



Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba
gov.scot

Repeat Violent Victimization: A Rapid Evidence Review



CRIME AND JUSTICE



Contents

Contents	2
Executive Summary	3
Introduction	3
Methods	3
Key Findings	3
Conclusion	4
1. Introduction.....	5
Violence in Scotland.....	5
Research Questions.....	5
Report Structure	6
Terms and Definitions	6
2. Methods	7
Search	7
Coverage	9
Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria	10
Quality Assessment	10
Strength of the Evidence.....	10
3. Synthesis of the Evidence	12
The Extent and Prevalence of RVV.....	12
What Types of Violence are Repeated?	14
Who are the Victims of RVV?	16
Why Does RVV Occur?	17
When Does RVV Occur?	19
RVV and Repeat Offending: The Overlap.....	19
Preventing RVV	20
4. Conclusion	23
Recommendations for Further Research.....	24
5. References	25
6. Appendices	31
Appendix 1: Quality Assessment of Individual Studies.....	31

Executive Summary

Introduction

Non-sexual violence in Scotland has fallen significantly over the last decade, but has remained broadly stable in more recent years. The Scottish Government are now examining the profile of violence in Scotland in order to drive further reductions. It appears that much of the violent crime in Scotland is concentrated on particular individuals, including those experiencing 'repeat violent victimisation' (RVV). As such, the purpose of this review is to enhance our understanding of RVV by providing a structured and rigorous search and assessment of the evidence.

Methods

To conduct this review, a systematic process of search and assessment was followed, involving an evidence search, application of inclusion and exclusion criteria, a quality assessment and synthesis of the evidence. 43 studies were identified, including academic articles, government reports, surveys, evaluations, evidence reviews and books, based in the UK, Sweden, the Netherlands and the US.

Many of these sources used robust and high quality methods. For example, 20 used nationally representative survey data. There were also at least 6 studies identified which employed qualitative methods. However, the evidence base also suffered from several key shortcomings. In particular, there is a lack of qualitative research on RVV, most of the research comes from outwith Scotland and many identified studies are now dated.

Key Findings

- Overall, evidence from national and international crime surveys shows that violent crime is disproportionately suffered by repeat victims. Although there are limitations as to what crime survey data can reveal about RVV, complementary measures such as police recorded crime and qualitative research produce similar findings.
- The evidence base provides some indication of the types of violence which are repeated, with national and international crime surveys showing that RVV is common for crimes such as assault, threats, robbery and theft.
- In addition, while not the focus of the present review, there is evidence to suggest that domestic violence is an important component of RVV.
- The evidence shows that repeat victims of violence tend to have particular characteristics. Most commonly, it has been demonstrated that repeat victims are often young, male (except in the case of domestic violence), and from deprived socioeconomic backgrounds.
- There are two main explanations for RVV in the literature. One perspective views repeat victimisation as the result of prior victimisation. This means that being victimised once can change individuals or their circumstances in ways

that increase the risk of being victimised again. The second perspective proposes that the factors that led to the initial victimisation are the same factors that lead to subsequent victimisation(s). The evidence indicates that both perspectives contribute to RVV.

- There is evidence to suggest that RVV follows a ‘time course’: that is, a relatively short high-risk period following the initial incident, followed by a rapid decline and levelling off of risk. This has implications for when measures to prevent RVV should be implemented. However, it is unclear from the literature whether this pattern applies to all forms of RVV.
- Violent offending may be an important risk factor for RVV.
- The evidence regarding the nature of RVV suggests that a violence reduction strategy focused on decreasing repeats should concentrate on enhancing the safety and protection of victims after the first violent offence. However, violent crime is yet to have been systematically addressed using such a strategy.

Conclusion

This review has examined 43 studies on RVV. The evidence provided a range of insights into the extent, prevalence and nature of RVV, but must be considered in light of some limitations. In particular, there is a lack of qualitative research on RVV, most research comes from outwith Scotland and many studies were conducted over ten years ago. It is recommended that further research seeks to improve our understanding of RVV by addressing these gaps in the evidence. This will help to ensure that the violence prevention and reduction interventions being delivered in Scotland remain relevant and evidence-based.

1. Introduction

Violence in Scotland

Over the past decade, there has been a significant reduction in non-sexual violent crime in Scotland. This trend is reflected in all established sources. For example, the 2017-18 National Statistics on Recorded Crime in Scotland show that despite a 1% increase in the last year, the number of non-sexual crimes of violence remains lower than all years between 1975 and 2012-13 (Scottish Government, 2018). Similarly, the latest Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) has demonstrated that violent crime has fallen by 46% between 2008-09 and 2017-18 (Scottish Government, 2019). Hospital admissions due to assault have also decreased by 55% between 2008/09 and 2017/18 (ISD, 2019).

Although significant progress has been made, preventing violence remains a key public health priority in Scotland. However, if a sustained and long-term reduction in violent crime is to be supported, there is a need to understand why the violence remaining in Scotland occurs. This will ensure that the violence prevention and reduction interventions being delivered remain relevant and evidence-based.

One potential explanation for the violence remaining in Scotland is that certain individuals experience multiple incidences of violence, which contributes disproportionately to the overall violent crime count. This is known as repeat violent victimisation (RVV), and has received growing attention in the literature in recent years (e.g. Pease, 1998; Farrell, 2005; Graham-Kevan et al., 2015; Ignatans and Pease, 2015). Various authors, in Scotland, the UK and internationally, have argued that while violent crime has declined in absolute terms, the proportion of violence accounted for by those most victimised has in fact increased (AQMeN, 2018; Ignatans and Pease, 2015; Pease and Ignatans, 2016).

The purpose of this review, therefore, is to enhance our understanding of RVV by providing a structured and rigorous search and assessment of the existing evidence base. It will seek to gain an overview of the density and quality of evidence in this area, and support the programme of work on non-sexual violence being carried out in the Scottish Government's Justice Analytical Services (JAS) division.

Research Questions

The research questions for the Rapid Evidence Review (RER) are as follows:

- What is the extent and prevalence of RVV?
- What types of violent crime are repeated?
- Who are the victims of RVV?
- Why does RVV occur?
- When does RVV occur?
- Do victims of RVV also perpetrate violence?

- How can RVV be prevented?

Report Structure

The RER will begin by providing an overview of the key terms and definitions used in the report. It will then describe the methodological approach taken to conduct the review, including the search procedures, inclusion and exclusion criteria, quality assessment and strength of the evidence. The findings from the evidence are then synthesised with reference to the research questions. The RER concludes with a discussion of the key findings, the strength of evidence on which they are based, the gaps in evidence identified, and suggestions for areas where further research would be beneficial.

Terms and Definitions

Repeat victimisation is defined as the experience of being a victim of the same type of offence more than once (Farrell and Sousa, 2001). The target of repeat victimisation can be an individual, a group of people, a property, a vehicle or another unit of analysis. Repeat victimisation is a subset of multiple victimisation, which is defined as the experience of being a victim of a number of different offences, regardless of the type (Office for National Statistics (ONS), 2013). Other terms used in the literature include re-victimisation, multi-victimisation, polyvictimisation and recidivist victimisation.

RVV, therefore, is the recurrence of violent crime against the same target. The target for RVV is the individual person, which allows for use of the more specific term 'repeat victim'. Although 'violence' encompasses a wide range of offences, this review will focus specifically on non-sexual crimes of violence, including assault and robbery.

2. Methods

This RER followed a systematic process of search and assessment, which involved four broad stages:

1. Evidence search
2. Application of inclusion and exclusion criteria for assessing relevance
3. Quality assessment of studies
4. Synthesis of the body of evidence

The details of stages 1-3 are described below, with the synthesis of the evidence presented in Section 3.

Search

In the first instance, the search for studies was carried out by the Scottish Government Library Service using KandE. KandE is an online search engine which covers a range of high quality databases, which are detailed in the below table.

Table 1: List of Databases Searched

Search Engines
Academic Search Ultimate (asn)
AGRIS (edsagr)
Australian Research Data Commons (edsard)
BioOne Complete (edsbio)
Bloomsbury Collections (edsblc)
British Standards Online (edsbsi)
Business Source Index (bsx)
Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (edschh)
Credo Reference (edscrc)
Credo Reference: Academic Core (edscra)
Criminal Justice Abstracts with Full Text (i3h)
DigitalNZ (edsdnz)
Emerald Insight (edsemr)
ERIC (eric)

FT.com (edsfit)
GreenFILE (8gh)
Military & Government Collection (mth)
New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics Online (edsdeo)
Oxfam Policy & Practice (edsoxf)
Oxford Bibliographies (edsobb)
Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (edsodb)
Oxford Reference (edsoro)
Oxford's Who's Who & Who Was Who (edsoww)
Political Science Complete (poh)
Public Information Online (edspio)
RePEc (edsrep)
SAGE Knowledge (edsskl)
SAGE Research Methods (edsrem)
ScienceDirect (edselp)
Sociology Source Ultimate (sxi)
Journals
Directory of Open Access Journals (edsdoj)
JSTOR Journals (edsjsr)
Books
Books at JSTOR (edsjbk)
eBook Collection (EBSCOhost) (nlebk)
Library Services
Biodiversity Heritage Library (edsbhl)
British Library Document Supply Centre Inside Serials & Conference Proceedings (edsbl)
British Library EThOS (edsble)
Canadian Electronic Library (edscl)
E-LIS (Eprints in Library & Information Science) (edseli)
Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts (lxh)

This search was informed by key words submitted by analysts within the JAS division of the Scottish Government. The search phrases included:

- “multiple victimisation” OR “multiple victimization”
- “repeat victimisation” OR “repeat victimization”
- “repeat violent victimisation” OR “repeat violent victimization”
- repeat AND (victim OR victims OR victimisation OR victimization)
- revictimisation OR re-victimisation OR revictimization OR re-victimization
- polyvictimisation OR polyvictimization OR poly-victimisation OR poly-victimization

These search phrases were used to identify studies exploring the extent, prevalence and nature of RVV. However, it is important to note that there are certain types of violence which are inherently repetitive (e.g. domestic violence and racial attacks) which are not explored extensively in this review. Although there is a wealth of literature on types of RVV such as these, given the timescales for this review, and the fact that some types of RVV have distinct causes and consequences to others, it was not practical or feasible to review and quality assess this literature for the purposes of the present RER. Therefore, while this review covers a range of literature on RVV, it should not be regarded as a comprehensive or definitive account of the evidence. Rather, it constitutes a collation of relevant material which could be identified and accessed within a relatively short period of time.

Coverage

The specified time coverage for the search was from the last 5 years and the geographical coverage was international. A series of broader searches were then conducted using Google and Google Scholar, as a sweep of studies that may not have been found in the initial search. In addition, a snowballing technique was employed whereby the references of studies were reviewed for additional evidence.

