse occurred daily, 33% weekly and 12% monthly; and 52% said they endured abuse for between 1-5 years (Hunter 1996:9-10)
- of assaults reported to police in South Australia in a 12 month period 9% of women and 8% of men allege two or more incidents; and of assaults reported to a community survey in 1992, 49% of women and 38% of men were victimised on two or more occasions within 12 months (Gardner 1994)
- at least a third of female victims of three types of personal crime had experience of two or more incidents in the past 12 months (Trimboli 1995:7)
- 30% of women sexually abused as children report incidents as occurring weekly, 22% fortnightly, and 27% monthly (Fleming 1997:67)

Repeat Victimisation and Crime Prevention & Detection

All this information would be so many numbers if its pragmatic implications for prevention and for policing had not been pursued. Crime prevention practitioners, like criminologists, begin with a series of questions. *What* crime problem should we focus on? Which leads to the supplementary question of *why*? And then, *when* and *where* to address this problem, and *how*?

The principal proponents in the UK of action on repeat victimisation (aside from the Home Office), academics Pease and Farrell (8), assert that it provides clues, if not answers, to the questions of what, where, and when (NBCP 1994). They argue that, given the extent and spread of crime and the finite resources with which to manage it, “an efficient way of directing crime prevention effort would be to concentrate upon those who have already been victimised” (Farrell & Pease 1993:1). The limited resources of crime prevention (not simply financial resources but of people in policing, government, housing and community services etc) should be aimed at people and places at highest risk. That is, at those targets with the highest probability of experiencing a further crime incident. Viewed this way, repeat victimisation may be considered a variant of opportunity reduction. Moreover, the preventative intervention(s) selected must be in place soon after victimisation but need only cover the period of greatest risk (Farrell & Pease 1993:8).

(8) Ken Pease is Professor of Criminology at Huddersfield University and Graham Farrell is at the Dept of Social Policy and Social Work at the University of Manchester.

The argument for focussing on repeat victimisation has been taken a step further in an experiment taking place in West Yorkshire (Anderson *et al* 1995). The contention of this multi-agency team goes to the heart of how police conceptualise and prioritise their work, and how they (individually and collectively) evaluate their 'successes'. In their preliminary report the authors (academic and operational) contend that "historically two schisms in crime control and the treatment of crime victims have opened up. One separates crime prevention and victim support. The other divides crime prevention and offender detection."

Offender detection is valued highly in policing but it is usually seen as a one-dimensional opportunity. Either you get 'em or you don't. However, detection and prevention are two sides of the same coin. The researchers have adopted a position that suggests crime prevention to be *the* overarching aim for police, and assert that this can be achieved by "the parallel and complementary methods of crime *detection* and crime *deflection*." 'Deflection' is introduced here as a new term that comprises methods of overt protection that deflect or deter an offender from choosing that target at that time. A *graded* response in these terms is a rather optimistic progression of mode of intervention from basic deflection techniques for opportunist offenders, to "more sophisticated detection techniques for the numerically fewer frequent offenders." (Anderson *et al* 1995:2-3).

For law enforcement agencies, paying attention to repeat victimisation may be a mixed blessing. First, the collection and collation of data to identify repeat victimisation is tremendously time consuming. Even one of the most sophisticated crime information systems in the UK could not, as a matter of routine, download the information required (Anderson *et al* 1995:610).

Second, repeat victimisation demands a reorganisation of operational deployment and prioritisation. Every police force in the UK has Crime Prevention Officers (even some Architectural Liaison Officers for designing out crime measures). Traditionally their deployment has been very much linked to the 'community relations' portfolio and their activities have been largely ineffective (Farrell & Pease 1993:1). A tremendous amount of effort, however, is expended in keeping CPOs up-to-date with current methods of crime prevention (eg at the Stafford Crime Prevention Centre & through the Home Office Police Research Group publications) and they are a resource that appears to be relatively non-existent in Australia (9). In response to the repeat victimisation research some forces (eg Greater Manchester & West Yorkshire) have redeployed their CPOs within their Criminal Investigation Department. The function of the CPO in this context is to be both reactive to incidents and individuals, and pro-active in collaboration with the crime analysts and victim support agencies. The idea is

(9) As an aside, this apparent lack of attention to Australian expertise within policing should be seriously questioned. The majority of officers in the workshops I conducted for the AFP marked *crime prevention* as the main priority for the AFP above *apprehension of the offender*.

