

## Does Crime Hurt Differently? Female and Male Realities of Victimization\* in the NCVS 2023 Data\*\*

Merve Reyhan BAYGELDİ CEYLAN\*\*\*

### ABSTRACT

The main objective of this study is to understand and analyze whether there are differences in victimization experiences between women and men based on the 2023 National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). Routine Activities Theory is used as an analytical lens to examine these differences within their social contexts. In this framework, this quantitative study aims to identify five interrelated dimensions of a crime incident: injury, offender characteristics, self-protection, police response, and the effects of crime on the victim. According to findings, women are more frequently exposed to sexual violence within private or familiar environments. On the other hand, men are more likely to encounter violence in public spaces. Additionally, offenders are strangers in men cases. Women are more likely to ask for help and tell the police about what happened. But men are more likely to keep quiet, not tell anyone they were hurt, and keep the emotional effects to themselves. The psychological and social effects of being a victim are different for men and women. These numbers show that gender and everyday routines are effective on victimization.

**Keywords:** Crime Victimization, Gender, Routine Activities Theory, NCVS, United States.

**Received / Accepted:** 09 October 2025 / 26 December 2025

**Citation:** Baygeldi Ceylan, M. R. (2026). Does Crime Hurt Differently? Female and Male Realities of Victimization in the NCVS 2023 Data. *İmgelem*, 18, 27-56.

### Suçun Etkisi Cinsiyete Göre Değişir mi? NCVS 2023 Verilerinde Kadın ve Erkek Mağduriyetleri

### ÖZ

2023 Ulusal Suç Mağduriyet Araştırması (NCVS) verilerini kullanarak Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'nde suç mağduriyetlerinin cinsiyete dayalı etkilerini ortaya koymak bu çalışmanın temel amacıdır. Cinsiyet, Rutin Aktiviteler Teorisi'ne göre hem bireylerin demografik bir özelliği hem de toplumsal bir realitedir. Bu durumda mağduriyetin cinsiyete dayalı sonuçları beş farklı açıdan ele alınmaktadır: Suç, fail, mağdurun kendini koruma stratejileri, polis tepkisinin ve suçun mağdur üzerindeki etkisinin. Araştırmanın bulguları, toplumsal cinsiyete dayalı mağduriyetin çeşitli olduğunu göstermektedir. Kadınlara yönelik cinsel ve yakın partner şiddeti daha yaygındır. Bununla birlikte, mağduriyetler genellikle tanıdık ya da özel mekânlarda gerçekleşir. Kamusal alanlarda erkekler daha fazla şiddetle karşı karşıyadır. Erkek vakalarında failer genellikle yabancıdır. Buna ek olarak, erkekler mağduriyetlerini ifade etmeme ve duygusal etkileri başkalarıyla paylaşmama yönünde bir tutum

\*Here, victimization is understood as the experience and process of harm resulting from a crime event, including its distribution and potential repetition, rather than as a fixed personal status. This distinction avoids reducing individuals to the passive label of "victim" and instead emphasizes victimization as a situational and dynamic phenomenon (Pease, 2007).

\*\*In this research article, ethics committee permission was not required as the data were not obtained using survey or interview techniques. / Bu araştırma makalesinin verileri anket veya mülakat teknikleri kullanılarak elde edilmediğinden etik kurul izni gerekmemiştir.

\*\*\*Dr., Ibn Haldun University, Faculty of Humanity and Social Sciences, Department of Sociology, Istanbul/Türkiye. E-mail: merve.baygeldi@ihu.edu.tr, ORCID Number: 0000-0003-2935-2723, ROR ID: <https://ror.org/02y5xdw18>



sergilemektedir. Kadınlar ise resmî kurumlara başvurma ve destek arama eğilimleri ise daha yüksektir. Bir suçta maruz kalma durumunun toplumsal alanda itibar zedelenmesi yaşama durumu ise kadınlarda daha yüksek olduğu görülmektedir. Bu bulgular, suç mağduriyetinin yalnızca bireysel özellikler üzerinden değil, toplumsal cinsiyetle iç içe geçmiş gündelik yaşam pratikleri bağlamında ele alınması gerektiğine işaret etmektedir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Suç Mağduriyeti, Cinsiyet, Rutin Aktiviteler Teorisi, NCVS, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri.

**Başvuru / Kabul:** 09 Ekim 2025 / 26 Aralık 2025

**Atf:** Baygeldi Ceylan, M. R. (2026). Suçun Etkisi Cinsiyete Göre Değişir mi? NCVS 2023 Verilerinde Kadın ve Erkek Mağduriyetleri. *İncelem*, 18, 27-56.

## INTRODUCTION

Criminal victimization represents a social phenomenon characterized by the presence of crime. Like other social phenomena, it possesses multiple dimensions. Therefore, it can be examined within the numerous variables of legal, psychological, cultural, economic, and political contexts (Andrews et al., 2003; Walklate, 2007). This study analyzes victimization through the lens of gender-based experiences. RAT will serve as a theoretical framework to analyze the social context of gender-based victimization.

Researchers have predominantly concentrated on offenders rather than victims. Crime is assessed as an action arising from the interaction between the offender and the law. In other words, individual motivations, social strain, structural disadvantages, the deterrent power of the legal system, and biological conditions are identified as primary factors and influential elements. Later criminological research included victims, often depicting them as passive recipients of harm instead of active participants in criminal activities (Karmen, 2007). Victimology has developed into a separate subfield; nonetheless, much empirical research continues to regard victims as a homogeneous group or examine types of victimization without integrating them into a cohesive theoretical framework.

Gender is a fundamental variable that shapes the nature of crime. Violent crime is the one of the most observable domains in that context. Violent victimization is concentrated among men according to statistics (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2023). Moreover, numbers also demonstrate statistically significant difference between two genders among the locations of violent crimes and the victim-offender relations. Men face a higher risk of victimization in public spaces. Additionally, violence is most often perpetrated by strangers not from the victims' social environment. Approximately half of violent crimes against men are committed by acquaintances, whereas this proportion is closer to one quarter in cases involving female victims (Heimer, 2008). However, women's victimization happens in private places. Moreover, women mostly exposed to sexual violence. According to NCVS data, nearly 20 percent of

## **Does Crime Hurt Differently? Female and Male Realities of Victimization in the NCVS 2023 Data**

---

nonfatal violent acts against women are perpetrated by intimate partners. This rate is five times higher than that observed by men (Catalano et al., 2009; Planty & Langton, 2013).

Gender differences is also observable in post-crime behaviors. NCVS findings shows that men report to the police significantly lower than women. This pattern is evaluated with the notion of masculinity (Ayala, 2015; R. B. Felson & Paré, 2005; Şentürk, 2023). Similarly, the psychological and social consequences of victimization vary by gender. Researchers show that women report higher levels of fear of crime (Andrews et al., 2003; K. A. Fox et al., 2009; Davies et al., 2011). The patterns indicate that the gender dimension of victimization is embedded in the organization of everyday life. Routine Activity Theory (RAT), developed by Cohen and Felson (1979), argues that victimization occurs when a motivated offender faces a suitable target in the absence of capable guardianship. This encountering emerges from social patterns. In other words, exposure to risk, spatial proximity and access to protective resources reflects some patterns of different social realities. Accordingly, it can be said that disparities between two gender is constructed on the type of participation in social life according to RAT.

These gendered opportunity structures are present in various countries. The World Health Organization says that one in three women will be physically or sexually abused at some point in their lives, most often by a partner (Violence against Women, 2025). But the numbers show that almost 80% of murder victims around the world are men. According to the Global Study on Homicide (2019), most of these deaths happen in public places and involve other men. These numbers show that gender affects both the likelihood of being a victim and the way that victimization happens in different situations.