The geographical coverage of the secondary literature search was also international. However, although the initial literature search only covered material from the last 5 years, the secondary literature search identified sources dating back to 1990. The central reason for this is that in the 1990s and 2000s there was a proliferation of research on RVV, as interest in the issue grew in research and policymaking circles to varying degrees in the UK and elsewhere (Shaw and Pease, 2000). Excluding research conducted within this period would therefore mean discounting a substantial proportion of the existing evidence on RVV. The implications of including these older studies are discussed below.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Using the initial search results, the relevance of the studies to the research questions was assessed. The table below provides a summary of the inclusion and exclusion criteria applied to the selection of the studies.

Table 2: Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Study Design	Primary empirical research (qualitative or quantitative), evaluation or secondary reviews	Primarily theoretical or conceptual in nature, lacking empirical evidence or explanation of methodology
Language	Written or available in English	Not written or available in English
Publication Date	From 1990 to 2019	Pre-1990
Publication Format	Journal articles, peer-reviewed materials, working papers, evaluation, government reports, discussion papers, books and book chapters, other academic research	Student paper, dissertation, conference paper
Aim of Study	Studies exploring the extent, prevalence or nature of repeat violent victimisation or repeat victimisation (including violence)	Studies focused exclusively on repeat victimisation of other crimes (e.g. burglary, property crime)

Applying these criteria led to an evidence base comprising a wide range of sources, including academic articles, government reports, surveys, evaluations, evidence reviews and books. The studies were based in England and Wales, Scotland, Sweden, the Netherlands and the US. The studies identified are detailed in Appendix 1¹.

Quality Assessment

Each of the studies identified was then quality assessed. This involved identifying the key characteristics of the studies and their limitations, which are summarised in Appendix 1.

Strength of the Evidence

The body of evidence identified in this report consists of 43 studies. Many of these use robust and high quality methods. For example, 20 use nationally representative survey data, which are either cross-sectional or longitudinal in nature. There were also at least 6 studies identified which employed qualitative methods, including

¹ Additional studies identified but not quality assessed can be found in the list of references. These studies provided important background, contextual and supportive information, but did not specifically present evidence on RVV.

interviews and focus groups, providing a more in-depth insight into the nature of RVV. The remaining studies predominantly used quantitative methods of data collection and analysis, including police records and surveys.

However, as well as the limitations highlighted in Appendix 1, the evidence base also suffers from several further shortcomings. Firstly, although some qualitative research was identified, the overwhelming majority of studies use quantitative methods. Given the importance of qualitative research for illuminating social processes and meaning, the lack of qualitative investigation of RVV appears to be a gap in the evidence base. Moreover, most of the research identified was conducted outwith Scotland, with the majority from England and Wales and the US. Indeed, only 3 studies collected primary data in Scotland (Scottish Government, 2019; Shaw and Pease, 2000; Farrell et al., 2005). The findings from many studies, therefore, are not necessarily applicable to Scotland. Finally, much of the research is now dated, with only 18 of the studies identified published in the last 10 years. This has implications for the findings of the review. In particular, some of the conclusions of earlier research may no longer be applicable or relevant in the present day. The findings discussed below should, therefore, be considered in the context of the limitations identified.

3. Synthesis of the Evidence

This section will synthesize the findings from the evidence base in regard to the research questions stated in the Introduction.

The Extent and Prevalence of RVV

A range of studies have sought to establish the extent and prevalence of RVV using crime surveys. Crime surveys typically ask a representative sample of people which crimes, if any, have been committed against them over a fixed period. The rate of RVV can be estimated by calculating the percentage of incidents of violence that are repeated against the same persons over the specified period.

Evidence from several crime surveys has shown that repeat victimisation represents a significant proportion of all violent offences. In Scotland, the most recent SCJS has shown that although fewer than 1 in every 100 adults suffered RVV in 2017/18, their experiences accounted for more than half (59%) of all violent crime (Scottish Government, 2019). These repeat victims are estimated to have experienced on average three violent crimes each during 2017/18, though a small proportion of the population (0.1%) were high frequency repeat victims experiencing five or more incidents.

Similar results have been shown in previous sweeps of the SCJS, although the proportion of adults experiencing two or more and five or more incidents of violence were all lower in 2017/18 than in 2008/09 (Scottish Government, 2019). However, there have been fluctuations in these figures across this time period. For example, those experiencing two or more violent crimes has been below the 2008/09 baseline since 2010/11 with the exception of 2016/17 when the estimate was not significantly different to the 2008/09 figure. The return to a significant decrease in 2017/18 suggests that the 2016/17 figure may have been an outlier in an otherwise declining trend. On the other hand, the proportion of adults experiencing five or more violent crimes has shown a less consistent trend and has only been below the 2008/09 baseline figure in 2014/15 and 2017/18. As such, it will be important to monitor these findings into the future to see whether the lower victimisation rate seen in 2017/18 is maintained.

More detailed analysis of repeat victimisation in Scotland using crime survey data was conducted by Shaw and Pease (2000). Using the 1982, 1988, 1992 and 1996 sweeps of the then Scottish Crime Survey (SCS), Shaw and Pease (2000) demonstrated that a range of crimes are disproportionately suffered by repeat victims, with the probability of becoming a victim again increasing as the number of prior victimisations increase. Although Shaw and Pease (2000) did not focus specifically on violent crime, their analysis included 'crime against the person', covering assault, personal theft and robbery.

Similar results are found elsewhere in the UK. The most recent Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) has demonstrated that a disproportionately large number of violent crimes are suffered by a small number of victims experiencing RVV (ONS, 2019). The findings showed that in the year ending March 2018, 57%

of violent incidents were experienced by repeat victims. 18% of all victims of violence were victimised twice, while 7% were victimised three times or more. Further, a study by Ignatans and Pease (2015) analysed data from a total of close to 600,000 respondents to the CSEW over a 30 year period (1982-2012), and found that although crime has declined in absolute terms, the proportion of crime accounted for by those most victimised has increased. Ignatans and Pease (2015) examined three general crime types (vehicle, property and personal), with this pattern applying to each. The personal crimes examined included wounding (where the incident results in severe or less serious injury), assault (where the incident results in minor injury), robbery and theft from the person².

At the international level, the International Crime Victims Survey (ICVS) has also demonstrated that a high proportion of violent crimes occur against individuals that have already been victimised. The ICVS has been carried out six times over the period 1989–2010. Although national samples are relatively small, the ICVS is standardised and far-reaching, and has been conducted in more than 80 countries (Kesteren et al., 2013). In the ICVS, respondents who report victimisation of a particular type are asked how often they have been victimised by such a crime in the course of the last year. It is therefore possible to determine the proportion of crimes repeated against the same persons, across country and crime type, over the period of the last 12 months. The ICVS has consistently shown that across all included countries RVV constitutes a large proportion of all violent offences, ranging from 16% to 39% depending on the type of violence considered (Kesteren et al., 2013).

However, while it is possible to assess the prevalence of RVV with good precision using crime surveys, there are limits to what this data can tell us about RVV. In particular, in order to reliably estimate trends of incidents of crime, crime surveys tend to cap the number of incidents which can be reported as a series, commonly at 5 (Farrell and Pease, 2007; Lauritsen et al., 2012). The cap ensures that survey estimates of incidence are not disproportionately affected by a very small number of respondents who report an extremely high number of incidents, which can be highly variable between survey years. This enhances the ability of the survey to monitor underlying trends consistently (Grant et al., 2016), but limits the influence of the relatively small number of victims who yield a high number of violent victimisations on incidence estimates. Nonetheless, even with a cap in place it is clear that experiences of crime are dominated by a group of repeat victims of violence.

An additional problem with crime surveys is that they are time-based, typically asking individuals about their experiences during a recall period of one year. This means that some victimisations will appear to be single incidents but may be repeats of crimes suffered in the previous year, or the first in a series extending into the next year. Finally, crime surveys rely on recall; it is possible that respondents may forget or exclude crimes they suffered (Shaw and Pease, 2000). These factors

² This is different to how violent crime is measured in the SCJS. In the SCJS, violent crime includes assault (including serious assault, minor assault with injury, minor assault with no or negligible injury, and attempted assault) and robbery (Scottish Government, 2019).

mean that even the large concentration of violent crime found in crime surveys is likely to be an underestimate (ONS, 2016a; Farrell and Pease, 1993).

A complementary measure of RVV comes from police recorded crime. A range of studies have examined the extent of RVV using this type of data, and have also demonstrated that a high proportion of violence is experienced by repeat victims (Lloyd et al., 1994; Hanmer et al., 1999; Shaw and Pease, 2000; Taylor, 2004; Matthews et al., 2001; Sampson and Phillips, 1992). Shaw and Pease's (2000) research is particularly relevant, given that it was conducted in Scotland. Shaw and Pease obtained data from police recording systems in three divisions: Falkirk, Maryhill and Dundee. Although the authors did not focus specifically on violence, they did collect data on assault. They used data collected over the course of a year, and found that around 10 per cent of those suffering assault suffered two or more incidents during the period represented.

However, this research is now dated. Moreover, there are limitations to identifying repeat victims using police data. In particular, it is well known that police data tend to underestimate the extent of crime, as not all incidents are reported or recorded. The issue of underreporting of crime to the police is compounded in the case of repeat victimisation, as repeat victims are less inclined to report crimes to the police than others (Weisel, 2005). Further, even if a crime is reported to the police, there are obstacles in its identification as a repetition of an earlier crime due to police recording practices (Shaw and Pease, 2000).

One way to address the shortcomings with survey and police recorded data is to supplement the findings with qualitative research, which provides a more detailed insight into the nature of RVV. Shaw and Pease (2000) adopted such an approach in their investigation of repeat victimisation in Scotland, conducting interviews with repeat victims and offenders, which showed the familiar repeat victimisation phenomena: crime being disproportionately suffered by repeat victims. However, although relevant, their study was conducted nearly 20 years ago, and does not focus specifically on violence. Indeed, this is reflective of a general paucity of qualitative research in the literature on RVV, with most studies assessing the extent of RVV using quantitative data. In the absence of additional measures of RVV beyond the SCJS in Scotland, it is difficult to fully ascertain the current extent and nature of RVV.

What Types of Violence are Repeated?

The SCJS definition of violence is comprehensive, covering assault (including serious assault, attempted assault, minor assault with no-negligible and minor injury) and robbery (Scottish Government, 2019). However, at present, the small number of repeat victims in annual SCJS samples makes it difficult to look at their experiences in detail from any one sweep, including the types of violence which they experience (Grant et al., 2016)³. Further, although Shaw and Pease (2000)

³ There are plans to bring data from several sweeps of the SCJS together into a pooled sample, with the aim of enabling further examination of experiences and the characteristics of crime, including that experienced by repeat victims.

analysed 'assault' as a distinct category in their analysis of police recorded crime, they did not individually examine the different types of violent crime which fell under the broad category of 'crimes against the person' in their analysis of the SCS.