that the CPO provides crime prevention advice and/or installation to the crime victim (sometimes confined to certain categories of individual) and to ensure a link-in with the local Victim Support Scheme thereby reducing the likelihood of a repeat incident. The job of the investigating officer is to actually pay attention to answers given to that routine question of “*anything like this happen before, love ...?*”

Third, the traditional responses to crime (fashioned for public/political consumption) have focussed on catching, processing and sentencing offenders. The preoccupation with this very, very small cohort of people at the tail end of the system has carried with it a spiralling demand for more resources (Weatherburn & Grabosky 1997:8). But the law of diminishing returns begins to apply as the more resources allocated to apprehension and sentencing have the effect of generating more offenders for the system to process, and hence higher reported crime rates. There is no conclusive evidence that this approach prevents crime nor repeat victimisation. Over the past ten years the UK prison population has climbed to be the highest in Europe but with no drop in overall crime rates. This is a very important debate for the crime victim support movement to engage in. Arguably, it is in the interests of the crime victim to not be victimised again, and only secondly to see the offender caught and punished. But it is surely in the interests of all parties to use the most efficient and effective means to prevent future crimes occurring.

Finally, the sorts of responses required to prevent repeat victimisation are not be the exclusive responsibility of the police, nor should they be. Whilst it is clear that a central role of an effective strategy would devolve to police, it is also imperative that the active collaboration of a range of local agencies over a sustained period of time is required. A strategy to address repeat victimisation in Australia would have to, without a force CPO, seek other mechanisms for delivering some of the target hardening measures. A range of collaborative options come to mind, for example, sub-contracting to commercial security providers, a protocol with the state/territory housing commission, or a partnership with a community organisation. None of these options are mutually exclusive and each carries their own advantages and disadvantages. Perhaps in part due to the rather fragmented nature of (generic) victim support services in Australia, there appears to be little involvement of this sector in prevention measures. However, victim support is a crucial element of strategies to prevent repeat victimisation and ways must be found of delivering it (10).

(10) Public investment (in clear cost benefit terms) in high risk individual targets does, of course, have a precedent in Australia. Fire brigades install smoke detector alarms in residential homes free of charge as a fire prevention measure. Some local Victim Support (VS) schemes in the UK have become involved in target hardening measures and the use of alarms for vulnerable clients. VS is also piloting new software designed to assist local schemes in identifying and monitoring repeat victimisation. However, VS has been less closely involved in developments of late

than in the early days (Helen Reeves, Director, Victim Support, *Personal Communication with the Author*, February 1997).

Repeat Victimization, the Crime Victim and Prevention

The implications of this approach are significant. The potential in preventing repeat victimisation is a reduction in overall crime levels by 15- 20%, and by similar amounts for various offence types. The implied cost benefits are enormous, not only in financial terms but in terms of the benefits to individuals and communities (11). I am sure that, by now, it is blindingly apparent that repeat victimisation demands a central role in prevention strategies for the crime victim.

The impact of crime on individuals is well known (see Maguire & Pointing 1988 for example). This does of course vary according to the type of offence and according to personal characteristics of the crime victim. The cumulative effects of repeat victimisation have been more thoroughly researched in the areas of sexual abuse and domestic violence (see for example Fleming 1997 and Dobash & Dobash 1992). It is less well known that similar trauma can occur for victims of property crime. The problem for victims of any repeat crimes is that the response, or lack of it, from agencies serve to compound the negative aftermath (the process known as *revictimisation*, see for example Paterson in Sumner *et al* eds., 1996:227). It is probable that many repeat incidents are not reported to police for this reason. Nothing then is done to arrest the probability of repeat victimisation on the third or fourth or fifth etc occasion. These then are only quantified in crime victim surveys.

Jan van Dijk (in Sumner *et al* eds., 1996:130), the eminent Dutch criminologist, has said of victims of crime that they,

“are sharply aware of their interest in better self-protection. They are therefore the government’s natural allies in campaigns for improved situational or community-based crime prevention. The public’s spontaneous tendency to be very concerned about its safety must not be seen as problematic. It should rather be seen as ‘healthy anxiety’ and a contribution to a better control of crime.”

