

Robberies against Female and Male Victims

Ji-Young Kim

Korean Institute of Criminology

Jisun Park[†]

Sookmyung Women's University

Na-Rim Lee

Female victimization is one of the areas in crime research that demands more attention. Despite the relatively high rates of robbery against female victims, very few studies have compared robberies perpetrated against female and male victims, and female victims of robbery have been under-researched. By adopting a comparative approach, we aim to investigate the differences in the characteristics of female and male victimization and contribute to developing better strategies for crime prevention and victim treatment. Based on 615 robbery cases against female victims and 720 robbery cases against male victims in South Korea, we performed detailed analyses of robbery victimization. We found notable differences between robberies against females and males in terms of offender's age, criminal history, and occupation; victim's age; victim-offender relationship; and offense location. Moreover, robbery victimization differed by the gender of the victim with respect to offense type, premeditation, violence use, and evidence left. Furthermore, we identified a number of factors that contributed to differentiating female victimization from male victimization. The present study has practical implications for preventing robbery and developing gender-specific treatment strategies for female victims.

Key words : robbery, gender difference, female victims, male victims, crime against women

[†] 교신저자 : Jisun Park, Sookmyung Women's University, Cheongpa-ro 47-gil 100, Yongsan-gu, Seoul
Tel : 02-2077-7621, E-mail : rmpjcr@hanmail.net

Robbery is a violent crime that evokes fear and anxiety(Cook, 1987; McCluskey, 2013). The risk of robbery victimization varies markedly among people with various background characteristics, including gender(Cohen, Cantor, & Kluegel, 1981). Female victims accounted for 48.8% of victims of robbery offenses committed in South Korea in 2014(Supreme Prosecutor's Office, 2015). Female victims who live alone or who carry valuable items, such as cash and jewelry, can be perceived as "more accessible and profitable targets" of robbery from the offender's point of view(Smith, 1987, p. 298). The proportion of female victims of robberies is higher than that of other types of violent crimes, such as homicide and arson(43.1% and 35.0%, respectively, Supreme Prosecutor's Office, 2015), with the exception of rape.

Despite these relatively high rates of robbery against female victims, very few studies have compared robberies perpetrated against female and male victims, and female victims of robbery have been under-researched(Smith, 1987). Female victimization is one of the areas in crime research that demands more attention(Kaysen, Morris, Rizvi, & Resick, 2005; Smith, 1987). Women are more likely to display fear of crime than men(Hale, 1996). Relative to men, women are more susceptible to post-traumatic stress disorder following a traumatic event(Norris, 1992; Ozer, Best, Lipsey, & Weiss, 2003) for more prolonged times(Gale & Coupe, 2005). Although a number of studies have investigated

female victimization including post-traumatic responses, these have predominantly focused on rape(Koss, Figueredo, & Prince, 2002; Ullman & Filipas, 2001) and intimate partner violence(Bouhours & Broadhurst, 2015; Kruttschnitt, McLaughlin, & Petrie, 2004). However, post-traumatic responses that victims experience may vary by the types of crime(Kaysen et al., 2005). More studies on female victimization are needed focusing on robbery, of which the percentage of female victims is bigger than that of other types of violent crimes(Supreme Prosecutor's Office, 2015). The characteristics differentiating female victimization of robbery from those of male victimization may contribute to identifying the gender-specific needs of female victims and developing effective treatment strategies for female victims(Kempf-Leonard & Sample, 2000; Lauritsen & Heimer, 2008).

Previous Research on Female and Male Victims of Robbery

Past research on robbery has demonstrated notable differences between offenses against female and male victims. First, with respect to offender characteristics, adult offenders relative to juvenile offenders were more likely to perpetrate against female victims(Snyder, 1999). Second, in terms of the type of robbery, male victims were more likely to be targets of street robbery than female victims(Groff, 2007). Additionally, the

offense duration was much longer for male victims than for females(Gale & Coupe, 2005). Notably, the financial loss to the victim was much greater for female than for male victims(Felson, Baumer, & Messner, 2000; Tillyer & Tillyer, 2015).