RVV is broken down by offence type in the CSEW. The latest CSEW found that RVV was most common for violence without injury (25% of victims), followed by assault with minor injury (23%) and violence with injury (21%) (ONS, 2019). In addition, RVV is also broken down by the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator in the CSEW – stranger, acquaintance or domestic. While domestic violence is not the focus of the present RER, evidence from the CSEW suggests that it is an important component of RVV, with the most recent results showing that a higher proportion of victims of domestic violence were repeat victims (34%) than victims of acquaintance violence (27%) and stranger violence (15%). However, these results come from the face-to-face interview of the CSEW, which are impacted by the cap on the number of incidents which can be reported as a series. In addition, domestic violence reported in this way is likely to be an underestimation because of the high level of underreporting of this type of violence in face-to-face interviews⁴ (ONS, 2019).

Hence, the self-completion module tends to capture higher levels of domestic violence than the face-to-face module. This module also employs a broader definition of domestic 'abuse', covering non-physical abuse, physical abuse (including threats or force), sexual assault and stalking, as opposed to just physical violence (ONS, 2016b). The proportion of victims of domestic abuse experiencing repeat victimisation in the CSEW was last reported on in 2016, which showed that over 30% of domestic abuse victims suffered more than one victimisation (15% experienced 2 victimisations and 16% experienced 3 or more victimisations) within the 12 month reference period (ONS, 2016b). The 30% of victims of domestic abuse who experienced more than one victimisation amounted to over half (60%) of domestic abuse incidents estimated by the CSEW (ONS, 2016b). However, nearly 70% of respondents opted not to provide an answer to this question, reducing the estimate of the proportion of victims who were victimised more than once (ONS, 2016b).

Similarly, the SCJS partner abuse self-completion module is reported on biannually. 'Partner abuse' is defined in the SCJS as any form of physical, non-physical or sexual abuse, which takes place within the context of a close relationship, committed either in the home or elsewhere (Scottish Government, 2019). The latest report showed that of those who reported partner abuse within the 12 months prior to interview, 12% experienced two incidents, 6% experienced three incidents and 5% experienced four or more incidents (Scottish Government, 2019). A further 13% said that there were too many incidents to count. Overall, around three in five respondents (61%) had experienced more than one incident⁵. In addition, just

⁴For example, of those aged 16 to 59 who reported being victims of physical domestic violence in the 2015 CSEW self-completion module on domestic violence, only 12% also reported being a victim of domestic violence in the face-to-face interview (ONS, 2016b)

⁵ This excludes those who responded 'don't know/can't remember' or who did not wish to answer.

under two-thirds (63%) of those who reported an incident of partner abuse in the 12 months prior to interview also reported at least one incident prior to this period.

The ICVS has also broken down repeat victimisation by type of crime (Farrell et al., 2005). The ICVS covers 11 crime types, including three types of violence: assault and threats, robbery and personal theft. RVV was most prevalent for assault and threats, with 39% of victims being repeat victims in the last 12 months, followed by robbery (22% of victims) and personal theft (16% of victims). Repeat victimisation is more common for these types of crime than others, such as property crime (Kesteren et al., 2013). This is reflected in evidence from other studies, which have also shown that although repeat victimisation occurs for all types of crime, rates of repeat victimisation are on average highest for violence (Graham-Kevan et al., 2015). Despite the lack of Scottish-specific evidence, therefore, the CSEW and the ICVS suggest that the types of violent crime which are repeated include assault, threats, robbery and theft. In addition, domestic violence is an important component of RVV.

Moreover, while this RER is focused primarily on repeat victimisation, research not covered in this review has highlighted the overlapping nature of this phenomenon with multiple victimisation. As above discussed, repeat victimisation refers to those who are victims of the same type of crime more than once, whereas multiple victimisation refers to those who are victims of multiple types of crime (Scottish Government, 2019). However, it has been highlighted that repeat victims often become more likely to be victimised more than once by another crime type (e.g. Hope et al., 2001). Indeed, Shaw and Pease (2000) examined cross-crime type sequences and demonstrated that while assaults best predicts future victimisation of the same type, victimisation by violence follows repeat housebreaking three times more often than one might expect.

Who are the Victims of RVV?

It is well established that the likelihood of experiencing violent crime is not evenly spread across the population, and varies across characteristics. For example, the most recent CSEW has shown that men, younger people, those who are single, those who are unemployed and those living in deprived areas are most likely to be victims of violent crime (ONS, 2019). In Scotland, the most recent SCJS showed that younger groups and those living in the 15% most deprived areas were more likely to experience violence than others (Scottish Government, 2019).

In the context of RVV, the evidence shows that repeat victims of violence also tend to have particular characteristics. For example, Jansson et al. (2007) analysed the 2006/07 sweep of the then British Crime Survey (BCS), covering England and Wales, and found that repeat victims of violence are often young, male, non-white and from deprived socioeconomic backgrounds. In Australia, analysis of the nationally representative National Crime and Safety Survey (NCSS) showed that men and younger people were more likely to be repeat victims of personal crimes (including assault and robbery) than others (Mukherjee and Carach, 1993). More recently, a review of 106 studies on repeat victimisation found that the risk factors

for being a repeat victim of violence include being male, younger, not married, on a low income and unemployed (van Reemst et al., 2013).

There is also research from the US which provides some insight into the characteristics typically associated with experiencing RVV. For example, in their analysis of victims of violence who were admitted to hospital over a four-year period in Ohio, the US, Buss and Abdu (1995) found that compared to one-time victims, repeat victims were more likely to be non-white and from deprived socioeconomic backgrounds. Similarly, Cooper et al. (2000) conducted a case-control study of persons admitted to a trauma centre due to violent assault in Baltimore, the US, over a 16-month period. They found that victims of RVV were more likely than single victims to be African American, male, unemployed and on a low income.

Outlaw et al. (2002) also demonstrated significant individual-level predictors for RVV in their analysis of around 5,000 residents of Seattle, the US. In particular, being non-white and having a low income were associated with experiencing more than one violent victimisation in the last two years. However, these studies are based on relatively small, non-representative samples in the US, making it difficult to determine the extent to which they apply to Scotland. Indeed, it is likely that a similar study would produce different results in Scotland, given the different ethnic composition of the US.

Although most research finds that men are more likely to experience RVV than women, the exception to this is in cases of domestic violence. As above discussed, while not explored extensively in this RER, evidence from the CSEW has shown that when RVV is broken down by the relationship between the victim and the perpetrator, domestic violence emerges as an important component of RVV (ONS, 2019). However, in the case of domestic violence, research has shown that women tend to compose the majority of victims (Walby and Towers, 2017).

In summary, while it is possible to infer from the existing literature who the victims of RVV are likely to be, at present there is no Scotland-specific research that has sought to identify the characteristics of repeat victims of violence. Although the SCJS provides useful estimates of the proportion of adults who have been a victim of violence more than once, more detailed analysis would be required to establish the exact characteristics of these individuals. The small sample size of repeat victims of violence in the SCJS also means that any difference found in characteristics between single and repeat victims may lack statistical significance. It is therefore unclear if the characteristics associated with being a single victim of violence are the same for repeat victims in the Scottish context.

Why Does RVV Occur?

The research suggests two general explanations for RVV (Clay-Warner et al., 2016; Tseloni and Pease, 2004). The first perspective views subsequent victimisation as the direct consequence of prior victimisation, which has come to be known as the 'state dependence' perspective. This perspective suggests that being victimised once can change individuals or their social circumstances in ways that heighten or 'boost' the risk of future victimisation (Clay-Warner et al., 2016). In particular, it has

been argued that the experience of victimisation puts into motion a 'victim labelling' process that enhances a person's risk of future victimisation. That is, when a person experiences an initial victimisation it can make them appear vulnerable, which leads potential offenders to view them as targets (Ousey et al., 2008).

It is also argued that experiences with victimisation can result in changes in people's activities and lifestyle that elevate their probability of future victimisation (Ousey et al., 2008). For example, in response to a previous victimisation experience, individuals may withdraw from pre-existing pro-social attachments and commitments and become socially marginalised (Schreck et al., 2006). Victims who withdraw may find themselves isolated from the conventional social ties that ordinarily constrain their involvement in high-risk activities, such as using drugs or associating with delinquent peers, which can in turn increase exposure to offenders (Schreck et al., 2006). Victims of violence may also retaliate, which increases victimisation risk via counter retaliation (Jacobs and Wright, 2006).

State dependence effects can also result from knowledge gained by the perpetrator after the first offence is committed. For example, taking the example of domestic violence, if during the first incident the police are not called, neighbours do not intervene, or the victim's family and friends do not become aware, the perceived risks for the offender are lower on subsequent victimisations, and they are more likely to perpetrate again. According to this perspective, therefore, prior victimisation causally impacts subsequent crime (Ousey et al., 2008).

In contrast, the population heterogeneity perspective proposes that the relationship between victimisation and repeat victimisation is spurious, because the factors that increase one's risk of being victimised the first time are the same factors that lead to subsequent victimisation. There are a range of factors which can make an individual more vulnerable to violence. For example, an individual's occupation can make them vulnerable to being repeatedly victimised, as some jobs have higher risks of violence than others (e.g. the police, security guards, nurses, care workers and public transport workers) (Health and Safety Executive, 2018). People who spend time in particular places, such as bars and nightclubs and on public transport, are also at greater risk of violence (Finney, 2004; Gerrell, 2018). In addition, some areas have higher rates of violent crime than others; living in such areas keeps one vulnerable to RVV (Morenoff et al., 2001).

Demographic characteristics also play a role in the population heterogeneity perspective; as above discussed men, younger people and those living in deprived areas are more likely to be victimised by violence than others (ONS, 2019). The exception to this is domestic violence, where research has shown that women are more likely to be victims than men (Walby and Towers, 2017). Possessing such characteristics, therefore, makes one susceptible to repeated victimisation. The population heterogeneity perspective therefore argues that victimisation has no independent effect on repeat victimisation; rather an underlying stable factor determines both victimisation and repeat victimisation (Turanovic and Ogle, 2017).

Although the state dependence and population heterogeneity perspectives are often treated as competing, most research finds that neither state dependence nor

population heterogeneity alone can explain RVV. Instead, both contribute to risk of RVV (Clay-Warner et al., 2016; Daigle et al., 2008; Everson, 2003; Tseloni and Pease, 2003). For example, using propensity score matching with longitudinal data from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) in the US, Clay-Warner et al. (2016) found that only those with high levels of underlying propensity for violent victimisation (due to being younger, male, non-white and non-married) experienced a 'boost' in risk from a victimisation event. Their results indicate that the same factors that predispose individuals to violent victimisation also amplify the effects of a victimisation event on odds of future victimisation.

A competing perspective within the literature posits that victimisation can actually reduce the risk of future victimisation, as experiencing victimisation makes people aware of risk, which motivates them to take self-protective action to prevent future incidents (Averdijk, 2011, cited in Clay-Warner et al. 2016). However, there is little empirical support for this perspective. Indeed, in demonstrating that victimisation increases the likelihood of future victimisation, several studies have directly refuted this argument (Ousey et al., 2008; Lauritsen and Davis Quinet, 1995; Wilcox et al., 2006).