Much research remains ambiguous. Much of the research remains ambiguous. Research on sexual violence primarily centers on women, while investigations into public violence and homicide predominantly target men. Individuals often concentrate on one aspect of reporting behavior, self-protective strategies, police response, or the psychological impacts on specific victim demographics. There is a deficiency in the literature regarding the comprehension of gendered victimization. Institutional responses intensify the situation. A higher percentage of women report experiencing harm from the police in comparison to men, although not all women assert such experiences. The National Crime Victimization Survey reveals that law enforcement is cognizant of less than 50% of all violent crimes. This is especially relevant to sexual assault (BJS, 2023). Men exhibit notably lower reporting rates, especially concerning victimization

that violates conventional masculine norms, including sexual or domestic violence (Ayala, 2015; R. B. Felson & Paré, 2005; Şentürk, 2023).

This study conducts an examination of data acquired from the 2023 National Community Voter Survey in order to investigate current gaps. The fact that these figures include offenses that were not recorded by law enforcement sets them apart from official crime statistics (figures, 2024). RAT is used as a theoretical framework in order to restrict the whole of this extensive dataset and to specify the parameters of the research in a clear and concise manner. Within that framework, this research makes use of five interconnected dimensions of victimization in order to gain an understanding of the emergence of an incident during and after it has occurred. These dimensions are as follows: (1) the characteristics of the incident; (2) the characteristics of the offender; (3) the self-protective behaviors of victims; (4) the response of the police; and (5) the psychosocial consequences.

This research did not investigate whether women or males are more likely to become victims of harassment or assault. It raises a more analytical question: Do men and women experience the effects of criminal acts differently? What situational and institutional variables are contributing to this discrepancy, and how do they impact the situation? In addition to this, it makes a contribution to the existing body of literature by including the whole process of the event into a temporal framework organized according to gender differences. For the purpose of victimization research, the United States of America acts as an essential sample. The results obtained from the United States provide Turkey with a framework that can be used for the analysis of particular as well as general societal processes of victimization in relation to gender inequalities. As a consequence of this, people do not consider the United States to be a model that is applicable everywhere; rather, they consider it to be an important case study to investigate. According to the findings of this research, gender serves not only as a secondary control variable but also as a major organizational framework for encounters with experiencing victimization. For the purpose of generating theories and implementing equitable crime prevention methods, victim support services, and judicial procedures, it is essential to conduct an analysis of the unique affects that crime has on men and women.

### **Literature Review**

When the subject is crime, the attention has historically focused on the offender. Researchers have long sought to explain criminal behavior by examining offenders' motivations, psychological or health-related abnormalities, family backgrounds, social ties, and decision-

## **Does Crime Hurt Differently? Female and Male Realities of Victimization in the NCVS 2023 Data**

---

making processes (Karmen, 2007; Walklate, 2007). Yet crime cannot be reduced to actions committed by an individual and subsequently defined as criminal by law. It must be situated within broader social realities. One of these realities is the victim. From this perspective, the victim's gender, the presence or absence of capable guardians or witnesses, and the routines of everyday life cannot be treated as factors external to crime. They are integral to how crime emerges and how victimization takes place.

Routine Activities Theory enables crime researchers to move beyond an offender-centered approach and to conceptualize crime within a wider social framework. This perspective simultaneously problematizes the social realities of offenders, victims and witnesses. Within this framework, victimization is a result of a unification of a motivated offender encounters, a suitable and vulnerable target in the absence of effective guardianship (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Vulnerability, in turn, is not an inherent trait of the target but is produced through social relationships and everyday routines. Building on this line of reasoning, the present study aims to examine how women's and men's differing everyday realities give rise to distinct chains of victimization.

### **Gendered Routine Activities and the Context of Victimization**

A growing body of research shows that women and men experience different types of victimization. These differences are closely linked to the social realities that emerge from the separation of everyday life practices. Compared to men, women face a higher risk of sexual assault, stalking, and intimate partner violence. Such crimes most often occur in private or familiar settings, and the offender is usually someone known to the victim (Connell, 2009; Márquez, 2023; Hearn, 1996). By contrast, men are more likely to experience crime in streets, bars, or other relatively unstructured public social spaces. In these cases, the victim and the offender typically do not know each other (Connell, 2000; Daly & Wilson, 1990). Although motivated offenders are present in such environments, the number of people who can intervene is often limited. Situations involving alcohol consumption and socializing with peers increase the likelihood of conflict and physical violence. Cross-cultural evidence show that the vast majority of homicides are committed by men against men, while violence among women remains relatively rare (Wilson & Daly, 1998).

The differences mentioned above can also be linked to the greater visibility of men's routine activities in public spaces. In addition, men's social networks and trust relations tend to

be broader, more complex, and less restricted than those of women. Within this context, women's more limited everyday lives—often centered on familiar people and private spaces—do not necessarily make them safer.

### **Offender–Victim Convergence and Gendered Opportunity Structures**

Routine Activities Theory asserts that the characteristics of victimization are influenced by the spatial and temporal interactions between offenders and victims. Connell (2000) and Hamby et al. (2013) assert that men have consistently perpetrated the majority of violent crimes across all societies. On the other hand, RAT shifts the focus from masculinity as a cause of crime to the circumstances that allow criminals to choose certain victims.

Women are more likely to be victims of sexual and domestic violence because they often live with men who are violent and don't always have safe places to go. Men are more likely to be victims of violence in public because they spend more time in places where there are mostly men and where they can hang out with other men without any rules. These are places where criminals can meet people who are easy targets and not be watched too closely.

People's views on and interactions with criminals also affect their chances, depending on their gender. People often think that women who commit crimes are strange or not as dangerous. This means they are more likely to get shorter sentences or try to explain what they did (Ayala, 2015; Masser et al., 2010). Men who commit crimes, especially violent ones, fit the mold of common criminal stereotypes better and get harsher punishments (Mitchell et al., 2009). These gendered views affect how the police do their jobs, how people are punished, and how the news tells stories. This makes it easier for people to break the law again.

### **Gender, Guardianship, and Victims' Behavioral Responses**

Activities that are considered routine cover a broad variety of factors, one of which is the people with whom one lives in close proximity or interacts on a regular basis. It is possible for those who are present at the moment of a crime to engage in a practice known as proactive guardianship, which has the potential to prevent criminal activity from occurring. It is possible for this guardianship to be authorized or unapproved. instances of official guardians include the police and schools, while instances of informal guardians include friends, relatives, and acquaintances who live in close proximity to the individual. When it comes to the circumstances surrounding the crime, the gender of the person who is getting guardianship is a crucial issue that plays a role.

## **Does Crime Hurt Differently? Female and Male Realities of Victimization in the NCVS 2023 Data**

---

Men are often seen to be powerful, according to the general public. When males are wounded, it is expected of them to defend themselves and fight back against the aggression. The majority of the time, individuals are not seen to be “appropriate” victims if they do not do this. Women, on the other hand, are more likely to be seen as victims due to the perception that they are weaker than males. Because of this, it is expected of males to cope with criminal activity on their own, but it is expected of women to seek assistance and deal with the experience of being a victim with the assistance of other people. The manner in which individuals respond to criminal activity changes whenever these positions are altered or mixed together. It is possible for the reactions of law enforcement, perceptions of victim behavior, and the effects of criminal activity on victims to change in accordance with the circumstances (Davies et al., 2011; Rye et al., 2006; Howard, 1984; Masser et al., 2010). These evaluations concurrently have an impact on larger society responses and are directly impacted by those emotions. Others sometimes get the impression that they are being victimized once again when they question what women say or evaluate them based on what others believe women ought to do (Connell, 2009; Jeanes, 2007). Women who have gone through these situations are less inclined to trust institutions and less willing to collaborate with one another. The institutional protection that is provided is weakened as a result of this.