In terms of weapon use, robberies of male victims were more likely to involve guns and other weapons, such as knives, than those of female victims were(Baumer, Horney, Felson, & Lauritsen, 2003). Additionally, a greater proportion of threats of violence were evident with male victims than with female victims(Gale & Coupe, 2005). However, considerable inconsistencies are observed in previous studies on robbery with respect to physical injury of the victims. First, the U.S. Department of Justice (2011) reported that the proportion of robbery victims who sustained physical injury did not differ by gender(36.9% of male victims and 37.9% of female victims). Second, Felson et al. (2000) reported that female victims of robberies were more likely to be injured than male victims were. Third, however, a number of studies reported the exact opposite results: Female victims, due to their relatively high compliance, were less likely to be physically coerced and injured as a result of robbery than male victims were(McCluskey, 2013; Zimring & Zuehl, 1986). Indeed, robbery offenses that ended in victim deaths were much more likely to be associated with males victims than with female victims(Cook, 1987; Zimring & Zuehl,

1986).

Following robbery offenses, female victims were more likely to report the incidents to the police than male victims were(Felson et al., 2000; U.S. Department of Justice, 2011). Additionally, the probability of being arrested was greater for offenders who perpetrated against female victims than who chose male victims(Snyder, 1999; Tillyer & Tillyer, 2015).

Furthermore, notable differences were observed after victimization: Male and female victims significantly differed in the symptoms they experienced after the offense. Gale and Coupe (2005) reported that female victims of robbery displayed greater fear of revictimization than male victims. Robbery victimization may cause substantial changes in daily life, such as not going out alone, not riding bicycles, and not carrying a purse(see Gale & Coupe, 2005). These changes were much more evident with female victims than with male victims, considerably restricting choices in social life(Gale & Coupe, 2005).

Aims of Our Study

Although a comparative approach is of great value to advance our knowledge about crime and victimization(Lauritsen & Heimer, 2008), research investigating differences between robberies perpetrated against female and male victims remains scarce(Lauritsen & Heimer, 2008). Our study is directed at evaluating

whether and how female victimization differs from male victimization in robbery offenses in depth.

The goal of the current study is to perform detailed analyses of female and male robbery victimization in South Korea and compare female and male victimization in terms of offender, victim, and offense characteristics. Furthermore, our goal is to determine the factors that contribute to differentiating female victimization from male victimization in robbery.

Our study ultimately aims to advance our understanding of female victimization, especially with respect to robbery, with its considerably high rates of female victims. Moreover, by adopting a comparative approach, we aim to provide insight into the differences in the characteristics of female and male victimization and contribute to developing better strategies for crime prevention and victim treatment.

Method

Data

We obtained robbery cases from 16 South Korean Public Prosecutor Offices in 12 cities, including Seoul, Suwon, Euijeongbu, Incheon, Daejeon, Cheongju, Jeonju, Gwangju, Busan, Daegu, Ulsan, and Changwon. Our sample comprised 1335 robbery cases prosecuted between 2011 and 2013. The case files included

police investigation reports, offender/victim statements, and trial records. Our sample consisted of 615 robbery cases against female victims(46.1%) and 720 robbery cases(53.9%) against male victims.

The majority of offenders in our data were male (91.2%, $n = 1217$) and 8.8% ($n = 118$) were female. The ages of the offenders ranged from 10 to 73 years, with an average of 25.8 years ($SD = 11.0$, median = 22, mode = 17). Among the 1319 cases in which the offenders' criminal records were known, 22.4% ($n = 296$) had committed robbery previously.