When Does RVV Occur?

In the wider literature on repeat victimisation, it has been demonstrated that after the initial incident, repeat offences tend to occur quickly (Weisel, 2005). The evidence shows that the risk of a repeat occurring is greatest in the period immediately after victimisation, with many taking place within a week of the initial offence (Farrell and Pease, 1993). After this period of heightened risk, the chance of a repeat declines rapidly until the victim has around the same risk of victimisation as those who have not been victimised. This pattern of a relatively short high-risk period, followed by a decline and levelling off of risk, is referred to as the 'time course' of repeat victimisation, and has been demonstrated consistently for crimes such as burglary and car crime (min Park and Eck, 2013; Weisel, 2005).

There is also a smaller body of evidence which suggests that this time course is applicable to violence. For example, in their study of the RVV of female college students in the US, Daigle and Fisher (2008) found that there was an elevated risk of repeat violence in a short time. In particular, the elevated risk was greatest within the same month. Shaw and Pease (2000) also demonstrated a similar pattern for assault using police recorded crime data. Studies focusing on domestic violence have also shown that subsequent victimisations tend to occur soon after the initial offence. For example, Lloyd et al. (1994) examined domestic violence incidents reported to the police on Merseyside, and found that 15% of repeat offences occurred within a day. However, it is unclear from the existing evidence whether this holds true for all forms of violent crime.

RVV and Repeat Offending: The Overlap

The correlation between victimisation and offending is a well-established empirical finding. Various studies have demonstrated that one of the most reliable predictors of violent victimisation is offending (Berg et al., 2012; Jennings et al., 2012;

Lauritsen and Laub, 2007; Schreck et al., 2008), which has come to be known as the 'victim-offender overlap'. Given the durability of this finding, it has been argued that criminal behaviour has the potential to be an important risk factor for experiencing RVV (Tillyer, 2013). Indeed, Tillyer (2013) proposes various reasons why offenders run an enhanced risk of being repeat victims of violence. For example, from the lifestyles-routine activity perspective, a criminal lifestyle might repeatedly present opportunities for victimisation.

There is evidence to support the notion that offending may be an important risk factor for RVV. For example, using data from the Youth Lifestyles Survey, Deadman and MacDonald (2004) found that when compared to non-offenders, violent offenders were more likely to be repeat victims of assault and theft. Similarly, in their analysis of two waves of data from the US National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health, Farrell and Zimmerman (2017) found that exposure to violence (including both being a victim of violence and witnessing violence) increases violent offending risk, with the strongest effects found for multiple victimisation and repeat exposure to violence.

However, Tillyer (2013) argues that despite the fact that criminal behaviour is likely to be a significant risk factor for violent victimisation, many RVV studies fail to account for it. At present, therefore, the extent to which offending contributes to RVV risk appears to be a gap in the evidence base. Tillyer (2013) highlights that any research seeking to establish the characteristics associated with RVV should therefore consider the important overlap between victimisation and offending. This is particularly important given research which suggests that victims who are involved in criminal behaviours are less likely to report their victimisation to authorities (Berg et al., 2012), making it unlikely they will receive any sort of victim services. Tillyer (2013) argues that offering victim support and prevention services to individuals in correctional settings is one way to reach a victim population that is at high risk for subsequent victimisation.

Preventing RVV

Given the evidence regarding the extent and prevalence of RVV, it has been argued that focusing on RVV may be an effective and efficient means of preventing and reducing violent crime, because it focuses resources on where violence is most concentrated (Grove et al., 2012). Indeed, Grove et al. (2012) conducted a systematic review of the effects of initiatives to prevent repeat victimisation, and found that appropriately targeted measures can significantly reduce repeat crimes. Although their review primarily found evaluations relating to burglary, they also identified evaluations relating to domestic violence (e.g. Robinson, 2006; Morgan, 2004).

In terms of the kinds of approaches and measures to implement, it has been argued that safety and protection from re-victimisation is an important way to reduce the likelihood of RVV (Callanan et al., 2012). There are a range of practical measures which can enhance the safety and protection of victims, including improved home security, panic alarms, heightened police awareness and refuges for victims of domestic violence (Callanan et al., 2012). These protect the victim by

preventing future opportunities for violence, as well as increasing the actual or perceived risks of apprehension for offenders (Grove et al., 2012).

Several measures of this kind have been implemented, particularly in relation to domestic violence (David et al., 2006; Lloyd et al., 1994; Hanmer et al., 1999; Sampson and Phillips, 1995). For example, Lloyd et al. (1994) developed a preventive strategy to reduce domestic violence on Merseyside, involving: the provision of quick response pendant alarms to domestic violence victims at risk; additional support and information for victims of domestic violence; more complete transfer of injunction details from courts to police; and heightened police awareness. This strategy had preventive effects on domestic violence in the area (Lloyd et al., 1994).

Moreover, in Scotland, Shaw and Pease (2000) have also provided examples of how RVV can be successfully addressed. They highlight a case where a victim of attempted murder and rape had been subjected to further threats from the offender. The individual was given home security advice and issued with a mobile phone and panic alarm linked to the police control room. No further incidents or threats were subsequently reported. Similarly, a female victim of domestic violence had been assaulted by her husband and was issued a mobile phone linked to the police control room. The man subsequently subjected her to threats. She used the mobile phone and officers attended and arrested the man. After this, no further incidents were reported (Shaw and Pease, 2000).

Findings regarding the time course of repeat victimisation suggest that prevention measures such as those discussed here should be implemented quickly. As above mentioned, there is evidence to suggest that RVV often occurs soon after the initial victimisation. There then exists a heightened risk period for re-victimisation, which declines with time (Weisel, 2005). While more research is required to determine if this time course is applicable to all types of violent crime, the research indicates that temporary prevention measures which provide protection during the high risk period after victimisation could be an effective and efficient means of reducing violence (Farrell and Pease, 1993).

Beyond measures for enhancing victim safety and protection, it has also been argued that meeting the practical needs of victims in the aftermath of an offence may be an important way to reduce the risk of repeated episodes of victimisation (Callanan et al., 2012). The main reason for this is that it ensures individuals have the resources and support available to them to prevent further violence occurring. This can include:

- Advocacy to participate in the criminal justice system to ensure offenders are prosecuted
- Help to access or communicate with a range of services and organisations (e.g. victim support networks, local councils regarding housing issues, employers relating to time off work)
- Help with housing, to ensure it meets safety needs

- Help with childcare, to enable victims with caring responsibilities to engage with service providers.

In addition, it has been argued that effective partnership working between agencies is important to reduce the risks of repeated episodes of victimisations (Callanan et al., 2012). For example, joint working between the police and support services to improve the safety of victims of RVV.

However, some practical difficulties with implementing a violence prevention/reduction strategy based on RVV have been highlighted. In particular, identifying appropriate safety and protection measures is difficult for violent crime, and where known prevention measures exist, victims are often difficult to contact (Farrell, 2005). Further, when contacted, some victims do not want, or do not have the resources, to adopt such measures. Moreover, while Shaw and Pease (2000) provide useful illustrations of problem-solving policing using the concept of RVV, there are few examples of this concept being embedded into practice, in Scotland or elsewhere, with most focusing on reducing repeat burglaries rather than RVV (Forrester et al., 1990). This has led to the argument that there is a need for a broader agenda in relation to the many types of crime that might be fruitfully addressed by the repeat victimisation approach (Farrell, 2005), with violent crime yet to have been systematically addressed using such a strategy.

Objections have also been raised around focusing crime prevention efforts on RVV. Namely, such a strategy is designed to act after the crime has taken place, meaning that it fails to address the root causes of violent crime (Farrell and Pease, 1993). In addition, concerns have been raised that the method in some way blames the victim, by implying that if they had behaved otherwise the crime would not have taken place (Farrell and Pease, 1993).

4. Conclusion

To conclude, this review has provided an assessment of the existing evidence on RVV, in Scotland and elsewhere. The RER examined 43 studies of varying quality, which have provided an insight into the extent, prevalence and nature of RVV. In particular, with regard to the research questions stated in the Introduction, this RER has demonstrated the following:

- Crime survey data indicate that RVV represents a significant proportion of all violent victimisation, both in Scotland, the rest of the UK and internationally. Although there are limitations as to what crime survey data can reveal about RVV, complementary measures such as police recorded crime and qualitative research produce similar findings.
- RVV has been demonstrated for a range of violent crimes, including assault, threats, robbery and theft. Domestic violence is also an important component of RVV.
- The evidence suggests that victims of RVV tend to have certain characteristics. In particular, they are often young, male (except in the case of domestic violence), and from deprived socioeconomic backgrounds.
- There are two key explanations for why RVV occurs in the literature, known as state dependence and population heterogeneity. The evidence suggests that both contribute to RVV.
- In the wider literature, it has been demonstrated that repeat victimisation often follows a ‘time course’: that is, a relatively short high-risk period following the initial incident, followed by a rapid decline and levelling off of risk. However, there is less evidence to suggest that it is applicable to RVV than other crime types.
- There is evidence to suggest that criminal behaviour is an important risk factor for experiencing RVV.
- The evidence regarding the nature of RVV suggests that a violence reduction strategy focused on reducing the extent of repeats should concentrate enhancing the safety and protection of victims after the first violent offence. However, violent crime is yet to have been systematically addressed using such a strategy.

These findings should be considered in the context of the shortcomings of the evidence base. In particular, there is a lack of qualitative research on RVV, most research comes from outwith Scotland and many studies were conducted over ten years ago.

Further, this review has also highlighted some key gaps in the evidence on RVV, in particular:

- Although data from the SCJS provides a useful estimate of the proportion of violent crimes which are likely to be repeats, the small number of repeat

victims in annual SCJS samples makes detailed analysis of their experiences challenging.

- There is a lack of Scottish-specific evidence regarding the extent and nature of RVV, the characteristics of repeat victims of violence, the circumstances and context around RVV, and the extent to which state dependence and population heterogeneity factors contribute.
- The extent to which offending contributes to RVV risk is unclear.
- It is also unclear whether the time course of repeat victimisation is applicable to all types of violent crime.
- The literature on the prevention of repeat victimisation focuses on reducing repeats of property crime, such as burglary. There is less evidence indicating 'what works' for reducing repeated violence.

Recommendations for Further Research

Despite these gaps, there is evidence to suggest that a substantial portion of the remaining violence in Scotland may be explained by the fact that certain individuals experience multiple incidences of violence, which contributes disproportionately to the overall violent crime count. It is recommended that further research seeks to improve our understanding of RVV by addressing these gaps in the literature. In particular, further research should explore:

- The types of violent crime which are repeated in Scotland.
- The characteristics of repeat victims of violence in Scotland.
- The circumstances and context around RVV in Scotland.
- The extent to which state dependence and population heterogeneity factors contribute to RVV in Scotland.
- The extent to which offending contributes to RVV risk, and how offenders might be supported with their experiences of violent victimisation.
- Victim's experiences of seeking help and support with RVV.
- Whether a 'time course' of repeat victimisation applies to different types of violent crime.