However, when males are victims, others often disbelieve them or minimize what they went through, particularly if it does not correspond with what the majority of people consider to be manly (Ayala, 2015; Davies et al., 2011). This is especially true when the victim is a child. Because of this, it is more difficult for males to speak about the things that they have been through, and it also makes it less likely that they would seek assistance. The methods in which women safeguard themselves from violence are illustrative of the functioning of gendered opportunity frameworks. When it comes to the law, self-defense is often characterized as a danger that is both imminent and equal. The abuse that is both sustained and repeated is often overlooked by this restrictive definition. Due to this, women are not always seen to be victims in situations that are brought before the court system (Ewing, 1987; McPherson, 2022). According to the Routine Activities Theory, the courts usually focus on isolated instances rather than chronic threats and lasting shortcomings in protection. This is because the two types of threats are more difficult to predict. The findings of research that is based on the Routine Activities Theory suggest that the repercussions of victimization are determined more by social reactions than by biological sex. According to research conducted by Andrews et al. (2003) and

Fox et al. (2009), women who have been victims of crime have been shown to have significantly higher levels of dread of criminal activity, heightened stress symptoms, and major disturbances in their day-to-day lives. When women are subjected to criticism or suspicion from other people, these effects become more pronounced.

When it comes to expressing their emotional anguish, men often do it with less candor. In accordance with the standards of masculinity, males are expected to keep their feelings to themselves and to avoid seeking aid (Davies et al., 2011). However, research also demonstrates that males might have major mental health issues as a result of the unfavorable reactions of other individuals from other people. The fact that this is the case suggests that the variations in experiences that women and men have are mostly the result of societal expectations and reactions, rather than inequalities that are caused by biological differences. When seen through the lens of the Routine Activities and Situational Opportunity frameworks, the differences in victimization that exist between women and men are more easily explained by variances in exposure, proximity to perpetrators, access to guardianship, and institutional responses. Women have a higher risk of being damaged in private settings because they are more likely to be in close proximity to the individuals who hurt them and have less protection. Men are more likely to be in danger when they are in public areas where social norms make it more difficult for them to call for assistance.

## **Method**

In this particular study, the primary research topic that was being investigated was, “How does gender affect individuals' experiences as victims of crime?” In order to provide an answer to this issue, the analytical framework, methodology, and theoretical viewpoint of the research were developed. The purpose of this study is to analyze the impact that gender has on their likelihood of being a victim of crime in the United States, with the goal of emphasizing the true similarities and differences that exist between male and female victims. For the purpose of accomplishing its objective, this research employs a descriptive quantitative technique. Within the scope of this study, the influence of gender on several elements of victimization is investigated. These aspects include the characteristics of the assault and injury, the perpetrator profiles, the locations of the incidents, the self-defense strategies used by victims, the interventions of law enforcement, and the social and psychological repercussions of being a victim. In this method, a multidimensional framework is used in order to explore the gendered dynamics of injury patterns, interactions between victims and offenders, and reporting behaviors related to injuries.

## **Does Crime Hurt Differently? Female and Male Realities of Victimization in the NCVS 2023 Data**

---

### **Set of Data and Source**

The Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) gave us the data for this research (study number 38962). The dataset is sorted by the year of the interview, not the year of the offense. This kind of style is called a collection-year format.

There are four main categories of files in the NCVS dataset: address, household, person, and event. This study utilizes an incident-level extract file created by merging both datasets, enabling simultaneous analysis of demographic and incident-specific factors.

### **Sample**

The NCVS is a survey that covers all 50 states and the District of Columbia. The dataset for 2023 uses a stratified multistage cluster sampling method. There are around 200,000 homes in that area. We spoke to 142,028 homes, which included 226,480 people. As a result, 82% of those who were asked to take part did. This research used a subsample of 9,324 persons who indicated being victims of at least one crime. The U.S. Census Bureau gave the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) the data using computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI). The dataset that was available to the public did not include any geographic information.

The sample includes people of different ages and levels of education. The majority of people in this category have a high school diploma: 2,895 women and 2,636 men. The second biggest group has a college degree, while the third largest group has a high school diploma. The biggest group of people is made up of men and women between the ages of 35 and 49. The second biggest group is those between the ages of 25 and 34, while the last important group is people between the ages of 50 and 64. The fact that 52.4% of the sample is female is in line with the fact that women are present in all age groups.

59.3% of men and women both have a high school diploma. 36.5% of women and 35.3% of men have a college degree, whereas 3.6% of women and 4.5% of men have a lower level of education. The majority of people in this age group are between 35 and 49 years old, with women making up 27% and males making up 26.7% of the total. The next biggest groupings of people are those between the ages of 25 and 34 and those between the ages of 50 and 64. The younger (12–24) and older (65+) age groups have fewer people living in them. 79.4% of those who took part said they were White or mostly White. 13.7% said they were Black or part Black, and 7% said they were Mixed or part of another minority group.

87.7% of the people who took part live in cities, while just 12.3% live in the country. This design works for both men and women. 42.6% of the males and 37.1% of the women in this group had never been married. The second biggest group is made up of people who are presently married. Men make up 38.2% of this group, while women make up 32.4%. Women are more likely than males to be divorced, become widows, or separate. Most of the people who took part were from the high-income group (34.9%), then the middle-income group (34.1%), and finally the low-income group (12.7%). 18.2% did not say how much money they made. A large number of people (95.3%) live in permanent housing units, whereas a small number (4.7%) live in mobile or temporary units.

### **Analysis**

The gender of the respondent is the main independent variable in this research. This is shown as a binary variable in SPSS, where 0 means Male and 1 means Female. Gender became the most important factor in each study that predicted the results. The main types of dependent variables include attack and injury, characteristics of the perpetrator, self-protective behavior, police reaction, and social-psychological impacts.

We used IBM SPSS Statistics (version 26) to look at the data. The first step used descriptive statistics to describe the sample and look at the basic distribution of the dependent variables. A range of statistical techniques were later used.

Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) tests were used to analyze the impact of gender on the situational, behavioral, and institutional aspects of victimization, including the crime's location, the connection between the victim and the perpetrator, and the frequency of crime reporting to law enforcement.

Spearman's rho correlation coefficients were used to analyze the association between gender and the sequentially assessed injury categories.

We used binary logistic regression to look at how gender affected several outcomes of victimization, such as the chance of reporting an injury and the kind of injury experienced. The regression results show coefficients (B), significance levels (p-values), and odds ratios (Exp(B)).

The NCVS dataset includes intricate sampling weight factors (e.g., WGTPERCY and WGTVICCY); nevertheless, this research used unweighted analyses to investigate disparities between groups of women and men instead of producing estimates for the overall population.

## **Does Crime Hurt Differently? Female and Male Realities of Victimization in the NCVS 2023 Data**

---

The study used just legitimate replies, excluding any data that was either absent or outside the established parameters.

### **Limitations**

A number of other factors that may be relevant are included in the dataset. These include racial background, the presence or absence of a disability, changes in marital status, the composition of households, citizenship, different types of jobs, military experience, and sexual orientation. These aspects were not taken into consideration in this research. The results solely consider the differences that exist between men and women; they do not take into consideration any other social or demographic factors related to the population. In the NCVS 2023 dataset, the data are organized according to the year in which they were obtained. Instead of the date that the event took place, occurrences are categorized according to the year that the interview took place. It is possible that this will make it more difficult to determine when the crime took place. Due to the fact that the study was only concerned with gender-based group comparisons, sample weights were not included in the analyses. Because of this decision, it may be more difficult to apply the results to the whole population of the United States. Although the dataset is of high quality and is typical of the country as a whole, it is susceptible to bias due to the fact that it is based on self-reports, which introduces the possibility of social desirability and memory bias. Recollections and narratives of people's experiences as victims may be influenced by a variety of factors, including those that are personal, emotional, and social in nature. There is a possibility that some consequences may be underestimated if certain incidents, such as sexual assault or psychological trauma, are not reported immediately. Individuals who reported having been victims of crime at least once were the only ones who were investigated for this research (n = 9,324). Considering that the conclusions are solely based on victim samples, it is clear that the findings are not applicable to the general population.