Regarding the victims' ages, 25.2% ($n = 336$) of the victims were in their twenties, 18.4% ($n = 245$) were in their thirties, 14.9% ($n = 199$) were in their fifties, 14.8% ($n = 197$) were in their forties, 14.7% ($n = 196$) were in their teens, 8.8% ($n = 118$) were over 60 years old, 0.2% ($n = 3$) were less than 10 years old, and 3.1% ($n = 42$) were of unknown age. In terms of the offender-victim relationships, 67.3% ($n = 898$) were strangers, 20.1% ($n = 268$) had just met before the offense, 5.3% ($n = 71$) were friends or lovers, and 4.5% ($n = 60$) were acquaintances. Additionally, 2.2% ($n = 30$) involved cases in which the victim did not know the offender, but the offender knew the victim. In 0.1% ($n = 2$) of the cases, the victim and the offender were relatives, and in 0.5% ($n = 6$), they had some other type of relationship, such as neighbors.

Among the 1317 offenses in which the type

of robbery was known, break-in robberies were the most frequent ($n = 599$, 44.9%), and street robberies were next ($n = 418$, 31.3%). The remaining 8.3% ($n = 111$) were robberies perpetrated after the offender approached the victim under the pretense of prostitution, and 14.2% ($n = 189$) were other types, such as kidnapping and hostage robberies.

Procedures

To conduct detailed analyses of robbery victimization and compare female and male victimization, we examined information about offenders, victims, and offense characteristics. First, we investigated offender characteristics, such as age, gender, criminal history, occupation, marital status, living status, and whether the offender was under the influence at the time of the offense.

Second, as victim characteristic variables we included victim-offender relationship, age, and offense location (victim's residence and workplace). Additionally, we investigated whether the victim was physically assaulted, whether the victim was sexually assaulted, and whether property was taken during the offense. Furthermore, we examined whether the victim was under the influence at the time of the offense and whether the victim reported the incident to the police.

Third, we employed offense type, premeditation, wearing a disguise/gloves,

possession of weapons/ligatures, method of approach, use of violence, and offense area as offense characteristic variables. Additionally, we determined whether robbery was committed with another type of crime and whether evidence (e.g., DNA-related, footprints) was left.

We used SPSS 22.0 to conduct the data analyses. First, we compared female and male victimization in terms of offender, victim, and offense characteristics by using Chi-square tests for categorical variables and Mann-Whitney U tests for continuous variables. Additionally, we conducted binomial logistic regression analyses to determine the variables that contributed to differentiating female victimization from male victimization.

Results

Robberies against Female and Male Victims: Offender Characteristics

We found notable differences in offender characteristics between robberies of female and male victims. First, we tested whether the offender's age at the time of the offense significantly differed by victim gender. Because Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests demonstrated that the offender's age was not normally distributed, we conducted Mann-Whitney U tests. The results showed that the age of the offender differed considerably

(Mann-Whitney $U = 119458.000$, $z = 14.549$, $r = .398$, $p = .000$). Offenders who perpetrated against female victims were older ($M = 30.02$, $SD = 11.2$) than those who perpetrated against male victims ($M = 22.16$, $SD = 9.5$).

Table 1 shows the results of the Chi-square analyses regarding offender characteristics. The offender's gender significantly differed between robberies of female and male victims. Although most robberies were perpetrated by male offenders, the proportion of female offenders who perpetrated against male victims was over twice that of those who perpetrated against female victims. In other words, female victims were almost exclusively victimized by male offenders. Additionally, offenders who perpetrated against female victims were three times more likely to

have a criminal history of robbery than those who perpetrated against male victims.

We found substantial differences regarding the occupation of the offender. Offenders who perpetrated against female victims were more likely to be mechanics and laborers, whereas offenders who perpetrated against male victims were more likely to be salespeople and students.

Offenders who perpetrated against female victims were less likely to be single and more likely to live alone at the time of the offense than those who perpetrated against male victims. Additionally, the proportion of offenders who were under the influence was slightly greater in robberies against female victims than in robberies with male victims.