Addressing these gaps will help to ensure that the violence prevention and reduction interventions being delivered in Scotland remain relevant and informed by evidence.

5. References

AQMeN (2018) Inequality and the crime drop. Society Now. Autumn 2018.

Available at:

<https://content.yudu.com/web/2ol8a/0A34yod/SN32/html/index.html?page=32&origin=reader>

Averdijk, M. (2011) 'Reciprocal effects of victimisation and routine activities', *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 27, pp. 125-149.

Berg, M. T., Stewart, E. A., Schreck, C. J. and Simons, R. L. (2012) 'The victim-offender overlap in context: Examining the role of neighbourhood street culture', *Criminology*, 50, pp. 1-31.

Buss, T. F. and Abdu, R. (1995) 'Repeat victims of violence in an urban trauma centre', *Violence and Victims*, 10, pp. 183-194.

Callanan, M., Brown, A., Turley, C., Kenny, T. and Roberts, J. (2012) *Evidence and Practice Review of support for victims and outcome measurement*. Ministry of Justice Research Series 19/12, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/217385/evidence-practice-review-support-for-victims-outcome-measurement.pdf

Clay-Warner, J., Bunch, J. M. and McMahon-Howard, J. (2016) 'Differential Vulnerability: Disentangling the Effects of State Dependence and Population Heterogeneity on Repeat Victimisation', *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854816636415>

Cooper, C., Eslinger, D. and Nash, D. (2000) 'Repeat Victims of Violence: Report of a Large Concurrent Case-control Study', *Archives of Surgery*, 135(7), pp. 837-843.

Cuevas, C. A., D. Finkelhor, H. A. Turner, and Ormrod, R. K. (2007) 'Juvenile delinquency and victimisation: A theoretical typology', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22, pp. 1581-1602.

Daigle, L. E., Fisher, B. S. and Cullen, F. T. (2008) 'The violent and sexual victimisation of college women: Is repeat victimisation a problem?', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23, pp. 1296-1313.

Davis, R., Maxwell, C. and Taylor, B. (2006) 'Preventing repeat incidents of family violence: Analysis of data from three field experiments', *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 2, pp. 183-210.

Deadman, D. and MacDonald, Z. (2004) 'Offenders as Victims of Crime?: An Investigation into the Relationship between Criminal Behaviour and Victimisation', *Journal of the Royal Statistics Society*, 167(1), pp. 53-67.

Everson, S. (2003) 'Repeat victimisation and prolific offending: Chance or choice?', *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, 5, pp. 180-194.

Farrell, G. and Pease, K. (1993) Once bitten, twice bitten: repeat victimisation and its implications for crime prevention. *Police Research Group, Crime Prevention Unit Paper 46*. London: Home Office Police Department.

Farrell, G., Phillips, C. and Pease, K. (1995) 'Like taking candy: why does repeat victimisation occur?', *British Journal of Criminology*, 35(3), pp. 384-399.

Farrell, G. and Sousa, W. (2001) 'Repeat Victimisation and Hot Spots: The Overlap and Its Implications for Crime Control and Problem-Oriented Policing', *Crime Prevention Studies*, 12, pp. 221-240.

Farrell, G. and Bouloukos, A.C. (2001) 'A cross-national comparative analysis of rates of repeat victimisation', in G. Farrell and K. Pease (eds.) *Repeat Victimisation. Vol. 12. Crime Prevention Studies*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Farrell, G. (2005) Progress and prospects in the prevention of repeat victimisation. In N. Tilley (Ed.), *Handbook of crime prevention and community safety* (pp. 143–170). Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.

Farrell, G., Tseloni, A. and Pease, K. (2005) 'Repeat victimisation in the ICVS and NCVS', *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: An International Journal*, 7(3), pp. 7–18.

Farrell, G. and Pease, K. (2007) The Sting in the Tail of the British Crime Survey: Multiple Victimisations. In: Hough, M, Maxfield, M Surveying Crime in the 21st Century. Cullompton: Willan, pp. 33–54.

Farrell, C. and Zimmerman, G. M. (2017) 'Does offending intensify as exposure to violence aggregates? Reconsidering the effects of repeat victimisation, types of exposure to violence and polyvictimisation on property crime, violent offending and substance use', *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 53, pp. 25-33.

Forrester, D., Frenz, S., O'Connell, M. and Pease, K. (1990) *The Kirkholt Burglary Prevention Project: Phase II. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 23*. London: Home Office.

Finney, A. (2004) Violence in the night-time economy: key findings from the research. London: Home Office.

Gerrell, M. (2018) 'Bus Stops and Violence, Are Risky Places Really Risky?', *European Journal of Criminal Policy Research*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10610-018-9382-5>

Graham-Kevan, N., Brooks, M., Willan, V. J., Lowe, M., Robinson, P., Khan, R., Stokes, R., Irving, M., Karwacka, M. and Bryce, J. (2015) 'Repeat Victimisation, Retraumatization and Victim Vulnerability', *The Open Criminology Journal*, 8, pp. 36-48.

- Grant, N., Robertson, J. and Page, L. (2016) *Scottish Crime and Justice Survey 2014/15: Technical Report*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government. Available at: <https://www2.gov.scot/Resource/0051/00517071.pdf>
- Grove, L. E., Farrell, G., Farrington, D. P., Johnson, S. D. (2012) *Preventing repeat victimisation: a systematic review*. Stockholm, Sweden: The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention.
- Hanmer, J., S. Griffiths, and D. Jerwood (1999) *Arresting Evidence: Domestic Violence and Repeat Victimisation*. Police Research Series, Paper 104. London: Home Office.
- Health and Safety Executive (2018) *Violence at work 2016/17*. Available at: <http://www.hse.gov.uk/statistics/causinj/violence/work-related-violence-report-2018.pdf>
- Hindelang M., Gottfredson M. and Garofalo J. (1978) Victims of personal crime: An empirical foundation for a theory of personal victimisation. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Hope, T., Bryan, J., Trickett, A. and Osborn, D. R. (2001) 'Phenomena of Multiple Victimisation: The Relationship Between Personal and Property Crime Risk', *British Journal of Criminology*, 41(4), pp. 595-617.
- Ignatans, D. and Pease, K. (2015) 'On whom does the burden of crime fall now? Changes over time in counts and concentration', *International Review of Victimology*, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0269758015610854>
- Information Services Division (2019) *Unintentional Injuries in Scotland*. Edinburgh: A National Statistics Publication for Scotland. Available at: <https://www.isdscotland.org/Health-Topics/Emergency-Care/Publications/2019-03-05/2019-03-05-UI-2019-Summary.pdf>
- Jacobs, B.A. and Wright, R. (2006) *Street justice: Retaliation in the criminal underworld*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Jansson, K., Budd, S., Lovbakke, J., Moley, S. and Thorpe, K. (2007) *Attitudes, perceptions and risks of crime: Supplementary Volume 1 to Crime in England and Wales 2006/07*. London: Home Office Statistical Bulletin.
- Jennings, W. G., Piquero, A. R. and Reingle, J. M. (2012) 'On the overlap between victimisation and offending: A review of the literature', *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 17, pp. 16–26.
- Kesteren, J., van Dijk, J. and Mayhew, P. (2013) 'The International Crime Victims Surveys: A retrospective', *International Review of Victimology*, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0269758013511742>

- Lauritsen, J. L. and Davis Quinet, K. (1995) 'Repeat victimisation among adolescents and young adults', *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 11, pp. 143-166.
- Lauritsen, J. L. and Laub, J. H. (2007) 'Understanding the link between victimization and offending: New reflections on an old idea', *Crime Prevention Studies*, 22, pp. 55-75.
- Lauritsen, J. L., Owens, J. G., Planty, M., Rand, M. R. and Truman, J. L. (2012) *Methods for Counting High-Frequency Repeat Victimisations in the National Crime Victimization Survey*. Technical Series Report, US Department of Justice. Available at: <https://bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/mchfrv.pdf>
- Lloyd, S., G. Farrell, and K. Pease (1994) *Preventing Repeated Domestic Violence: A Demonstration Project on Merseyside*. Home Office Crime Prevention Unit Paper 49. London: Home Office.
- Matthews, R., C. Pease, and K. Pease (2001) Repeated Bank Robbery: Theme and Variations. In G. Farrell and K. Pease (eds.), *Repeat Victimization. Crime Prevention Studies*, Vol. 12. Monsey, New York: Criminal Justice Press.
- min Park, S. and Eck, J. E. (2013) 'Understanding the Random Effect on Victimization Distributions: A Statistical Analysis of Random Repeat Victimization', *Victims and Offenders*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2013.814612>
- Morenoff, J. D., Sampson, R. J. and Raudenbush, S. W. (2001) 'Neighbourhood Inequality, Collective Efficacy and the Spatial Dynamics of Urban Violence', *Criminology*, 39(3), pp. 517-558.
- Morgan, F. (2004) *The NDV Project Final Evaluation*. Perth: Crime Research Centre, University of Western Australia.
- Mukherjee, S. and Carach, C. (1993) *Repeat Victimization in Australia: Extent, Correlates and Implications for Crime Prevention*. Australian Institute of Criminology Research and Public Policy Series No. 15.
- Office for National Statistics (2013) *Repeat victimisation*. Available at: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20160106234227/http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171776_339553.pdf
- Office for National Statistics (2016a) *Review of methodology for addressing high-frequency repeat victimisation in Crime Survey for England and Wales estimates*. Available at: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/aboutus/whatwedo/statistics/consultationsandsurveys/allconsultationsandsurveys/reviewofmethodologyforaddressinghighfrequencyrepeatvictimisationincrimesurveyforenglandandwalesestimates>
- Office for National Statistics (2016b) *Intimate personal violence and partner abuse*. Available at:

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/compendium/focusonviolentcrimeandsexualoffences/yearendingmarch2015/chapter4intimatepersonalviolenceandpartnerabuse#partner-abuse-repeat-victimisation>

Office for National Statistics (2019) *The nature of violent crime in England and Wales: year ending March 2018*. Available at:

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/articles/the-natureofviolentcrimeinenglandandwales/yearendingmarch2018#which-groups-of-people-are-most-likely-to-be-victims-of-violent-crime>

Ousey, G. C., Wilcox, P. and Brummel, S. (2008) 'Déjà vu all over again: Investigating temporal continuity of adolescent victimisation', *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 24(3), pp 307–335.

Outlaw, M., Ruback, B. and Britt, C. (2002) 'Repeat and Multiple Victimisations: The Role of Individual and Contextual Factors', *Violence and Victims*, 17, pp. 187-204.

Pease, K. (1998) *Repeat victimisation: Taking stock* (Crime Detection and Prevention Series No. 90). London: Home Office.