It is inevitable that a person victimised by crime has, after the event, a heightened awareness of it. And ‘awareness’ is very different to ‘fear of crime’. To a certain extent Neighbourhood Watch type initiatives are based on this premise. The action of crime victims to improve their safety and security, whether by window locks or self defence classes, is a rational response to victimisation and a method of regaining a sense of control and confidence. Most victim support services focus on crisis intervention. This involves three basic concerns: “providing victims with safety and security, providing them with an opportunity to ventilate and receive validation for their stories, and helping them predict and prepare them for the future.” (Young in Sumner *et al* eds., 1996:234 *my emphasis*)

(11) Janice Webb, evaluator of the *Crime Concern UK Direct Line Homesafe Burglary Prevention Programme*, writes about an investment in improving the security of 15% of the vulnerable households in the target area over one year, achieving a likely reduction in burglary rates of 30% over 12 months. She also recommends that such programmes be located in areas with a sufficiently high crime rate of about 10% plus (*personal communication* with Yvonne Korn, Director, National Campaign Against Violence And Crime, February 1997).

Very little attention has been paid to the role agencies can play in assisting crime victims in this tendency for improved self-protection or stabilisation (12). Crime victims have been just as ignored as a focus for crime prevention as they have in the criminal justice system. Traditionally, crime prevention has located its activities in measures designed to divert or apprehend offenders, and in a variety of situational responses in the environment. However, if considered as *the* unit around which a multi-agency and law enforcement response revolves (rather than an area or an offence type), the crime victim has the potential to become the focus for investigation, detection, support, community liaison and prevention. Core components of a strategy to prevent repeat victimisation are given at Appendix A.

Moreover, an increasing amount of research is indicating that crime victim priorities are not necessarily those of law enforcement agencies. For example, crime victims report being more satisfied with intervention by police and prosecutors if they are treated well (ie kept informed and treated with sensitivity) even if the outcomes are not those which are ideally desired (Wemmers in Sumner *et al* eds., 1996:133). Similarly, crime victims tend to comment on the quality of service provided and the level of attention their crime receives, whereas the police relate success to making arrests (Gill *et al* 1996). So those who regard client care policies with some cynicism should really look again at their import.

The West Yorkshire research team referred to two schisms in crime control. The first I have elaborated on but the second is that between crime prevention and victim support. This, they assert, is a wholly artificial one. Repeat victimisation (Anderson *et al* 1995:3) is a:

reconciliation of reactive and pro-active responses to crime. Crime prevention and victim support are necessary for the same people (recent victims) at same time (promptly after their victimisation). Reaction to the last offence, if it has a preventative component, is pro-action to the next.

Farrell (1993 in Anderson *et al* 1995:20) has linked the occurrence of repeat victimisation to routine activity theory. The three elements of motivated offender, suitable victim and absence of capable guardian must coincide for a crime incident to occur. "The idea that a crime can be prevented by removing any one of these three essential elements is breathtakingly simple, but defines the entire repertoire of crime prevention methods." It is suggested that the focus on the crime victim (on the basis of their 'suitability' in the above context) in response and detection is not only an effective way of marshalling resources but also a route for easy collaboration for agencies to address prevention.

(12) Many victim support agencies are also remis in not having paid enough attention to this. The exception would be domestic violence and sexual abuse services which have developed strategies of safety planning with individual clients.

Issues of Concern

One of the biggest areas of concern with a repeat victimisation approach is the potential it carries for victim blaming. The ambivalence if not distaste with which crime victims are regarded has been well documented (13). Indeed, criminal victimisation carries with it a highly charged dose of self blame and loathing. Prevention strategies for repeat victimisation include measures for agencies to implement. They also include suggestions for the crime victim. If these are not taken up, for whatever reason, and the person or household is victimised again, it would be an easy response to say “It told you so ...” This is victim blaming at its most polite. Taken to an extreme, the unwillingness or incapacity of the crime victim to undertake precautionary measures may result in the agencies withdrawing their protection and concern.

Walklate (1989:294) has claimed that ‘victim blaming’ prevention strategies for the most part presume victims precipitate their victimisation (14). There are a number of points to be made about this. First, the victim cannot be held solely responsible for preventative measures to be enacted. Second, by calling for police assistance, the crime victim initiates the intervention. Third, preventative measures must be geared carefully to those individuals most at risk of repeat victimisation - the young, single person households, those experiencing multiple deprivation and single parents, and be sensitive to the context of their lives. As Farrell and Pease (1994:9) have written,

“the phenomenon of repeat victimisation quite accurately identifies those who are most likely to be victimised, but it provides no uniform effective responses to it. It tells who needs crime prevention help, but not precisely what help they need. This is a strength rather than a weakness. The variety of crime prevention needs to reflect the variety of crime. The range of preventative techniques must be commensurate with the range of victim circumstances.”