### **Findings**

#### **Assault and Injury**

**Table: 1. Chi- Square Table of Incident Location and Assault Type**

<b>Incident</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Female(n)</b>	<b>Male(n)</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Incident location</b>	Home	3194	2684	0.000
	Friend's place	160	107	
	Public	1530	1649	

Type of assault (3 groups)	Sexual	30	16	0.062
	Threat	474	507	
	Physical	160	151	

Table 1 shows that the gender of the victim and the place of the crime are strongly related ( $p < 0.001$ ). This is important for everyday life. Opportunity-based assault is less influenced by female vulnerability and more by the unequal access to environments where motivated offenders and appropriate victims converge in the absence of adequate security. There have been 3,194 cases of women being hurt at home, while there have been 2,684 cases of men being hurt. This is because women are more likely to be near thieves, which can make informal protection less useful. RAT makes it easier for criminals to work in public places, where men were more likely to be victims (1,649 cases vs. 1,530 cases) because social interactions were less organized and the situation was more dangerous. There weren't many events at a friend's house that included both men and women (160 women and 107 men). This indicates that semi-private spaces may provide superior informal oversight compared to fully public or domestic settings, preventing the convergence of offenders and victims (Felson, 2002). Research indicates that women are more susceptible to assaults in private or familiar settings by family members or intimate partners, whereas men are more frequently victimized in public by strangers or colleagues. At least three quarters of violence against women is done by someone they know, but only half of violence against men is done by someone they know (National Research Center, 1996). Most nonfatal intimate partner violence between men and women occurs in the home, underscoring the significance of daily habits in influencing the risk of victimization (Heimer, 2008).

Table 1 shows that more women (0.6%, or 30 people) than men (0.3%, or 16 people) said they had been sexually attacked. However, the difference was not statistically significant ( $p = .062$ ). From a RAT perspective, this trend is significant as sexual victimization correlates with proximity, absence of a caretaker, and a power imbalance that facilitates the attacker's access (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Felson, 2002). There wasn't much difference between men and women in other types of attacks. 9.5% of women ( $n = 474$ ) and 10.6% of men ( $n = 507$ ) stated they had experienced attacks due to threats. The rate of physical assault was the same for men and women: 3.2% for men ( $n = 151$ ) and 3.2% for women ( $n = 160$ ).

**Does Crime Hurt Differently? Female and Male Realities of Victimization  
in the NCVS 2023 Data**

---

**Table: 2. Correlation Table of Injury Types**

Type of Injury	Spearman rho (Binary Gender)	P value
None	-0.047	0.204
Rape injuries	0.181	0.000 **
Attempted rape injuries	0.082	0.024 *
Sexual assault injuries	0.062	0.092
Knife, stab wounds	-0.074	0.043 *
Gun shot, bullet wounds	-0.012	0.738
Broken bones or teeth	0.022	0.554
Internal injuries	0.016	0.670
Knocked unconscious	-0.077	0.036 *
Bruises, cuts	0.036	0.322

Both Spearman's association (Table 2) and binary logistic regression analysis (Table 3) were used to look at the link between damage type and gender. The first study found strong links between gender and some kinds of injuries. The second study gave more information about how strong and which way these links go.

**Table: 3. Regression Table of Type of Injury**

Type of Injury	B	S.E.	P value	Exp(B)
None	1.112	0.366	0.002 **	3041
Rape injuries	3.150	0.618	0.000 **	23342
Attempted rape injuries	21.303	14075	0.999	1.78E+09
Sexual assault injuries	2.364	1148	0.039 *	10632
Knife, stab wounds	-0.566	0.649	0.383	0.568
Gun shot, bullet wounds	0.885	1059	0.403	2423
Broken bones or teeth	0.716	0.465	0.124	2046
Internal injuries	0.533	0.414	0.197	1704
Knocked unconscious	-1372	0.742	0.064 †	0.254
Bruises, cuts	1.231	0.351	0.000 **	3426

Sexual abuse injuries become a prominent risk factor for victimized women. A considerable positive correlation exists between gender and rape-related injuries ( $\rho = 0.181$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Raped women were more likely to be physically injured. Logistic analysis confirmed that women had a 23-fold higher risk of rape-related injuries ( $\text{Exp}(B) = 23.342$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Being

female was also strongly associated with being raped ( $B = 2.364$ ,  $p = .039$ ,  $\text{Exp}(B) = 10.632$ ). Injury following attempted rape was strongly correlated ( $\rho = 0.082$ ,  $p = .024$ ), although the regression model didn't support this ( $p = .999$ ). Probably because that group didn't have enough instances or the difference was too great.

Men were more likely than women to be directly harmed by violence, especially stab wounds ( $\rho = -0.074$ ,  $p = .043$ ) and losing consciousness ( $\rho = -0.077$ ,  $p = .036$ ). The model showed that women were less likely to faint during assaults ( $B = -1.372$ ,  $p = .064$ ,  $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.254$ ). This finding was almost crucial.

Worry caused more cuts and bruises in women than males. Although there was no significant correlation between the two variables ( $\rho = 0.036$ ,  $p = .322$ ), logistic regression revealed a 3.4 times higher risk of accidents for women ( $B = 1.231$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\text{Exp}(B) = 3.426$ ). Physical violence seems to leave less severe but detectable scars on women. Besides that, neither research revealed a substantial association between gender and catastrophic injuries like being shot, breaking bones, or being harmed inside. These findings reveal that men and women experience key stress-related consequences at the same rate.

Men are more likely to be wounded by weapons or physical force than women by sexual violence. Gender not only predicts victimhood but also the kind of violence a person will experience and how it will effect them. However, male victims were more likely to report being stabbed or losing consciousness. Women are more likely to be injured by known offenders, particularly intimate partners (Márquez et al., 2023) whereas males are more likely to be hurt by strangers or in public. Abused men don't usually report it because they feel guilty, believe they should be protected, and embrace dominating masculinity. Several theories suggest that gender roles shape victim perception. Women are usually considered "credible victims," but males are generally overlooked (Ewing, 1987; Mitchell et al., 2009). The findings reveal that gender affects the likelihood of becoming a victim of violence, the sorts of victims, how easily they can be seen, and how others see them.

What victims do after being wounded is assessed in terms of social change, intimacy, and caring (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Felson, 2002). Sexual violence increases when the victim and perpetrator are close, life is unsafe, and authority is unfair. All of these increase the risk of injury or victimization. Because they are more likely to be in abusive situations, women are more likely to be sexually assaulted.