Table 1. Robberies against Female and Male: Offender characteristics

Offender Characteristic	Robberies against Female victims	Robberies against Male victims	χ^2	Φ
Female offender	33(5.4%)	85(11.8%)	17.1***	.113
Criminal history of robbery	212(35.1%)	84(11.7%)	102.6***	.279
Salesperson	8(1.1%)	18(2.9%)	5.7*	.065
Mechanic	23(3.7%)	5(0.7%)	14.9***	.106
Laborer	70(11.4%)	29(4.0%)	26.1***	.140
Student	55(8.9%)	170(23.6%)	50.9***	.195
Single	416(67.6%)	617(85.7%)	61.8***	.215
Living alone	210(36.4%)	149(22.7%)	27.8***	.150
Under the influence	137(22.3%)	129(17.9%)	3.9*	.054

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Robberies against Female and Male Victims: Victim Characteristics

The results with respect to victim characteristics are presented in Table 2. Differences were present regarding the victim-offender relationship. Female victims were more likely to be strangers to their offenders than male victims were. Male victims were more likely to be attacked by someone whom they had just met than female victims were.

Differences were observed regarding the victim's age. First, the proportions of victims in their teens and thirties were greater for male victims. Second, the proportions of victims in

their fifties and victims aged 60 or older were greater for female victims. Differences with respect to victims in their twenties and forties were not significant ($\chi^2(1) = 0.02$, $\chi^2(1) = 1.26$, respectively).

In terms of the offense location, a significantly larger proportion of female victims reported that they were attacked in their residence and workplace than that of male victims.

Male victims were more likely to be physically assaulted during offenses than female victims. Additionally, a larger proportion of male victims than female victims reported that their property was taken. In contrast, female victims

Table 2. Robberies against Female and Male: Victim characteristics

Victim Characteristic	Robberies against Female Victims	Robberies against Male Victims	χ^2	Φ
V-o relationship: just met	100(16.3%)	168(23.3%)	10.3**	.088
Stranger to the offender	455(74.0%)	443(61.5%)	23.4***	.132
Age -10s	67(10.9%)	129(17.9%)	13.1***	.099
Age -30s	87(14.1%)a	158(21.9%)	13.5***	.100
Age -50s	111(18.0%)	88(12.2%)	8.9**	.082
Age -60s and older	68(11.1%)a	50(6.9%)	6.9**	.072
Victim residence	297(48.3%)	171(23.8%)	87.8***	.256
Victim workplace	212(34.5%)	191(26.5%)	9.9**	.086
Physically assaulted	278(45.2%)	419(58.2%)	22.4***	.130
Sexually assaulted	114(18.5%)	6(0.8%)	127.1***	.309
Property taken	479(77.9%)	611(84.9%)	10.8**	.090
Under the influence	60(9.8%)	139(19.3%)	23.8***	.134
Victim reported to police	354(57.6%)	479(66.5%)	11.4**	.092

* p <.05, ** p <.01, *** p <.001

were more than twenty-three times more likely to be sexually assaulted during offenses as male victims.

Notably, male victims were more than twice as likely to have been under the influence at the time of the offense than female victims were. Additionally, male victims were more likely to report the incident to the police than female victims were.

Robberies against Female and Male Victims: Offense Characteristics

Table 3 shows differences in offense characteristics between robberies against females and males. First, differences were evident with respect to the robbery type. Compared to robberies against males, robberies against females were more likely to involve break-ins, whereas those against males were more likely to involve street robbery.

With respect to offense premeditation, notable differences were present. Offenders who perpetrated against females were less likely to pre-select a target and more likely to carry a weapon or a tool than those who targeted males. Additionally, the proportion of offenders who wore a disguise and gloves was significantly larger for robberies against females than against males. Moreover, relative to offenders who perpetrated against males, offenders who perpetrated against females were more likely to possess weapons and ligatures.

The two groups also differed as to the method of approach. Offenders who perpetrated against females were more likely to use threats and employ a surprise attack when approaching the victim than offenders who perpetrated against males. In contrast, offenders who perpetrated against males were more likely to deceive the victim when approaching, by, for instance, asking for a cigarette or pretending to be a police officer.

With respect to the use of violence, substantial differences were evident. Relative to offenders who attacked males, offenders who attacked females were more likely to verbally abuse the victim, make threats with a weapon, and use force against the victim. Notably, offenders who attacked females were six times more likely to bind the victim than offenders who attacked males. In contrast, robberies against males were more likely to involve manual hitting and stabbing.