The same concept applies whether the victim is a commercial premises or a black family victimised by racially motivated attack. After all, the *leitmotif* of the famous Kirkholt burglary experiment in the UK was to achieve prevention “by all locally appropriate means”. Fourth, a strategy to prevent repeat victimisation contains a number of interventions only one of which specifically involves the victim, and which involve a number of different delivery mechanisms. Fifth, an offender is, in the final analysis, responsible for his/her own actions. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, a comprehensive crime prevention strategy for a locality, or a particular offence or a particular set of victims, would not put all its eggs into the one repeat victimisation basket.

(13) An interesting discussion of this issue can be found in McFarlane in Sumner *et al* eds., 1996:259).

(14) This was an early avenue of theorising for criminologists. Van Dijk in Maguire and Pointing (1988:119) refers to Mendelsohn (1963) for this.

The arguments for focusing attention on repeat victimisation are alluring. Much more research needs to be conducted into this area but sufficient evidence exists in Australia to contemplate at least a well evaluated pilot program for property-related offences. On a more cautionary note, the more complex issues and dynamics involved in much personal crime urges a thorough examination of the literature and careful construction of an intervention program.

For any offence, however, repeat victimisation brings the crime victim centre stage in prevention strategies.

**CORE COMPONENTS TO A STRATEGY TO PREVENT REPEAT
VICTIMISATION**

GROUNDWORK: essentially involves “selling the concept” as worthwhile of attention. Idea initially raised on a one-to-one basis with agency opinion-leaders.

INTER-AGENCY COLLABORATION: Move to convene an inter-agency group to discuss existing research evidence and its implications. Group to include police, local crime prevention policy-makers, victim support agency(s), researchers, housing providers, and insurance representatives. Composition may vary according to the offence type to be focussed on. Decide which offence to concentrate on. Discuss the potential resource implications for each agency if a strategy to prevent repeat victimisation was piloted. Consider whether publicity to a pilot initiative would be useful or detrimental.

DATA COLLECTION: Collect data on patterns of victimisation with as much detail as possible. Sources would include police recorded offences (and those reported in incident books), victim surveys, insurance agency data, and information from other providers (government and non-government).

PROGRAM CONSTRUCTION: Construct a framework program that outlines a gradation from minimum level response, steps two and three, etc, and with what ‘triggers’ for what level of intervention. This will include working out what characteristics of the personal or property crime victim will generate what level of priority response. This is about risk factors and an elevation of the prevention objective from deflection to detection. The different modes of intervention are extensive and the gradation of response should reflect “all locally appropriate means”. Build in the evaluative mechanisms.

DELIVERY MECHANISMS: Consider the mechanisms for delivering interventions. Again these should reflect local resources. In responses to residential burglary, for example, some UK schemes have police refer the incident out to a local victim support scheme which provides both security installation and initial emotional support and debriefing. Should also include the delivery of information about process of investigation, etc.

REVIEW POSSIBLE OUTCOMES: Run through all possible implications for the approach and consider negatives such as ‘bad’ publicity, the unwillingness or incapacity of victims to participate, potential for ‘victim blaming’, insufficient volume of crime, capacity of participating agencies to deliver their input and with what consequences, etc. Then rework the program in the light of this.

ESTABLISH PROTOCOLS & LOCATION: Design procedures internal to participating agencies. This is especially important for police as internal communications and information sharing between shifts and the various repositories of crime data is vital. An inter-agency protocol and method of pooling data will also be vital. Create time frames for reviewing the program and its outcomes. Decide on the location of the program. Ideally it should be a ‘high crime area’.

IMPLEMENTATION: Train all staff/officers/volunteers on the reasons for the new approach and duties involved. Integrate any reasonable suggestions and concerns. Implement the program.

REVIEW: Review and evaluate. Publish and disseminate results.