**Does Crime Hurt Differently? Female and Male Realities of Victimization  
in the NCVS 2023 Data**

---

**Offender**

**Table: 4. Chi- Square Table of Sex Distribution Among Offender and the Victim**

Victim sex	Offender sex		Total	P value
	Male	Female		
<b>Male</b>	832	173	1005	0,000
<b>Female</b>	903	361	1264	
<b>Total</b>	1735	534	2269	

Table 4 shows that there were 2,269 cases of sex between offenders and victims. The relationships between criminals and victims differ significantly based on gender. Women are less likely to commit crimes than men. Some crimes have victims who are men (173) and women (361). This pertains to male (n=832) and female (n=903) victims. There are big differences between men and women ( $p < .001$ ). Another interesting fact is that most of the victims are men. This supports Daly and Wilson's (1990) assertion that competitive males commit homicide at a higher rate than females. The fact that many women are abused by men shows that patriarchal power structures are still behind violence against women. The number of women who steal, particularly from males, is decreasing. The argument made by Brenik et al. (2025) that crimes perpetrated by female offenders against male victims are commonly neglected is supported by this evidence. In their respective studies, Stanko and Hobdell (1993) and Jovanoski and Sharlamanov (2021) found that male victims are less likely to speak out or seek assistance. The larger tales in society that minimize the severity of men's abuse may be the cause of this disparity. Men perpetrate a greater number of offenses than women, irrespective of gender. Gender norms and inequalities may influence the ways in which individuals inflict harm upon one another. People who commit crimes and people who are victims act differently in everyday situations (Felson, 2002; Cohen & Felson, 1979). Males abuse a lot of different kinds of victims. Men are more likely to be in social situations where conflict is likely, have less informal control, and put up with violence. When men attack women in friendly or social situations, they are more likely to hurt them because they are easier to get to and there are fewer barriers to protection. The time, place, and type of human interactions have an impact on the relationships between male and female offenders and their victims (Felson & Eckert, 2018).

**Table: 5. Chi-Square Table of Knowing the Offender Among Sex**

	<b>Knew/had seen</b>	<b>Stranger</b>	<b>Don't know</b>	<b>Residue</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>P value</b>
<b>Male</b>	492	520	29	31	1072	0.000
<b>Female</b>	807	442	41	34	1324	
<b>Total</b>	1299	962	70	65	2396	

There were big differences ( $p < .001$ ) between the number of times female and male victims knew the offender, as shown in Table 5. Men ( $n=1,072$ ) are slightly more likely to be harmed by strangers ( $n=520$ ) than by thieves they know or have seen before ( $n=492$ ). Female victims ( $n=1,324$ ) are more likely than male victims ( $n=442$ ) to say that a friend or neighbor hurt them ( $n=807$ ).

**Table: 6. Chi-Square Table of Level of Offender-Victim Relation**

<b>Level of Offender-Victim Relation</b>					
	<b>Relatives or Close to Family</b>	<b>Social Environment</b>	<b>Not Close and not Clear</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>P Value</b>
<b>Male</b>	100	116	112	328	0.000
<b>Female</b>	318	168	124	610	
<b>Total</b>	418	284	236	938	

Table 5 shows knowledge as well as how close the victim and criminal are to each other (Table 6). There are 328 male victims. 100 of them are related to or close to family, 116 are in larger social circles, and 112 have distant or unclear relationships. There are more female victims ( $n = 610$ ) in the “relatives or close to family” category ( $n = 318$ ), which means that women are more likely to be hurt in personal or family situations. In general, these trends show that men and women are hurt in different ways. Family and friends are more likely to hurt women. Strangers are more likely to hurt men.

These results are consistent with earlier research. Semenza (2021) asserts that women are more susceptible to assault in familiar environments due to their socialization, while men are more prone to abuse in public or by strangers. Gebo et al. (2022) and Varlioglu & Hayes (2022) observe that early violent socialization and interpersonal abuse influence perpetrator-victim dynamics variably across genders, particularly among youth and intimate partners. It is clear that these hypotheses are supported by the disparities in the numbers on both lists. When it comes to analyzing abusive behaviors, gendered theories are very necessary. When seen from

**Does Crime Hurt Differently? Female and Male Realities of Victimization  
in the NCVS 2023 Data**

a situational perspective, these proximity differences illustrate how regular social interactions generate victims. Within close-knit social networks, women are more likely to become victims of criminal activity because they are constantly in the company of criminals and no one is keeping an eye on them from the outside. But the profiles of male offenders are more dispersed, which implies that they engage in social circumstances that are more public and less regulated than those of female offenders.

**Self-Protection**

**Table: 7. Chi-Square Table of Self Protection Action**

Self-Protection Action	Answer	Female (n)	Male (n)	p-value
<b>Screamed from pain, fear</b>	No	737	708	0.000
	Yes	60	9	
<b>Tried to get attention</b>	No	729	695	0.000
	Yes	68	22	
<b>Threat off w/ other weapon</b>	No	789	703	0.123
	Yes	8	14	
<b>Avoided injury</b>	No	236	254	0.537
	Yes	320	301	
<b>Scared offender off</b>	No	393	359	0.102
	Yes	163	196	
<b>Helped escape</b>	No	394	453	0.000
	Yes	162	102	
<b>Protected property</b>	No	446	455	0.754
	Yes	110	100	
<b>Protected other people</b>	No	460	479	0.258
	Yes	96	76	
<b>Other type help</b>	No	527	525	0.990
	Yes	29	30	

Men and women employ distinct strategies for self-protection (Table 7). A higher percentage of women than men engaged in yelling (7.5% compared to 1.2%), attempting to gain attention (8.5% versus 3.1%), or assisting others in escaping. The observed differences were statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ). No differences were observed between men and women regarding the physical aggression techniques utilized to deter assailants, prevent injury, and protect property or individuals.

In situations where direct pushback is unsafe or unfeasible, yelling and fleeing can be viewed as strategies to attract external assistance (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Felson, 2002). Women are more inclined to employ these methods when faced with potential personal or legal harm during a physical confrontation in a familiar or intimate setting.

Men and women vary, proving that chance concepts are useless. According to feminist legal studies (McPherson, 2022), self-defense notions make individuals furious and self-centered rather than desperate. Strategies based on passive or avoidance methods may reduce harm and demonstrate greater effectiveness, especially for women (Bachman et al., 2004), while training may serve to empower women (De Welde, 2003). Hermand et al. (2001) argue that social norms related to balance inhibit violent resistance, whereas Edwards and Koshan (2023) maintain that the “reasonable man” standard in English and Canadian law limits women's defensive options, especially in intimate relationships. The findings suggest that Routine Activities Theory can explain the impact of situational factors on self-protective behavior; however, it fails to clarify how female legal and cultural norms define acceptable conduct. Situational opportunities, female education, and societal constraints contribute to self-protection.

## **Police Response**

**Table: 8. Chi-Square Table of Reporting to Police**

<b>Report to Police</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>female(n)</b>	<b>male (n)</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Reported to police</b>	Yes	1663	1476	0.000
	No	3125	2886	
<b>How did police find out</b>	Respondent	1221	1096	0.000
	Other hh member	125	92	
	Someone official	103	83	
	Someone else	160	131	
	Police at scene	29	53	
	Offender was police	7	2	
	Some other way	14	14	
<b>Took report</b>	No	135	149	0.015
	Yes	1014	850	
<b>Searched</b>	No	815	702	0.148
	Yes	334	297	
<b>Took evidence</b>	No	1002	843	0.027
	Yes	147	156	

**Does Crime Hurt Differently? Female and Male Realities of Victimization  
in the NCVS 2023 Data**

<b>Questioned witness/suspect</b>	No	825	745	0.055
	Yes	324	254	
<b>Promised surveillance</b>	No	1068	949	0.022
	Yes	81	50	
<b>Promised investigate</b>	No	947	842	0.081
	Yes	202	157	
<b>Made arrest</b>	No	1032	884	0.096
	Yes	117	115	
<b>Other response</b>	No	1072	938	0.134
	Yes	77	61	
<b>Don't know type response</b>	No	1111	967	0.155
	Yes	38	32	
<b>Later contact with police</b>	Yes	525	399	0.001
	No	1091	1041	
<b>Police or respondent contacted</b>	Police contacted	270	229	0.000
	R contact police	178	112	
	Both	58	35	0.000
	Don't know	5	2	
	Other	2	12	0.000
<b>In person or by phone</b>	In person	101	90	
	Phone, mail, etc	340	248	0.008
	Both 1 and 2	55	43	
	Don't know	7	0	

Table 8 presents a detailed overview of how victims engage with the police, the types of interventions they receive, and the extent to which these vary by gender. A statistically significant difference is evident in the rate of police reporting: 34.7% of female victims (n = 1,663) and 33.8% of male victims (n = 1,476) reported their victimization to law enforcement (p = .000). Notably, women were more likely to initiate direct contact with the police, whereas men more frequently came into contact with officers already present at the scene (e.g., “Police at scene”: men = 53, women = 29).