Pease, K. and Ignatans, D. (2016) 'The Global Crime Drop and Changes in the Distribution of Victimisation', *Crime Science*, 5(11),
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40163-016-0059-4>

Robinson, A. L. (2006) 'Reducing repeat victimisation among high risk victims of domestic violence: The benefits of a coordinated community response in Cardiff, Wales', *Violence Against Women*, 12, pp. 761–788.

Sampson, A. and Phillips, C. (1992). *Multiple Victimisation: Racial Attacks on an East London Estate*. Crime Prevention Unit Series Paper 36. London: Home Office.

Schreck, C. J., Stewart, E. and Fisher, B. S. (2006) 'Self-control, victimisation, and their influence on risky lifestyles: A longitudinal analysis using panel data', *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 22, pp. 319-340.

Schreck, C. J., Stewart, E. A. and Osgood, D. W. (2008) 'A reappraisal of the overlap of violent offenders and victims', *Criminology*, 46, pp. 871-906.

Scottish Government (2018) *Recorded crime in Scotland 2017-2018*. Edinburgh: A National Statistics Publication for Scotland. Available at:
<https://www.gov.scot/publications/recorded-crime-scotland-2017-18>

Scottish Government (2019) *Scottish Crime and Justice Survey 2017/18: Main Findings*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Shaw, M. and Pease, K. (2000) *Research on Repeat Victimisation in Scotland: Final Report*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Executive Central Research Unit.

Taylor, N. (2004) 'Petrol Service Stations as Victims of Crime: Their Risks and Vulnerabilities', *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: An International Journal*, 6(1), pp. 31-41.

Tillyer, M. S. (2013) 'Violent victimisation across the life course: Moving a "victims careers" agenda forward', *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 41, pp. 593-612.

Tseloni, A. M. and Pease, K. (2003) 'Repeat personal victimisation: "Flags" or "boosts"?', *British Journal of Criminology*, 43, pp. 196–212.

Tseloni, A. M. and Pease, K. (2004) 'Repeat personal victimisation: Random effects, event dependence and unexplained heterogeneity', *British Journal of Criminology*, 44, pp. 931-945.

Tseloni, A., Ntzoufras, I., Nicolaou, A. and Pease, K. (2010) 'Concentration of personal and household crimes in England and Wales', *European Journal of Applied Mathematics*, 21, pp. 326-348.

Turanovic, J. J. and Ogle, M. R. (2017) State Dependence and Population Heterogeneity in Theories of Victimisation. In Huebner, B. M. (ed.) *Oxford Bibliographies*. New York: Oxford University press.

van Reemst, L., Fischer, T. F. C. and van Dongen, J. D. M. (2013) *Risk factors for repeat victimisation: a literature scan*. Criminology Department, Erasmus School of Law, Erasmus University Rotterdam Commissioned by the Research and Documentation Centre (WODC), Ministry of Security and Justice.

Vecchio, J. M. (2013) 'Once bitten, thrice wise: The varying effects of victimisation on routine activities and risk management', *Deviant Behaviour*, 34, pp. 169-190.

Walby, S., Towers, J. and Francis, B. (2015) 'Is Violent Crime Increasing or Decreasing? a New Methodology to Measure Repeat Attacks Making Visible the Significance of Gender and Domestic Relations', *The British Journal of Criminology*, 56(6), pp. 1203-1234.

Walby, S. and Towers, J. (2017) 'Measuring violence to end violence: mainstreaming gender', *Journal of Gender-Based Violence*, 1(1), pp. 11-31.

Wilcox, P., May, D. C., Roberts, S. D. (2006) 'Student weapon possession and the "fear and victimisation hypothesis": Unraveling the temporal order', *Justice Quarterly*, 23, pp. 502-529.

Weisel, D.L. (2005) *Analysing Repeat Victimisation*. Problem-Oriented Guides for Police Problem Solving Tools Series, No. 4. Washington: US Department of Justice.

6. Appendices

Appendix 1: Quality Assessment of Individual Studies

Table 3: Quality Assessment of Individual Studies

Author and Year	Title	Location	Details	Limitations
Averdijk (2011)	Reciprocal effects of victimisation and routine activities	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the 1994 National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) - an ongoing nationally representative survey (of non-institutionalised persons of aged 12 and over) which collects data on the frequency, characteristics, and consequences of criminal victimisation in the United States Questionnaire focuses on victimisation within the last 6 months prior to the first day of the month of the interview 108,208 cases included from the years 1995-1998 Tests the 'Once Bitten Twice Shy' perspective, which argues that victimisation decreases risky routine activities which in turn decreases the risk of future victimisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis restricted to public violence – unclear whether applicable to other types of violence (e.g. in the home) Only three indicators of routine activities used Not all respondents participated in all waves – problems with missing data and selective attrition Survey does not cover the entire population (e.g. limited to crimes committed against those living in private households aged 12 and over) Only asks respondents of experiences during recall period of 6 months Dependent on respondents recalling past events Data is dated Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland

Buss and Abdu (1995)	Repeat victims of violence in an urban trauma centre	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medical record and survey data collected from victims of urban violence presenting at the emergency department of St. Elizabeth Hospital (Youngstown, Ohio) during a 4 year period • Study included two subsamples: a retrospective telephone survey (131 respondents) and a personal survey of victim inpatients (102 respondents) • Data used to assess extent and nature of RVV, including characteristics of repeat victims 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small and unrepresentative sample • Focus on 'urban violence' (assault) - unclear whether findings are applicable to other types of violence • Only examines victims of RVV who are injured severely enough to be hospitalised • Findings are now dated • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Clay-Warner et al. (2016)	Differential Vulnerability: Disentangling the Effects of State Dependence and Population Heterogeneity on Repeat Victimization	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses propensity score matching with longitudinal data from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) to explore the reasons why repeat violent and property victimisation occur • Uses three waves of the NCVS (1998-1999), comprising 27,195 cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abovementioned limitations with NCVS also applicable to this study (e.g. survey does not cover entire population and recall period limited to 6 months) • NCVS does not contain measures of offending or self-control, so model cannot fully control for risk heterogeneity • Data is dated • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Cooper et al. (2000)	Repeat Victims of Violence: Report of a Large Concurrent Case Control Study	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducted in trauma centre in Baltimore • Case-control study which identified 200 cases and 224 controls during a 16 month period, from 1999-2001 • Cases were persons admitted with a traumatic injury as a result of violent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small and unrepresentative sample • Focus on violent assault – unclear whether findings are applicable to other types of violence • Only examines victims of RVV who are injured severely enough to be hospitalised

			<p>assault who had been previously hospitalised for a similar reason</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Controls were a random selection of eligible age- and sex-matched patients admitted for reasons unrelated to violent injury • Data used to explore risk factors for RVV 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings are now dated • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Cuevas et al. (2007)	Juvenile delinquency and victimisation: A theoretical typology	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on a subsample of respondents to the Developmental Victimization Survey (DVS), which assessed the victimisation experiences of a nationally representative sample of 2,030 young people in the US between 2002-2003 • Subsample included 1,000 respondents aged between 10-17 • Explores connection between delinquency and victimisation and identifies typology of delinquent-victims • Focus on violent and property victimisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey based on self-report data – susceptible to issues of social desirability • Underrepresentation of types of more severe delinquency and victimisation in sample • Telephone survey – underrepresents groups without phone access • Focus on adolescents – unclear whether findings are applicable to other age groups • Data now dated • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Daigle and Fisher (2008)	The violent and sexual victimisation of college women: Is repeat victimisation a problem?	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on two national-level surveys of more than 8,000 female students: the National College Women Violent Victimization (NCWVV) and the National College Women Sexual Victimization (NCWSV) • Surveys conducted in 1997 • The NCWVV survey measured the extent and nature of different types of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses cross-sectional rather than longitudinal design to retrospectively examine violent and sexual victimisation • More precise information on date/time of incident required to fully understand the time course of repeat incidents

			<p>violence college women had experienced, whereas the NCWSV survey measured different types of sexual victimisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daigle and Fisher (2008) use this data to explore the extent and nature of both types of victimisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sample of female students – unclear whether findings are applicable to other population groups • Data now dated • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Davis et al. (2006)	Preventing repeat incidents of family violence: analysis of data from three field experiments	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three field experiments conducted in New York during the 1990s to evaluate whether programs, targeted at public housing residents who reported family violence to the police, reduced the rate of subsequent victimisation • Intervention involved a 'crisis response team', consisting of a police officer and social worker, who followed up on initial police response to complaint • Utilises a sample of nearly 1,000 cases pooled from three randomised experiments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small and unrepresentative sample • Composition of the samples in the three experiments varied, with different populations and offences, preventing valid comparison • Focus on family violence – unclear whether applicable to other types of violence • Data now dated • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Deadman and MacDonald (2004)	Offenders as Victims of Crime? An Investigation into the Relationship Between Criminal Behaviour and Victimization	England and Wales	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses data from the 1998 Youth Lifestyles Survey (YLS) • Nationally representative sample of 4,848 12-30 year olds living in private households in England and Wales • Information on offending behaviour is collected through self-completion questionnaires • Study considers the impact of violent, non-violent and persistent offending on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey does not cover the entire population (e.g. limited to crimes committed against those living in private households aged 12-30) • Unclear whether findings are applicable to other age groups • Only asks respondents of experiences during recall period of 12 months • Dependent on respondents recalling past events

			the probability of being a victim of violent and non-violent crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data is dated • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Farrell and Pease (1993)	Once bitten, twice bitten: Repeat victimisation and its implication for crime prevention	England and Wales	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarises and reviews existing evidence on repeat victimisation • Covers racial attacks, domestic violence as well as burglary and property crime • 33 studies are reviewed (conducted between 1967-1993), international focus • Discusses methodological issues in the study of repeat victimisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No systematic assessment of quality of research included • Findings are now dated • No Scottish-specific evidence included – findings are not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Farrell (2005)	Progress and prospects in the prevention of repeat victimisation	England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarises and reviews existing evidence relating to the prevention of repeat victimisation • Includes 53 studies from the UK, US and elsewhere, conducted between 1974-2005 • Covers various types of repeat victimisation, including personal and violent crimes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No systematic assessment of quality of research included • Findings are now dated • No Scottish-specific evidence included – findings are not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Farrell et al. (2005), Kesteren et al. (2013)	International Crime Victims Survey	41 countries, including Scotland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large-scale, representative international survey conducted across 6 sweeps (1989-1992-1996-2000-2004/05-2010) • Respondents asked about their experiences of crime over a 5-year period, and then asked to focus on their experiences over the past 12 months • Can examine the proportion of victims who experienced violence more than 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National samples are relatively small (typically between one and two thousand per country) • Response rates were variable across countries, reducing comparability • Samples of repeat victims are small • Does not cover the entire population (e.g. limited to crimes committed against adults living in private households)