In relation to the crime area, differences were noted. Robberies against females were more likely to be committed in residential areas and less likely to be committed in commercial areas than those against males were. The proportion of robberies committed with other types of crime, such as sexual assault and arson, was significantly larger in robberies against females than in those against males.

With respect to leaving evidence at the offense location, offenders who perpetrated against females were more likely to leave

Table 3. Robberies against Female and Male: offense characteristics

Offense Characteristic	Robberies against Female victims	Robberies against Male Victims	χ^2	Φ
Break-in robbery	348(56.6%)	251(34.9%)	63.3***	.218
Street robbery	169(27.5%)	249(34.6%)	7.8**	.076
Pre-selecting a target	157(25.6%)	244(33.9%)	10.9**	.090
Carrying a weapon/tool	290(47.2%)	185(25.7%)	67.0***	.224
Wearing a disguise	128(20.8%)	77(10.7%)	26.1***	.140
Wearing gloves	70(11.4%)	38(5.3%)	16.6***	.112
Weapon possession	269(43.7%)	180(25.0%)	52.2***	.198
Ligature possession	148(24.1%)	37(5.1%)	99.5***	.273
Approach -threat	196(31.9%)	188(26.1%)	5.4***	.063
Approach -surprise	94(15.3%)	82(11.4%)	4.4*	.057
Approach -deception	192(31.2%)	310(43.1%)	19.8***	.122
Verbal abuse	301(48.9%)	280(38.9%)	13.6***	.101
Making threats with a weapon	239(38.9%)	147(20.4%)	54.9***	.203
Using force	252(41.0%)	162(22.5%)	52.9***	.199
Binding	122(19.8%)	24(3.3%)	92.8***	.264
Manual hitting	188(30.6%)	323(44.9%)	28.7***	.147
Stabbing	35(5.7%)	66(9.2%)	5.7*	.066
Residential area	336(54.6%)	256(35.6%)	48.9***	.191
Commercial area	249(40.5%)	419(58.2%)	41.6***	.177
Committed to another crime	235(65.1%)	243(54.9%)	8.7**	.104
DNA evidence left	106(17.2%)	39(5.4%)	47.9***	.189
Fingerprints/footprints left	79(12.8%)	26(3.6%)	39.0***	.171

* p <.05, ** p <.01, *** p <.001

DNA-related evidence and fingerprints/footprints than offenders who perpetrated against males.

Logistic Regression Analyses:
Differentiating female victimization

from male victimization

Binomial logistic regression analyses were performed to determine variables that contributed to differentiating robberies against females from

those against males. The dependent variable was the gender of the victim (one for female victim and zero for male victim). As independent variables, variables from previous analyses that yielded the most significant results (i.e. the largest effect sizes) were chosen. Rea and Parker(1992) suggested that an effect size of .20 or more can be considered moderate. Accordingly, we selected ten variables of which the effect size was .20 or more: 'offender's age at the time of the offense', 'victim sexually assaulted', 'criminal history of robbery', 'ligature possession', 'binding', 'victim residence', 'carrying a tool/weapon', 'break-in robbery', 'single (offender marital status)', and 'making threats with a weapon'.

The model was significant ($\chi^2(10) =$

461.120, $p < .001$, Table 4). Compared to offenders who perpetrated against male victims, offenders who perpetrated against female victims were over 21 times more likely to sexually assault the victim. Additionally, offenders who perpetrated against female victims were more than twice as likely as offenders who perpetrated against male victims to commit robbery at the victim's residence, have a criminal history of robbery, or bind the victim. Furthermore, relative to offenders who perpetrated against male victims, offenders who perpetrated against female victims presented higher probabilities of carrying a tool or a weapon, committing a break-in robbery, and being older.