**Table: 9. Chi-Square Table of Police Response**

<b>Police Response</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Female (n)</b>	<b>Male (n)</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Took report</b>	No	300	234	0.005
	Yes	225	165	
<b>Questioning</b>	No	464	354	0.005

<b>Surveillance</b>	Yes	61	45	0.002
	No	454	356	
<b>Recovered property</b>	Yes	71	43	0.001
	No	427	302	
<b>Made arrest</b>	Yes	98	97	0.005
	No	436	332	
<b>Stayed in touch</b>	Yes	89	67	0.003
	No	399	317	
<b>Other action</b>	Yes	126	82	0.004
	No	488	375	
<b>Police follow-up</b>	Yes	37	24	
	No	454	351	
	Yes	71	48	

Table 9 also demonstrates that 88.2% of female victims will make a formal complaint after speaking to police, compared to a tiny percentage of male victims ( $p = .015$ ). Police activities including collecting evidence, interrogating witnesses or suspects, and pledging to monitor things also indicated tiny but statistically significant gender disparities, mainly in favor of female victims. After their first police contact, 32.5% of women had more than men ( $p = .001$ ). This suggests female victims follow up more. The second table displays police actions and results. Victimized women were more likely to report the offense to police (42.9%), be arrested (16.9% vs. 16.8%), and have follow-up contact (24% vs. 20%), all statistically significant ( $p < .01$ ). The statistics show that gender strongly affects police victimization reactions. These results support police gender dynamics study. Buzawa and Austin (1993) found that police aid injured women because they are more conspicuous and “in need of protection.” Male victims don't seek for assistance because they're terrified of being rejected, mocked, or misdiagnosed, which makes them less social, according to Dim and Lysova (2021). Javaid (2017) showed police prejudices in male sexual victimization ignoring. Johnson (2007) and Leisenring (2012) found that many female victims saw the police as helpful, but they also found discontent, as shown by their increased follow-up contact (Table 8), often to improve resolution or protection. Hoyle and Sanders (2000) found that action, social relationships, and story context impact victims' desires for revenge, aid, and security. The government helps women victims more than males, yet men are disregarded. Women struggle to share their experiences with others (Masharipov, 2024). These discrepancies demonstrate police prejudice and self-inflicted issues for males.

**Does Crime Hurt Differently? Female and Male Realities of Victimization  
in the NCVS 2023 Data**

**The Effect**

**Table: 10. Chi-Square Table of Social and Psychological Effects on Victims Among Sex**

Social and psychological effects	Answer	Female (n)	Male (n)	p-value
Victim of crime leads to problems (job, school, boss, etc.)	No	717	703	0.000
	Yes	185	92	
Victim of crime leads to problems (family members or friends)	No	661	691	0.000
	Yes	241	104	
Did you feel worried or anxious	No	125	135	0.000
	Yes	525	260	
Did you feel angry	No	161	149	0.000
	Yes	488	246	
Did you feel sad or depressed	No	272	237	0.000
	Yes	377	158	
Did you feel vulnerable	No	173	178	0.000
	Yes	475	217	
Did you feel violated	No	195	187	0.000
	Yes	453	208	
Did you feel mistrust	No	243	177	0.016
	Yes	405	216	
Did you feel unsafe	No	156	145	0.000
	Yes	493	250	

Table 10 shows significant gender differences in the social and psychological consequences of victimization across all measured domains ( $p \leq .016$ ). Female victims consistently report higher levels of functional disruption, interpersonal strain, and emotional distress than male victims. In terms of functional impact, 20.5% of women—compared to 11.6% of men—reported problems affecting employment, education, or interactions with authority figures, while interpersonal disruptions were reported by 26% of women and 13% of men. Emotional responses also differed markedly: women more frequently reported anxiety (80.8% vs. 65.8%), anger (75.2% vs. 62.3%), sadness or depression (58.1% vs. 40.0%), vulnerability (73.3% vs. 55.0%), feelings of violation (69.9% vs. 52.6%), mistrust (62.5% vs. 55.0%), and feeling unsafe (75.9% vs. 63.3%).

Women who have experienced violence, particularly sexual and interpersonal assault, have more career hurdles, less social supports, and long-term mental health issues, according to study. Separate financial and care duties may worsen these issues for certain women (Hanson

et al., 2010). Understand that women with high melancholy levels are not necessarily more likely to have emotional problems. According to Andrews et al. (2003), Fox et al. (2009), and Jeanes (2007), institutional and structural responses to abuse, such as disbelieving, minimizing, and victim-blaming, are substantially linked to increased anxiety, terror, and PTSD in women. Gender standards regarding inactivity and purity affect emotional expression and healing.

If a guy struggles to express his melancholy, he may have difficulties explaining his concerns. Ayala et al. (2015) said male victims typically get skepticism or criticism, which makes them less confident and makes them suppress their feelings. Women report victimization and seek aid more than males. Thus, gender inequality may be unveiled (Kaukinen, 2002). Women are more likely to experience sexual or physical abuse from partners or institutions, which can lead to anxiety, distrust, and feelings of unsafety (Masser et al., 2010).

These trends indicate that violence and cultural perceptions regarding women's reliability, emotional expressiveness, and willingness to seek assistance and show respect influence victimization. Jeanes (2007) and Masser et al. (2010) contend that “credible victimhood” enhances the visibility of women's suffering, while men's suffering is often overlooked or penalized for deviating from conventional emotional narratives. The social and psychological consequences of victimization are influenced by gender, encompassing aspects such as potential, discourse, and diffusion.

## **CONCLUSION**

This study uses Routine Activities Theory to reexamine gendered victimization in the US using the 2023 National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). The most significant finding is that violent victimization rates may converge while opportunity structures remain heterogeneous. The 2023 National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) found 22.5 violent victims per 1,000 12-year-olds. Subtrends including male non-simple assault showed altering exposure patterns rather than the cessation of gendered risk (Tapp & Coen, 2024). Our data's largest long-term gender discrepancies match victimization clusters, according to the RAT interpretation. When a motivated criminal meets a suitable target under constrained competent supervision, clusters form. Gender does not affect “motivation”; rather, social structure separates everyday jobs into various places, connections, and times. The larger body of victimization literature links gender to the settings and relational proximity of harm, not just prevalence (Tapp & Coen, 2024). NCVS-based patterns show women's disproportionate exposure to sexual and domestic contexts and men's disproportionate exposure to public assaults.

## **Does Crime Hurt Differently? Female and Male Realities of Victimization in the NCVS 2023 Data**

---

Comparative data from other areas strengthens the interpretation. According to UNODC statistics, four-fifths of international homicide victims are male. This is because males are often exposed to high-risk public settings and criminal networks (UNODC, 2019). However, global femicide and partner/family homicide statistics repeatedly points to the home and intimate connections as disproportionately damaging for women. The home and personal relationships are opportunity structures with offender access, privacy, and limited guardianship (UNODC, 2025).