Robyn Holder, ACT Victims of Crime Co-ordinator, 06 257 8452

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson D *et al* (1995), *Biting Back: Tackling Repeat Burglary & Car Crime*, Home Office Crime Detection & Prevention Series No.58, HMSO.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (1996) *Women's Safety Survey*.
- Bennett T & Durie L, (December 1996) "Domestic Burglary Task Force: Cambridge", in *FOCUS*, Home Office Police Department.
- Burquest R, *et al*, (1992) "Lessons from Schools" in *Policing*, vol 8. Summer 1992.
- Dobash R.E and Dobash R.P (1992), *Women, Violence and Social Change*, Routledge, London.
- Farrell G & Pease K, (1993) *Once Bitten, Twice Bitten: repeat victimisation & its implications for crime prevention*, Home Office Crime Prevention Unit Series No.46, HMSO.
- Farrell G and Pease K (September 1994), *Repeat Victim Support*, Unpublished paper.
- Fleming J (January 1997), "Prevalence of Childhood Sexual Abuse in a Community Sample of Australian Women" *Medical Journal of Australia*, vol 166.
- Forrester D *et al*, (1988) *The Kirkholt Burglary Prevention Project, Rochdale*, Home Office Crime Prevention Unit Series No.13, HMSO.
- Gardner J (January 1994) "Violence Against Women" *JUSTATS*, South Australian Office of Crime Statistics, 3.
- Gill M *et al* (1996) *The Crime Allocation System: Police Investigations into Burglary and Auto Crime*, Home Office Police Research Series No.16, HMSO.
- Government Statistician's Office (1996), *Crime and Safety: Trends in Queensland*, Queensland Government.
- Hanmer J & Stanko E.A, (1985) "Stripping Away the Rhetoric of Protection: violence to women, law and the state in Britain and the USA", in *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 13.
- Hunter, S (1996) *Domestic Violence Phone-In*, Office of Women's Policy, Northern Territory Government.
- Johnson V *et al*, (1994) *Crime on Industrial Estates*, Home Office Crime Prevention Unit Series No.54, HMSO.

Lloyd S *et al* (1994), *Preventing Repeated Domestic Violence: a demonstration project on Merseyside*, Home Office Crime Prevention Unit Series No.49, HMSO.

Maguire M and Pointing C *eds* (1988), *Victims of Crime: a new deal*, Open University Press.

Mayhew P, *et al*, (1993) *The 1992 British Crime Survey*, Home Office Research Study No.132, HMSO.

Morgan F, (February 1993) *Break & Enter Dwelling Offences: an analysis using JIS computer files*, Unpublished Paper, Crime Research Centre, University of Western Australia.

Mukherjee S and Carach C (1997), *Crime In Australia: A Statistical Profile*, Australian Institute of Criminology.

National Board for Crime Prevention (May 1994), *Wise After the Event: Tackling Repeat Victimisation*, Home Office, UK.

Phillips T (1995), "State Differences in Burglary Victimisation in Australia: an exploratory analysis" in *Crime Victims Surveys in Australia*, Conference Proceedings, Criminal Justice Commission, Queensland.

Polvi N *et al* (1990) "Repeat Break & Enter Victimisation: Time Course and Crime Prevention Opportunity", *Journal of Political Science & Administration*, 17.

Polvi N *et al* (1991) "The Time Course of Repeat Burglary Victimisation", *British Journal of Criminology*, 31.

Sampson A & Phillips C, (1992) *Multiple Victimisation: Racial Attacks on an East London Estate*, Home Office Crime Prevention Unit Series No.36, HMSO.

Sampson A & Phillips C, (1995) *Reducing Repeat Racial Victimisation on an East London Estate*, Home Office Crime Detection & Prevention Series No.67, HMSO.

Sherman L.W *et al* (1991) ""Predicting Domestic Homicide: Prior Police Contact and Gun Threats" in Steinman (ed) *Woman Battering: Policy Responses*, Cincinnati: Anderson.

Sorenson S.B *et al* (1991) *Repeated Sexual Victimization*, Violence and Victims, 6, (4).

Sumner C *et al* *eds.*, (1996) *International Victimology, Conference Proceedings*, Australian Institute of Criminology.

Thomas P, (March 1993) *SA Crime & Safety Survey, 1991: Break and Enter Offences*, JUSTATS, South Australian Office of Crime Statistics.

Trickett D *et al* (1992) "What is Different About High Crime Areas?" *British Journal of Criminology*, 32.

Trimboli L (April 1995), "Women as Victims and Offenders" *Crime & Justice Bulletin*, No 22, NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research.

Walklate S (1989) *Victimology: The Victim and the Criminal Justice System*, Unwin Hyman, London.

Weatherburn D and Grabosky P (1997), *Strategic Approaches to Property Crime Control*, National Crime Symposium, Australian Institute of Criminology.

West J, (1994) *Unley and Mitcham Home protection Project: victim survey consultant's report*, South Australia Police Department.