Table 4. Binomial Logistic Regression

Likelihood of attacking a female rather than a male	β	S.E.	Wald	p	Exp(β)
Offender's age at the time of the offense	.039	.008	24.027	.000	1.039
Sexually assaulted	3.059	.447	46.814	.000	21.311
Criminal history of robbery	.966	.172	31.642	.000	2.628
Ligature possession	.332	.324	1.049	.306	1.394
Binding	.730	.370	3.897	.048	2.076
Victim residence	.996	.142	49.288	.000	2.707
Carrying a weapon/tool	.617	.165	13.992	.000	1.854
Break-in robbery	.463	.145	10.158	.001	1.589
Single (Offender)	-.314	.192	2.677	.102	.731
Making threats with a weapon	-.031	.174	.031	.861	.970

Note: -2 log likelihood = 1356.487, $R^2 = .295$ (Cox & Snell), $R^2 = .395$ (Nagelkerke)

Discussion

In the previous literature female victims of robbery have been almost ignored. Taking a gender-comparative approach to assessing the offender, victim, and offense characteristics of robbery, the present study identified unique patterns of female victimization. To summarize, female victims were almost exclusively victimized by male offenders. Offenders who perpetrated against female victims were more likely to live alone, be mechanics and laborers, and be under the influence at the time of the offense. Female victims were more likely to be attacked in their residence and workplace and less likely to be under the influence at the time of the offense than male victims were. Additionally, robberies against female victims were more likely to be committed in residential areas, involve break-in robbery, and be committed with other types of crime.

Our results suggest that offenders who perpetrated against female victims tended to be more experienced than those who perpetrated against male victims. Indeed, relative to offenders who perpetrated against males, those who victimized females were older and more likely to have a criminal history of robbery. Additionally, the proportion of victims aged 50 or older was larger for female victims than for male victims, indicating that offenders who attacked female victims also chose older and hence more vulnerable victims. Furthermore, offenders who

perpetrated against female victims were more likely to display premeditation, as evidenced by their tendency to carry a weapon, a tool, and/or ligatures and to take actions to protect their identity by wearing a disguise and gloves than those who targeted male victims. At the same time, female victims were less likely to report the incident to the police than male victims. These results together suggest that females are at relatively higher risk of victimization than males. Notably, offenders who attacked female victims were more likely to leave DNA-related evidence and fingerprints/footprints than those who chose male victims. This finding may be because female victims were mostly attacked by strangers, and in such cases, tracking DNA-related evidence and fingerprints/footprints would have been essential to apprehend the offenders. Additionally, we again note that our sample was obtained from Public Prosecutor Offices, indicating that the offenders in our sample were all identified, arrested, and prosecuted.

Our study showed that relative to offenders who attacked male victims, offenders who attacked female victims were more likely to use threats, employ a surprise attack, verbally abuse the victim, make threats with a weapon, use force against the victim, and bind the victim. These results are inconsistent with previous studies which reported that robberies against male victims were more likely to involve weapons and threats of violence than those of

female victims were(Baumer et al., 2003; Gale & Coupe, 2005). However, as previously stated, inconsistencies are present in previous studies on robbery with regard to physical injury of victims(U.S. Department of Justice, 2011; Felson et al., 2000). Our results do provide support for previous findings that female victims are less likely to be physically injured than male victims are(McCluskey, 2013; Zimring & Zuehl, 1986).

Our results have practical implications for mental health professionals who work with female victims, especially for the development of efficient treatment strategies. First, approximately half of the female victims were attacked in their residence, and approximately one third of the female victims were attacked in their workplace. Attacked in their own life space, victims may experience severe emotional distress including anger, fear, and anxiety, which may considerably influence their life. Second, approximately one fifth of female victims were sexually assaulted during robbery, which indicates that additional care must be provided for victim to effectively cope with robbery victimization as well as sexual victimization. Third, in terms of violence used, female victims were more likely to be verbally abused, threatened with a weapon, and bound than male victims. Use of violence, weapons and ligatures on the victim may cause not only physical but also psychological symptoms, such as shame and helplessness. Therefore, harmful consequences of violent victimization should be considered for effective victim treatment.