Reality genders guardianship; “capable guardians” include cultural scripts and structures. One of this study's most crucial findings is that guardianship is an institutional and cultural capacity to observe, validate, and act, not only a physical presence (bystanders, locks, police patrol). The NCVS method studies reported and unreported events to show how gender norms prevent disclosure, which reduces guardianship, especially for stigmatized male victims. Male crime victims are less likely to report incidents and more dissatisfied with police response, according to studies. Dim and Lysova (2021) suggest this may reduce “formal guardianship” after the event. In parallel, worldwide measuring work shows how stigma and institutional impediments reduce gender-based violence reporting. This indicates that the prevalence reflects both the perpetrator's victimization and the societal availability of guardianship paths including police, health services, and support groups (Violence against Women, 2025).

The five-dimensional study design shows that gender defines victimization as a process rather than an event, linking the environment to self-protective behavior, reporting options, policing, and psychological effects. When gender is used as a control variable or study focuses on one outcome (e.g., reporting), this integrated framing is absent.

The findings also support the “gendered spaces” extension of regular activity thinking, which claims that women and men are victimized differently in culturally “feminine” or “masculine” environments. Abstract-level (paywalled) data suggests that “feminine” settings like shopping and banking may make women more vulnerable. However, nightlife and other male-coded contexts have distinct risk configurations, supporting the idea that location is socially constructed (Savard et al., 2020).

According to official Canadian data, women are more likely to be abused by intimate partners than males are by strangers. This confirms that the US trend is fundamentally repeatable across Western cultures (Vaillancourt, 2010). Gender difference, institutional trust,

and social norms surrounding disclosure and asking aid affect the severity of gendered opportunity structures, not their existence.

RAT can explain where victimization happens and why harm escalates or persists thereafter, according to this study. Second conceptual contribution. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), 30% of women experience physical or sexual violence in their lifetimes, and progress in reducing intimate partner violence has been slow. This shows that private opportunity structures and institutional guardianship oppose change (Violence against Women, 2025).

Rising global femicide statistics shows that many deadly home incidents are preceded by abuse and occasionally police involvement. This shows that “guardianship failure” may last a long time. This supports RAT-consistent psychological repercussions in the results. Psychological responses and social response contexts (support vs denial) and institutions' credibility as protectors after injury influence differential discomfort and disruption. The study is descriptive and relies on secondary data, yet it is not theoretically simple. This study is unique in three ways: (1) it incorporates multiple victimization dimensions into a single RAT-guided framework; (2) it uses NCVS capacity to investigate guardianship by including unreported incidents; and (3) it positions gendered victimization in the US within a comparative opportunity-structure argument rather than a cultural explanation. So, the research goes beyond the idea that “women and men experience different kinds of victimization.” It accomplishes so by explaining how gender affects the assembly of RAT components and how these configurations affect outcomes like police involvement and psychological effect. Prevention and victim care must target situational nodes where gendered convergence occurs to succeed, as the RAT suggests. Because informal guardianship is weaker, men are more at risk in unorganized public areas and social contexts. For women, it emphasizes the home and relationship circumstances, where criminals have easy access and protection from the outside is often inadequate. This emphasizes the need of institutional mechanisms for victims to seek help. Global policy discourse stresses that women are more at risk at home and that institutional intervention is vital to prevention.

This study is limited by the NCVS assessment (self-report and recall restrictions) and gender operationalization. Future research should use NCVS microdata to model intersectional routine activities (e.g., gender, age, neighborhood context) and test how guardianship (formal or informal) mediates the relationship between situational context and psychosocial harm. More study underlines the need of identifying structurally at-risk groups. RAT is well-suited to

## **Does Crime Hurt Differently? Female and Male Realities of Victimization in the NCVS 2023 Data**

---

explain guardianship and exposure disparities since NCVS-based research show substantially greater incidence of violent victimization.

To conclude, the 2023 National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) supports hypothesis that criminal activity may “hurt differently” for men and women owing to gendered opportunity systems. These frameworks include regular activities, geographical organization, relational proximity, and uneven guardianship. Cross-national murder and femicide statistics, global prevalence estimates of violence against women, and comparative victimization reporting patterns all show that gender shapes victimization settings and effects, even at low aggregate rates.

## REFERENCES

- Andrews, B., Brewin, C. R., & Rose, S. (2003). Gender, social support, and PTSD in victims of violent crime. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 16*(4), 421-427. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024478305142>
- Ayala, E. E., Kotary, B., & Hetz, M. (2015). Blame attributions of victims and perpetrators. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515599160*
- Bachman, R., Lachs, M., & Meloy, M. (2004). Reducing Injury Through Self-Protection by Elderly Victims of Violence: The Interaction Effects of Gender of Victim and the Victim/Offender Relationship. *Journal of Elder Abuse & Neglect, 16*(4), 1-24. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J084v16n04\\_01](https://doi.org/10.1300/J084v16n04_01)
- Brenik, M., Tuluceanu, A. C., Smillie, E., Carpes Barros Cassal, L., Mead, C., & Mojtahedi, D. (2025). Impact of Perpetrator and Victim Gender on Perceptions of Stalking Severity. *Behavioral Sciences* (Basel, Switzerland), *15*(2), 120. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15020120>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2023, September). U.S. Nonfatal Violent Victimization Rate Returns to Prepandemic Levels. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. [https://bjs.ojp.gov/document/cv22\\_pr.pdf](https://bjs.ojp.gov/document/cv22_pr.pdf)
- Buzawa, E. S., & Austin, T. (1993). Determining Police Response to Domestic Violence Victims: The Role of Victim Preference. *American Behavioral Scientist, 36*(5), 610–623. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764293036005006>
- Catalano, S., Smith, E., Synder, H., & Rand, M., (2009). Female Victims of Violence, 2009. Bureau of Justice Statistics. <https://bjs.ojp.gov>
- Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach. *American Sociological Review, 44*(4), 588-608.
- Connell, R. W. (2000). *The Men and the Boys*. University of California Press.
- Connell, R. W. (2009). *Gender in World Perspective* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1990). Killing the Competition: Female/Female and Male/Male Homicide. *Human Nature, 1*(1), 81-107. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02692147>
- Davies, M., Austen, K., & Rogers, P. (2011). Sexual preference, gender, and blame attributions in adolescent sexual assault. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 151*(5), 592-607. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2010.522617>
- De Welde, K. (2003). Getting physical: Subverting gender through self-defense. *Women's Studies International Forum, 26*(3), 235-246.
- Dim, E. E., & Lysova, A. (2021). Male Victims' Experiences with and Perceptions of the Criminal Justice Response to Intimate Partner Abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 37*(15-16), NP13067–NP13091. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605211001476>
- Edwards, S. S., & Koshan, J. (2023). Women Who Kill Abusive Men: The Limitations of Loss of Control, Provocation and Self-Defence in England and Wales and Canada. *The Journal of Criminal Law, 87*(2), 75-96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00220183231165719>
- Ewing, C. P. (1987). Battered women who kill: Psychological self-defense as legal justification. Lexington Books.
- Felson, M. (2002). Crime and Everyday Life. Pine Forge Press.