			<p>once over the course of a year (i.e. the RVV rate)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present database covers 325,454 individual respondents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cap on number of criminal incidents that person can report as a series • Only asks questions about recall period of one year • Dependent on respondents recalling past events
Farrell and Zimmerman (2017)	Does offending intensify as exposure to violence aggregates? Reconsidering the effects of repeat victimisation, types of exposure to violence and polyvictimisation on property crime, violent offending and substance use	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on two waves of data from the nationally representative National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health) • Sample of 12,603 respondents aged 12-18, collected between 1995-2008 • Data used to explore the relationship between the effects of repeat victimisation, exposure to different types of violence on property crime, violent offending and substance use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure of exposure to violence captured experiences in 12 months preceding interview rather than lifetime exposure • Focused on adolescents who are enrolled in school; unclear whether findings are applicable to other population groups • Study is not focused principally on violence • Data is now dated • Findings are not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Gerrell (2018)	Bus Stops and Violence, Are Risky Places Really Risky?	Sweden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses risk terrain modelling (RTM) to geographically forecast risk of crime in Malmo, Sweden • Compares the spatial risk factors for where the number of crimes is high with the spatial risk factors for where the risk of victimisation is high • Performed by fitting negative binomial models on crime around bus stops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focuses on robbery and aggravated assault – unclear whether applicable to other types of violence • Findings are not necessarily applicable to Scotland

Graham-Kevan et al. (2015)	Repeat Victimization, Retraumatization and Victim Vulnerability	England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on qualitative interviews with 54 victims of police recorded violent crime • Participants recruited from a larger concurrent study into repeat victimization in Preston • Data collected from the police database held at Lancashire Constabulary, Victim Support (VS) and Preston Domestic Violence Services (PDVS) between April 2013 and September 2013 • Explores relationship between traumatic experiences, violent crime victimization and re-victimization suffered throughout life, in relation to current psychological and psychosocial functioning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limitations with qualitative research include lack of generalisability due to small sample sizes and subjective nature of the research • Relies on participant recall of past trauma exposure; may lack accuracy • Victims self-selected (i.e. responded to requests and attended interviews) – potential for bias • Based on self-reported symptoms as opposed to clinical assessment • Findings are not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Grove et al. (2012)	Preventing Repeat Victimization: A Systematic Review	Sweden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systematic review of 31 studies evaluating efforts to prevent repeat victimization • Evaluation studies selected from systematic searches of databases, hand searches of bibliographies and contact with academics and practitioners • Applies inclusion and exclusion criteria and systematic coding manuals • Crimes types included residential burglary, domestic violence, commercial crime and sexual victimization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review is not focused specifically on violence – unclear whether all findings are applicable to violent crime • No Scottish-specific evidence included – findings are not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Hanmer et al. (1999)	Arresting Evidence: Domestic Violence	England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of a project in Leeds designed to reduce repeat victimization of domestic violence through the use of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on domestic violence – unclear whether findings applicable to other types of violence

and Repeat Victimization	early intervention and graduated police responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data on extent of domestic violence are gathered from police recorded data – limitations of this include underreporting to police and difficulty identifying crimes as repetitions • Limitations with qualitative interviews include lack of generalisability due to small sample sizes and subjective nature of the research • Findings are now dated • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland 		
Ignatans and Pease (2015)	On whom does the burden of crime fall now? Changes over time in counts and concentration	England and Wales	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extracts data from almost 600,000 respondents from the 1982-2012 sweeps of the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) to determine which types of victimisation have become more or less concentrated during the overall crime drop • The CSEW is a large-scale, representative survey involving an annual sample of 35,000 households across England and Wales • Respondents asked about their experiences and perceptions of crime, including crime not reported to the police 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limitations of the CSEW include that the survey does not cover the entire population (e.g. limited to adults living in private households) • Artificial limit of 5 on number of criminal incidents that person can report as a series (lifted from 2018 onwards) • Only asks respondents of experiences during recall period of one year • Dependent on respondents recalling past events • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iganatans and Pease (2015) examine three general crime types (vehicle, property and personal) 	
Jacobs and Wright (2006)	Street justice: Retaliation in the criminal underworld	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative interviews with 52 African-American street offenders from St. Louis, Mississippi, who had been the victim of at least one violent crime which they either retaliated or attempted to do so • Addresses how criminals seek to avenge themselves after being robbed • Presents 'typology of retaliation' and policy recommendations to address criminal retaliation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limitations with qualitative research include lack of generalisability due to small sample sizes and subjective nature of the research • Data now dated • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Jansson et al. (2007)	Attitudes, perceptions and risks of crime: Supplementary Volume 1 to Crime in England and Wales 2006/07	England and Wales	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the 2006/07 and 2005/06 sweeps of the British Crime Survey (now known as the Crime Survey for England and Wales) – a large, nationally representative survey conducted since 1982 • Asks people about their experiences of property and personal crimes as well as their perceptions of and attitudes towards different crime-related issues • The 2006/07 BCS included 47,203 face-to-face interviews conducted between April 2006 and March 2007 (47,796 in 2005/06 BCS) • Jansson et al. (2007) present additional analysis on attitudes, perceptions and risks of crime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limitations of the BCS include that the survey does not cover the entire population (e.g. limited to adults living in private households) • Artificial limit of 5 on number of criminal incidents that person can report as a series • Only asks respondents of experiences during recall period of one year • Dependent on respondents recalling past events • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland

Jennings et al. (2012)	On the overlap between victimisation and offending: A review of the literature	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of research examining the relationship between victimisation and offending • Identifies 37 studies (from 1958-2011) which assess the victim-offender overlap • Evidence identified uses a range of analytical and statistical techniques • Research predominantly from the US but also England and Wales, Canada, South Korea, Sweden and the Netherlands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No systematic assessment of quality of research included • Some studies included are now dated • No Scottish-specific evidence included – findings are not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Lauritsen and Davis Quinet (1995)	Repeat victimisation among adolescents and young adults	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses longitudinal panel data from the nationally representative National Youth Survey (NYS) to test theories of why repeat victimisation occurs • Based on a sample of adolescents and young adults • Interviews conducted from 1977-1982 • Focuses on four crime types – assault, robbery, theft and vandalism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretically relevant variables unavailable in NYS data • Based on sample of adolescents and young adults – unclear whether findings applicable to other age groups • Focus on assault and robbery – unclear whether applicable to other types of violence • Findings now dated • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Lloyd et al. (1994)	Preventing Repeated Domestic Violence: A Demonstration Project on Merseyside	England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of the effectiveness of 'The Merseyside Domestic Violence Prevention Project', which focused on reducing repeated domestic violence • Data collected on extent of repeated domestic violence using police incident logs (calls to the police from the public) in Merseyside 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design of the study prevented evaluation of the effectiveness in terms of an increase or reduction in repeat victimisation due to the lack of control group • Focus on domestic violence – unclear whether findings applicable to other types of violence

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy assessed using qualitative interviews with victims as well as examination of associated costs and the effect on enforceable injunctions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data on extent of domestic violence are gathered from police recorded data – limitations of this include underreporting to police and difficulty identifying crimes as repetitions • Limitations with qualitative interviews include lack of generalisability due to small sample sizes and subjective nature of the research • Findings are now dated • Findings not necessarily directly applicable to Scotland
Matthews et al. (2001)	Repeated Bank Robbery: Themes and Variations	England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examines all bank robberies, completed and attempted, reported to the UK Metropolitan Police between 1992-1994 • Demonstrates rate of repetition against the same branches, as well as nature and time course of repeats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authors noted difficulties with identifying which robberies were repeats due to police recording practices • Focuses specifically on robbery, not necessarily applicable to other types of violence • Findings are now dated • Findings not necessarily directly applicable to Scotland
min Park and Eck (2013)	Understanding the Random Effect of Victimization Distributions: A Statistical Analysis of Random Repeat Victimisations	England and Wales	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simulates data from the 2008/09 British Crime Survey (now known as the Crime Survey for England and Wales) – a large, nationally representative survey conducted since 1982 • Employs mathematical demonstrations to investigate the statistical characteristics of random repeat victimisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unclear if ‘random repeat’ pattern identified is applicable to all types of violent crime – particularly crimes demanding special relationships between offenders and victims • Does not investigate random repeats in the process of multiple victimisation

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aims to clarify the effect of random repeats on the distribution of victimisations • The 2008/09 BCS included 46,286 face-to-face interviews conducted between April 2008 and March 2009 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limitations of the BCS include that the survey does not cover the entire population (e.g. limited to adults living in private households) • Artificial limit of 5 on number of criminal incidents that person can report as a series • Only asks respondents of experiences during recall period of one year • Dependent on respondents recalling past events • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Morenoff et al. (2001)	Neighbourhood Inequality, Collective Efficacy and the Spatial Dynamics of Urban Violence	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study links police records, statistics, census data and a survey of 8,872 Chicago residents to assess an integrated theoretical perspective on neighbourhood-level variations in homicide • Structural characteristics in 1990 and survey measures from 1995 are used to model variations in the event rate of homicide for 1996-1998 across 343 neighbourhoods • Assesses importance of spatial dynamics for explaining urban violence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures of organisations and institutions drawn from survey (self) reports – limited to residents' perceptions • Focus on homicide – unclear whether findings applicable to other types of violence • Findings are now dated • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Mukherjee and Carach (1993)	Repeat victimisation in Australia: Extent, Correlates and	Australia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on data from the 1993 National Crime and Safety Survey Australia (NCSSA) – a large-scale, nationally representative survey – and the 1991 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not cover the entire population (e.g. limited to adults living in private households)

	Implications for Crime Prevention		<p>Queensland Crime Victims Survey (Queensland CVS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NCSSA collects information from individuals and households about their experience of selected crimes, reporting behaviour and risk factors, while the Queensland CVS collects complementary information on fear of crime • Surveys include residents of private households • The NCSSA collects information from those aged 15+, while the Queensland CVS collects information from those aged 18+ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only asks respondents of experiences during recall period of one year • Dependent on respondents recalling past events • Findings now dated • Findings not necessarily directly applicable to Scotland
Scottish Government (2019)	Scottish Crime and Justice Survey 2017/18: Partner Abuse	Scotland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis based on self-completion module of the 2017/18 sweep of the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) – a large-scale, representative survey asked of 6,000 adults in Scotland each year • Respondents asked about their experiences of partner abuse within the last month • Includes incidents not reported to the police 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCJS does not cover the entire population (e.g. limited to crimes committed against adults living in private households) • Dependent on respondents recalling past events
Office for National Statistics (ONS) (2016)	Crime Survey for England and Wales - Intimate personal violence and partner abuse	England and Wales	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of findings from the self-completion module of the 2014/15 sweep of the Crime Survey for England and Wales – a large scale, nationally representative survey involving a sample 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CSEW does not cover the entire population (e.g. limited to crimes committed against adults living in private households)