Our findings also have implications for practitioners in criminal justice systems for investigating and preventing robbery. First, approximately one third of perpetrators against female victims had a criminal history of robbery, which has practical implications for investigation. Especially considering that most offenses against female victims were committed by strangers, narrowing down suspects can be a priority in robbery investigations. Second, approximately half of the females were victims of break-in robbery and attacked in their own residence. The results suggest that gender-responsive robbery prevention strategies. Females may benefit more than males from strategies such as installation of closed-circuit televisions(CCTVs), alarm systems, and locks on gateways and windows in residences to prevent robberies(Kim & Kim, 2015).

Kaysen et al. (2005) reported that most female victims of robbery displayed emotional distress. Female victims reported feeling more frightened during the offense than male victims(Gale & Coupe, 2005). Compared to male victims, female victims displayed a greater tendency to experience distress, anger, anxiety, sleeping problems, and fear following robbery victimization(Gale & Coupe, 2005). Future research should examine differences in the psychological, behavioral, and cognitive symptoms that female and male victims may experience after robbery.

The findings obtained from our sample, which

comprised prosecuted cases, may not be generalized to all robberies in South Korea. However, our study performed empirical analyses of robbery victimization and identified unique patterns of female victimization distinct from those of male victimization. Our findings would be of great value in efforts to improve the services for female victims provided by criminal justice and mental health professionals.

References

- Bachman, R., Dillaway, H., & Lachs, M. S. (1998). Violence against the elderly: A comparative analysis of robbery and assault across age and gender groups. *Research on Aging, 20*(2), 183-198.
- Baumer, E., Horney, J., Felson, R., & Lauritsen, J. L. (2003). Neighborhood disadvantage and the nature of violence. *Criminology, 41*(1), 39-72.
- Bouhours, B. & Broadhurst, R. (2015). Violence against women in Hong Kong: Results of the International Violence Against Women Survey. *Violence Against Women, 21*(11), 1311-1329.
- Cohen, L. E., Cantor, D., & Kluegel, J. R. (1981). Robbery victimization in the U. S.: An analysis of a nonrandom event. *Social Science Quarterly, 62*, 644-657.
- Cook, P. J. (1987). Robbery violence. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 78*(2), 357-376.
- Felson, R. B., Baumer, E. P., & Messner, S. F. (2000). Acquaintance robbery. *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency, 37*, 284-305.
- Gale, J. & Coupe, T. (2005). The behavioral, emotional and psychological effects of street robbery on victim. *International Review of Victimology, 12*, 1-22.
- Groff, E. R. (2007). Simulation for theory testing and experimentation: An example using routine activity theory and street robbery. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 23*(2), 75-103.
- Hale, C. (1996). Fear of crime: A review of the literature. *International Review of Victimology, 4*, 79-150.
- Kaysen, D., Morris, M. K., Rizvi, S. L., & Resick, P. A. (2005). Peritraumatic responses and their relationship to perceptions of threat in female crime victims. *Violence Against Women, 11*(12), 1515-1535.
- Kempf-Leonard, K., & Sample, L. (2000). Disparity based on sex: Is gender-specific treatment warranted? *Justice Quarterly, 17*(1), 89-128.
- Kim, J. Y. & Kim, J. Y. (2015). The study on the relation of the places that robberies were occurred and robbery methods. *The Korean Association of Police Science Review, 17*, 71-96.
- Koss, M. P., Figueredo, A. J., & Prince, R. J. (2002). Cognitive mediation of rape's mental, physical and social health impact: Tests of four models in cross-sectional data. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 70*, 926-941.
- Kruttschnitt, C., McLaughlin, B., Petrie, C. (2004). *Advancing the federal research agenda on violence against women*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Lauritsen J. L. & Heimer, K. (2008). The Gender Gap in Violent Victimization, 1973-2004.

- Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 24, 125-147.
- McCluskey, J. D. (2013). A comparison of robbers' use of physical coercion in commercial and street robberies. *Crime & Delinquency*, 59, 419-442.
- Norris, F. H. (1992). Epidemiology of trauma: Frequency and impact of different potentially traumatic events on different groups. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 60, 409-418.
- Ozer, E. J., Best, S. R., Lipsey, T. L., & Weiss, D. S. (2003). Predictors of post-traumatic stress disorder and symptoms in adults: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 52-73.
- Rea, L. M., & Parker, R. A. (1992). *Designing and conducting survey research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Boss.
- Smith, M. D. (1987). Changes in the victimization of women: Is there a "new female victim"? *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency*, 24, 291-301.
- Snyder, H. N. (1999). The overrepresentation of juvenile crime proportions in robbery clearance statistics. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 15(2), 151-161.
- Supreme Prosecutor's Office (2015). *2014 Analytic reports on crimes*. Seoul: Supreme Prosecutor's Office.
- Tillyer, M. S. & Tillyer R. (2015). Maybe I Should Do This Alone: A comparison of solo and co-offending robbery outcomes. *Justice Quarterly*, 32, 1064-1088.
- Ullman, S. E., & Filipas, H. H. (2001). Predictors of PTSD symptom severity and social reactions in sexual assault victims. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 14, 369-389.
- U.S. Department of Justice (2011). *Criminal Victimization in the United States, 2008 - Statistical Tables*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Zimring, F. E., & Zuehl, J. (1986). Victim injury and death in urban robbery: A Chicago study. *Journal of Legal Studies*, 15(1), 1-40.
- 1차원고접수 : 2017. 04. 25.
심사통과접수 : 2017. 06. 04.
최종원고접수 : 2017. 06. 20.

여성을 대상으로 한 강도 범죄 피해: 남성 피해자와의 비교를 중심으로*

김 지 영

박 지 선[†]

이 나 립

한국형사정책연구원

숙명여자대학교 사회심리학과

여성의 범죄 피해는 더 많은 연구를 필요로 하는 분야 중 하나이다. 강력 범죄 가운데 강도 사건의 높은 빈도에도 불구하고, 여성 피해자를 대상으로 한 연구는 살인, 성범죄 등에 주로 집중되어 왔다. 따라서 여성 피해자와 남성 피해자를 대상으로 한 강도 범죄의 특성을 비교한 연구는 매우 드물게 존재하며, 특히 여성을 대상으로 한 강도 범죄의 피해는 관련 연구가 매우 부족한 실정이다. 본 연구는 여성을 대상으로 한 강도 범죄의 특성을 남성 대상 강도 범죄와 비교하여 그 차이점을 조사하고, 궁극적으로 강도 범죄 예방 및 피해자 치료를 위한 더 나은 전략을 발전시키는 데 기여하는 것을 목표로 하였다. 이를 위해 국내에서 발생한 여성 피해자 대상 강도 사례 615건과 남성 피해자 대상 강도 사례 720건을 바탕으로 해서, 본 연구에서는 강도 범죄 피해에 있어 범죄자 특성, 피해자 특성, 범행 특성 등에서의 차이점에 대해 심층적으로 분석하였다. 그 결과, 본 연구에서는 여성 대상 강도와 남성 대상 강도 사건 사이에 범죄자의 나이, 범죄 전력, 직업, 피해자의 나이, 피해자-가해자 관계, 범죄 장소 등에 있어 유의미한 차이를 발견하였다. 더불어, 강도 범죄의 유형, 범행의 계획성, 폭력 사용, 남겨진 증거 등에 있어서도 여성 대상 강도와 남성 대상 강도 사건 사이에 두드러진 차이점이 나타났다. 이러한 차이점들을 바탕으로 해서, 마지막으로 본 연구가 강도 범죄의 예방 및 특히 여성 피해자를 위한 치료 전략 수립에 대해 갖는 함의에 대해 논의하였다.

주제어 : 강도, 성차, 여성 피해자, 남성 피해자, 여성 대상 범죄

* 이 논문은 2014년 한국형사정책연구원 '연구총서 14-B-06: 연쇄강력범죄 실태조사III(연쇄강도)'의 연구수행을 위해 수집한 자료를 활용하였음.

† 교신저자 : 박지선, 숙명여자대학교 사회심리학과, 서울시 용산구 청파로 47길 100

Tel : 02-2077-7621, E-mail : rmpjcr@hanmail.net