**Does Crime Hurt Differently? Female and Male Realities of Victimization  
in the NCVS 2023 Data**

---

- Felson, M., & Eckert, M. (2019). *Crime and everyday life: A brief introduction*. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506394817>
- Felson, R. B., & Paré, P.-P. (2005). Gender and the victim's decision to report crime to the police. *Criminology*, 43(3), 683-710.
- Fox, A. R., Nobles, K.A., & Piquero M.R. (2009). Gender, crime victimization and fear of crime. *Security Journal*, 22(1), 24-39. <https://doi.org/10.1057/sj.2008.13>
- Gebo, E., Rebellon, C. J., & Turner, H. A. (2022). Specifying the Nature of the Victim-Offender Overlap: A Gendered Analysis of Victimization and Offending Subtypes. *Victims & Offenders*, 17(3), 372-394. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2021.1970066>
- Global Study on Homicide. (2019). UNODC. <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/global-study-on-homicide.html>
- Hamby, S., Finkelhor, D., & Turner, H. (2013). Perpetrator and Victim Gender Patterns for 21 Forms of Youth Victimization. *Violence and Victims*, 28(6), 915-930. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-12-00067>
- Hanson, R. F., Sawyer, G. K., Begle, A. M., & Hubel, G. S. (2010). The Impact of Crime Victimization on Quality of Life. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 23(2), 275-284.
- Hearn, J. (1996). Men's violence to known women: Men's accounts and men's policy developments. In *Violence and gender relations: Theories and interventions* (pp. 99-114). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Heimer, K. (2008). Understanding Violence Against Women Using the NCVS: What We Know and Where We Need to Go. e Bureau of Justice Statistics Data User's Workshop, Washington, D.C. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh236/files/media/document/heimer.pdf>
- Heimer, K., & Lauritsen, J. L. (2008). Violence Against Women: An Examination of NCVS and UCR Data. Bureau of Justice Statistics. <https://bjs.ojp.gov>
- Herman, D., Mullet, E., Tomera, P., & Touzart, V. (2001). The relationship between intent, consequences, the dangerousness of the victim, and blame: The case of self-defense. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 7(1), 57-69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10683160108401783>
- Howard, J. A. (1984). The "normal" victim: The effects of gender stereotypes on reactions to victims. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47, 270-281.
- Hoyle, C., & Sanders, A. (2000). Police Response to Domestic Violence. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 40(1), 14-36. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/40.1.14>
- Javaid, A. (2017). Giving a Voice to the Voiceless: Police Responses to Male Rape. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 11(2), 146-156. <https://doi.org/10.1093/policing/paw035>
- Jeanes, E. L. (2007). The doing and undoing of gender. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 14(6), 579-597. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2007.00371.x>
- Johnson, I. M. (2007). Victims' perceptions of police response to domestic violence incidents. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35(5), 498-510. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2007.07.003>
- Jovanoski, A., & Sharlamanov, K. (2021). Male as a Victims: Domestic Violence from a Different Perspective. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, 12(3), Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.14299/ijser.2013.01>

- Karmen, A. (2007). *Crime Victims: An Introduction to Victimology*. Cengage Learning.
- Kaukinen, C. (2002). The help-seeking decisions of violent crime victims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17(4), 432-456. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260502017004006>
- Leisenring, A. (2012). Victims' Perceptions of Police Response to Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of Police Crisis Negotiations*, 12(2), 146-164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332586.2012.728926>
- Márquez, C. S., Lukić, N, & Strand, L (2023). Gender Perspective of Victimization, Crime and Penal Policy. In D. Vujadinovic, M. Fröhlich & T. Giergerich (Eds.), *Gender-Component Legal Education*, Routledge.
- Masharipov, A. (2024). Özbekistan'da Kadına Yönelik Şiddete Karşı Toplumsal Farkındalık Oluşturma Aracı Olarak Sosyal Medya: Sukut Saqlama Örneği. *İmgelem*, Özbekistan Özel Sayısı, 249-270. <https://doi.org/10.53791/imgelem.1455119>
- Masser, B., Lee, K., & McKimmie, B. M. (2010). Bad Woman, Bad Victim? Disentangling the Effects of Victim Stereotypicality, Gender Stereotypicality and Benevolent Sexism on Acquaintance Rape Victim Blame. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 62(7-8), 494-504. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9648-y>
- McPherson, R. (2022). Women and self-defence: An empirical and doctrinal analysis. *International Journal of Law in Context*, 18(4), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1744552322000131>
- Mitchell, D., Angelone, D. J., Kohlberger, B., & Hirschman, R. (2009). Effects of Offender Motivation, Victim Gender, and Participant Gender on Perceptions of Rape Victims and Offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(9), 1564–1578. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260508323661>
- National Research Center. (1996). *Understanding Violence Against Women*. National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/5127>
- Pease, K. (2007). Victims and Victimization. In S. Shoham Giora, O. Beck, & M. Kett (Eds.), *International Handbook of Penology and Criminal Justice* (pp. 587–611). Routledge.
- Planty, M., & Langton, L. (2013). *Female Victims of Sexual Violence, 1994–2010* [Special Report]. Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Rye, B. J., Greatrix, S. A., & Enright, C. S. (2006). The Case of the Guilty Victim: The Effects of Gender Stereotypes on Reactions to Victims. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 54(7-8), 639-649. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9020-9>
- Savard, D. M., Kelley, T. M., & Merolla, D. M. (2020). Routine Activities and Criminal Victimization: The Significance of Gendered Spaces. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 35(23-24), 5425-5447. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517721170>
- Semenza, D. C. (2021). Gender Differences in the Victim-Offender Relationship for On- and Offline Youth Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(19-20), 9255-9276. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519864358>
- Şentürk, S. (2023). Decentering Western Feminism and Manly Nationalism. *İmgelem*, 7(13), 391-408. <https://doi.org/10.53791/imgelem.1328861>
- Stanko, E. A., & Hobdell, K. (1993). Assault on Men: Masculinity and Male Victimization. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 33(3), 400-415.

**Does Crime Hurt Differently? Female and Male Realities of Victimization  
in the NCVS 2023 Data**

---

- Statistics, U. S. B. of J. (2024). National Crime Victimization Survey, [United States], 2023 [Dataset]. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR38962.v1>
- Tapp, S. N., & Coen, E. J. (2024). Criminal Victimization, 2023. Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/criminal-victimization-2023>
- UNODC. (2019). *Global Study on Homicide*.
- UNODC. (2025). *Femicides in 2024*.
- Vaillancourt, R. (2010). Gender differences in police-reported violent crime in Canada, 2008 (Vols. 1–24). Statistics Canada.
- Varlioglu, R., & Hayes, B. E. (2022). Gender differences in the victim-offender overlap for dating violence: The role of early violent socialization. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 123, 105428. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2021.105428>
- WHO (2025). *Violence against women*. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/violence-against-women>
- Walklate, S. (2007). *Imagining the Victim of Crime*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1998). Lethal and nonlethal violence against wives and the evolutionary psychology of male sexual proprietariness. In *Rethinking violence against women* (pp. 199-230). Sage Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452243306.n8>

*Makale Bilgileri/Article Information*

<b><i>Etik Beyan:</i></b>	Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan edilir.	<b><i>Ethical Statement:</i></b>	It is declared that scientific and ethical principles have been followed while carrying out and writing this study and that all the sources used have been properly cited.
<b><i>Çıkar Çatışması:</i></b>	Çalışmada kişiler veya kurumlar arası çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır.	<b><i>Conflict of Interest:</i></b>	The authors declare that declare no conflict of interest.
<b><i>Yazar Katkı Beyanı:</i></b>	Çalışmanın tamamı yazar tarafından oluşturulmuştur.	<b><i>Author Contribution Declaration:</i></b>	The entire study was created by the author.
<b><i>Mali Destek:</i></b>	Çalışma için herhangi bir kurum veya projeden mali destek alınmamıştır.	<b><i>Financial Support:</i></b>	The study received no financial support from any institution or project.
<b><i>Yapay Zekâ Kullanımı:</i></b>	Bu çalışmada herhangi bir yapay zekâ tabanlı araç veya uygulama kullanılmamıştır.	<b><i>Use of Artificial Intelligence:</i></b>	This study did not utilize any artificial intelligence-based tools or applications.
<b><i>İntihal:</i></b>	Bu makalede intihal taraması yapılmış ve intihal içermediği teyit edilmiştir. – <a href="#">İntihal.Net</a>	<b><i>Plagiarism:</i></b>	This article has been scanned for plagiarism and it has been confirmed that it does not contain plagiarism. – <a href="#">İntihal.Net</a>