			<p>of 35,000 households across England and Wales</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings on the extent of, and trends in, intimate violence among men and women aged 16 to 59 resident in England and Wales • Includes incidents not reported to the police 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dependent on respondents recalling past events • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Office for National Statistics (ONS) (2019)	Crime Survey for England and Wales	England and Wales	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large-scale, representative survey involving a sample of 35,000 households across England and Wales • Respondents asked about their experiences and perceptions of crime • Includes crimes that have not been reported to the police • Can examine the proportion of victims who experienced violence more than once over the course of a year (i.e. the RVV rate) • RVV broken down by types of violence and relationship with offender 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CSEW does not cover the entire population (e.g. limited to crimes committed against adults living in private households) • In main survey, artificial limit of 5 on number of criminal incidents that person can report as a series (lifted from 2018 onwards) • Only asks respondents of experiences during recall period of one year • Dependent on respondents recalling past events • Findings not necessarily directly applicable to Scotland
Ousey et al. (2008)	Déjà vu All Over Again: Investigating Temporal Continuity of Adolescent Victimization	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses longitudinal panel data from the Rural Substance Abuse and Violence Project (RSVP) – a study of substance use, criminal victimisation and criminal offending • Based on a sample of 2,706 adolescents from a public school in Kentucky • Data collected between 2001-2004 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on adolescents (public school students) – unclear whether findings applicable to other population groups • Focus on assault and theft victimisation – unclear whether findings applicable to other types of violence • Data now dated

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assesses divergent perspectives regarding the state dependence explanation of RVV 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Outlaw et al. (2002)	Repeat and Multiple Victimisations: The Role of Individual and Contextual Factors	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on telephone survey data from a multi-stage sample of 5,302 Seattle residents in 1990 Uses hierarchical modelling to examine the relative contributions of factors about the person and context in models of repeat victimisation and multiple victimisation Estimates separate hierarchical models for repeat property, repeat violent and multiple victimisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sample underrepresents adults in 20-24 age group and low income families, and over-represents homeowners and married persons Only asks respondents of experiences during recall period of two years Dependent on respondents recalling past events Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Sampson and Phillips (1992)	Multiple Victimization: Racial Attacks on an East London Estate	England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation of a crime prevention project to reduce repeat racial victimisation between 1990 and 1991 on a local authority housing estate in East London Quantitative and qualitative research methods used to evaluate the project, including: Collection of statistical data on the number, location and type of racial attacks and harassment from police, local authority housing and community group information Qualitative interviews with repeat racial victims, local authority staff, police officers and community group workers and representatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on a small and unrepresentative sample The author notes that prevention measures were implemented inconsistently across sample Data on extent of racial attacks collected from police - limitations of this include underreporting to police and difficulty identifying crimes as repetitions Limitations with qualitative interviews include lack of generalisability and subjective nature of the research Focus on racial attacks – unclear whether findings applicable to other types of violence Findings are now dated

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systematic observations at public meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Scottish Government (2019)	Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) 2017-18	Scotland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large-scale, representative survey asked of 6,000 adults in Scotland each year • Respondents asked about their experiences and perceptions of crime • Includes crimes not reported to the police • Can examine the proportion of victims who experienced violence more than once over the course of a year (i.e. the RVV rate) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not cover the entire population (e.g. limited to crimes committed against adults living in private households) • In main survey, cap of 5 on number of criminal incidents that person can report as a series • Only asks respondents of experiences during recall period of one year • Dependent on respondents recalling past events • Small sample sizes for repeat victims
Schreck et al. (2006)	Self-control, victimisation and their influence on risky lifestyles: A longitudinal analysis using panel data	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses the first three waves of panel data from the national evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT) program (1995-1999), covering 6 US cities • Longitudinal examination of the causal mechanisms underlying violent victimisation using sample of 1,500 adolescents • Focus on whether victims alter lifestyle choices (like their own delinquency and contact with delinquent peers) in response to their earlier violent victimisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sample attrition and missing data led to reduced sample size • Only two measures of risky activities included; not covering range of daily activities that could be predictive to victimisation • Dependent on respondents recalling past events • Data is now dated • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland

Shaw and Pease (2000)	Research on Repeat Victimization in Scotland	Scotland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of extent and nature of repeat victimisation in Scotland • Triangulation of three methods, including: • Data from four sweeps of Scottish Crime Survey (SCS) (1982, 1988, 1992, 1996) • Police recorded crime data for three police divisions, collected over one-year period • Qualitative interviews with repeat victims and offenders • Covers range of crimes, including repeat property victimisation, repeated crime against the person, repeated theft 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of SCS: • SCS does not cover the entire population • Cap on number of criminal incidents that person can report as a series • Only asks respondents of experiences during recall period of one year • Dependent on respondents recalling past events • Police recorded crime: • Only collected in three police divisions • Not all incidents of crime are reported to the police • Difficult to identify crime as repetition of earlier crime due to recording practices • Qualitative interviews: • Limitations with qualitative interviews include lack of generalisability due to small sample sizes and subjective nature of the research • Research is not focused specifically, nor principally, on violence • Research is now dated
Taylor (2004)	Petrol Service Stations as Victims of Crime: Their Risks and Vulnerabilities	Australia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses national statistics data from Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) on crimes recorded by the Police in each state and territory within Australia from 1993 to 2001, focusing specifically on petrol station robbery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limitations with police recorded crime include underreporting to police and difficulty identifying crimes as repetitions • Survey based on self-report data

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ABS data combined with national self-report survey data from Small Business Crime Survey (sample of 735 petrol station proprietors) • Nature and extent of robberies at petrol stations examined, including levels of repeat victimisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focuses specifically on robbery - not necessarily applicable to other types of violence • Findings are now dated • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Tillyer (2013)	Violent victimisation across the life course: Moving a 'victims career' agenda forward	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on four waves of data from the nationally representative National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) • Sample of 2,779 respondents collected between 1994-2008, from when respondents were aged 12-32 • Examines violent victimisation patterns across the life course and outlines a 'victims career' agenda 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sample attrition and missing data led to reduced sample size (which disproportionately affects high risk individuals) • Only asks respondents of experiences during recall period of one year - victimisations that occurred outside these time frames are not recorded • Add Health only includes data through young adulthood - unclear if early and persistent victimisation in adolescence is associated with an increased risk for violent victimisation throughout the life course • Data is now dated • Findings are not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Tseloni and Pease (2003)	Repeat personal victimisation: "Flags" or "boosts"?	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the 1994 National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) - an ongoing nationally representative survey (of non-institutionalised persons of aged 12 and over) which collects data on the frequency, characteristics, and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all respondents participated in all waves – problems with missing data and selective attrition • Survey does not cover the entire population (e.g. limited to crimes committed against those living in

			<p>consequences of criminal victimisation in the United States</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses data collected across three waves of interviews between 1994-1995 • Examines effects of state dependence and population heterogeneity on repeat personal victimisations • Personal victimisations include rape, sexual assault, robbery, assault, threats, pick-pocketing and larceny • Employs a fixed effects random intercept multilevel model of personal crime counts 	<p>private households aged 12 and over)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only asks respondents of experiences during recall period of 6 months • Dependent on respondents recalling past events • Not focused exclusively on violence • Findings are now dated • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland
Tseloni and Pease (2004)	Repeat Personal Victimization: Random Effects, Event Dependence and Unexplained Heterogeneity	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the 1994 National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) - an ongoing nationally representative survey (of non-institutionalised persons of aged 12 and over) which collects data on the frequency, characteristics, and consequences of criminal victimisation in the United States • Uses data collected across three waves of interviews between 1994-1995 • Personal victimisations include rape, sexual assault, robbery, assault, threats, pick-pocketing and larceny • Identifies the risks of repeat personal victimisation and investigates extent to which event dependence and unexplained heterogeneity affect current victimisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all respondents participated in all waves – problems with missing data and selective attrition • Survey does not cover the entire population (e.g. limited to crimes committed against those living in private households aged 12 and over) • Only asks respondents of experiences during recall period of 6 months • Dependent on respondents recalling past events • Not focused exclusively on violence • Findings are now dated • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland

van Reemst et al. (2013)	Risk factors for repeat victimisation: a literature scan	The Netherlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies risk factors for repeat victimisation through systematic literature review of 106 studies • Search engines used include the search engine of the Erasmus University Rotterdam (sEURch), of the Dutch government, PsychInfo and National Criminal Justice Reference Service • Studies also searched through snowball and citation methods • Inclusion and exclusion criteria relating to methods, content and language applied (only prospective studies with strong research design included) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No primary research conducted • Possible that not all characteristics and populations have been fully explored in research, or have only been researched in a single study • Findings are discussed in relation to Dutch people; unclear whether applicable to Scotland
Vecchio (2013)	Once bitten, thrice wise: The varying effects of victimisation on routine activities and risk management	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative study of 36 men (34 African American, 2 white), aged between 19-50, who were participating in a mandatory drug treatment centre in the Midwest • Interviews conducted in 2010 • Data used to explore effects of victimisation on subsequent behaviour and management of lifestyle risks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limitations with qualitative research include lack of generalisability due to small sample sizes and subjective nature of the research • Specifically, study draws on individual narrative accounts of whether victimisations were perceived to subsequently influence behaviour – perceptions are inherently subjective • Sample is from the US, urban, all male and African American – findings unlikely to be applicable to other population groups
Weisel (2005)	Analysing Repeat Victimization	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Problem-Oriented Guide for Police’ which summarises and reviews existing knowledge on repeat victimisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No systematic assessment of quality of research included • Does not focus exclusively on RVV

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 42 published studies reviewed, international focus • Covers literature on range of offences, including violence as well as property crime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings are now dated • No Scottish-specific evidence included – Findings unlikely to be applicable to Scotland
Wilcox et al. (2006)	Student weapon possessing and the 'fear victimisation' hypothesis	US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses longitudinal data from the Rural Substance Abuse and Violence Project (RSVP) – a study of substance use, criminal victimisation and criminal offending • Based on a sample of around 4,000 adolescents from 113 public schools in Kentucky • Data collected between 2001-2004 • Explores the direction of relationships between student weapon carrying and school-crime experiences, including victimisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on adolescents (public school students) – unclear whether findings applicable to other population groups • Substantial number of eligible participants excluded due to non-consent – possible that sample is biased with regard to key variables (e.g. delinquency and victimisation) • Data is now dated • Findings not necessarily applicable to Scotland



© Crown copyright 2019

You may re-use this information (excluding logos and images) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

The views expressed in this report are those of the researcher and do not necessarily represent those of the Scottish Government or Scottish Ministers.

This document is also available from our website at www.gov.scot.
ISBN: 978-1-78781-708-1

The Scottish Government
St Andrew's House
Edinburgh
EH1 3DG

Produced for
the Scottish Government
by APS Group Scotland
PPDAS563430 (04/19)
Published by
the Scottish Government,
April 2019



Social Research series
ISSN 2045-6964
ISBN 978-1-78781-708-1

Web and Print Publication
www.gov.scot/socialresearch

PPDAS563430 (04/19)